SENATE—*Tuesday, April 13, 1999*

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Lord of creation, You have written Your signature in the bursting beauty of this magnificent spring morning in our Nation's Capital. The breathtaking splendor of blossoms blankets the city with fairyland wonder. The daffodils and crocus have opened to express Your glory. Now, Lord, tune our hearts to join with all nature in singing Your praise.

We thank You for the rebirth of hope that comes with this season of renewal. You remind us, ''Behold, I make all things new!'' As the seeds and bulbs have germinated in the earth, so You have prepared us to burst forth in newness of life. We forget the former things and claim Your new beginning for us. Help us to accept Your forgiveness and be giving and forgiving people. Clean out the hurting memories of our hearts so that we may be open communicators of Your vibrant, creative spirit as we tackle problems and grasp the possibilities of this day for our beloved Nation's future. By Your power. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. On behalf of the majority leader, I would like to make a few announcements.

SCHEDULE

Mr. SESSIONS. This morning, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow the weekly party caucuses to meet, and upon reconvening at 2:15 p.m. the Senate will begin immediate consideration of the appointment of conferees with respect to the budget resolution. Therefore, Members should expect rollcall votes during today's session of the Senate.

The leader has also expressed his intent to consider the budget conference report this week, with the hope of a final vote on that important legislation by Thursday.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 767

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant (John Merlino) read as follows:

A bill (S. 767) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 2-month extension for the due date for filing a tax return for any member of a uniformed service on a tour of duty outside the United States for a period which includes the normal due date of such filing.

Mr. SESSIONS. I object to further reading of this bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleagues for their attention.

(The remarks of Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 768 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

OSHA RESPONSIVENESS HEARING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I also will take just a moment to express my personal appreciation to the Chair for chairing a very important subcommittee hearing this morning on OSHA, hearing at that meeting from an individual from Alabama, Mr. Ron Hayes, whose son tragically was killed in a workplace accident and who has made it his personal cause to confront the problems in OSHA, to make sure that agency is responsive to real needs and is really working to improve the workplace and make it safer and not just be involved in bureaucratic paperwork. It was an extraordinary hearing into a very important matter that can protect the lives and health of many people in the workplace and at the same time reduce bureaucracy and paperwork.

I Thank the Senator for his efforts.

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. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will take a moment to talk a little bit about agriculture.

As the President knows, agriculture is a most important element in Wyoming's economy and to Wyoming's culture. During this past week, I had a chance to visit with many people in Wyoming who are very concerned about agriculture and agricultural markets or the lack thereof. So I want to talk a little bit about my vision of the things we are doing and can be doing in Congress with respect to agriculture in this country.

Certainly our purpose ought to be to strengthen markets so the price for agricultural products is enhanced and so family farmers and family ranchers are able to make a reasonable return on their investment and on their time.

We have had a tough year in agriculture, in crops, and in livestock, and many of us have been working for some time to find some of the things that are appropriate for the Government to do to strengthen the agricultural sector.

One of them, of course, is trade and the idea of reducing the unilateral sanctions we have had in place around the world. Many times in the past, countries such as Pakistan, when they set off the bomb and so on, we immediately then did not trade with them. We have changed some of those unilateral sanctions. They are not useful for any other reason than to penalize our own markets.

We are pushing for stronger enforcement of trade agreements, particularly in NAFTA, for example, where we need to make sure that they are being administered properly, that goods are not being dumped, that goods are not coming in from another country through, in this case, the member of NAFTA that benefited from that, and working to reduce unfair trade barriers which have existed and continue to exist around the world in interesting places, such as the European Union, where the President has just been. These are the kinds of things that seem to me to be totally unfair, where we open our markets to others and, in return, we have market barriers.

I am very pleased with what is happening with regard to the negotiations with China. I am not pleased with all

the things that happen in China, of course, but in terms of the WTO negotiations, we find, for example, that we are going to make some arrangements to reduce the 40-percent to probably 10-percent tariff on our meat. That will be a very good forward move.

I am hopeful we can find a way to get the largest potential customer in the world into the WTO so that not only will it open markets but we do not have to deal unilaterally with someone; if we have an agreement, then there is the World Trade Organization to enforce those agreements.

We are talking about the tax relief for agriculture. We had income averaging last year, which is very good because the income of the farmers and ranchers varies very much. We have a proposition to have farm accounts which allow farmers to put the money into sort of an IRA for a period of time and draw it out before they pay taxes on it so that they tend to level out in income.

Estate tax relief: I hope that is one of the things we talk about when we deal with the tax reform—estate tax relief. Currently legislation is there to do that.

Meat labeling: I think we need to have, as we have proposed it here—and will again—meat labeling so that we know what the products are and so buyers, when they go to the grocery store, can determine whether the product is domestic. They need to have an opportunity to do that.

Also, grading: USDA grades are for domestic products, and will be used that way. Again, current legislation is pending.

One of the problems of the livestock industry has been, allegedly—and I agree with it—the concentration of packers. We have the latest figures, and I heard that about four packers kill about 87 percent of the product, which would cause you to think that there may be some legislation on pricing. And we need to do that.

We met with the Attorney General and asked that we, again, take a look at the potential of monopoly activities that may be there and do something about the concentration of packers. If they find again that there is nothing illegal being done, as they have in the past, it seems to me that we ought to take a look at the underlying legislation, the Packers and Stockyards Act, to see if, in fact, that needs to be changed. We need to have more competition. Things like owning the cattle, for example, and then using their own cattle instead of going into the market, which can manipulate the price—that fact, that there is buying without reporting the market price. That is something we need to do.

We are trying to change the inspections for interstate shipment of meat so that State inspections will suffice. We think that will help the market a great deal.

Certainly, in the crop area we need to look at NAFTA to make sure that there is not dumping of wheat and other products in this country. We need to take a look at the Crop Insurance Program, which I think has not worked that satisfactorily, to move the Freedom to Farm, and some of the things that are included in that.

Mr. President, I just think that there are a number of things that need to be done. We have some unique issues, of course, in the West where in a great many of our States—in my State of Wyoming 50 percent, and in the case of Nevada, 87 percent—the land belongs to the Federal Government. Much of the land is grazed. Livestock grazes on much of the land. We need to make that accessible so we can have multiple use of those renewable resources. We need to do something about the permit program so that they are not difficult. It isn't necessary, in my view, to have an environmental impact statement on every unchanged renewal of the grazing permits.

So these are some of the changes that need to be done. I don't think agriculture is looking for subsidies, or looking for a farm program. But they are looking for an opportunity to have the markets—an opportunity to go into the marketplace and get prices that are, in fact, reflective of the costs that go into the product.

This is a basic industry to our country. There will be changes made, of course, as time goes by. There have been tremendous changes in agriculture over the last 50 years. The family farmers are getting larger. They are more mechanized and more efficient. They are also much more expensive. And much more investment is required. When you have a great deal of investment, of course, when you have several years of bad prices, it makes it very, very difficult, which also leads to the need probably for some additional lending capacity and some additional assistance in lending because of the 2 years that we have had.

So, Mr. President, I hope that as we come back in after this recess people will be more aware of the difficulty in agriculture, and that we can address ourselves to the many opportunities that we have to strengthen those markets and to provide more healthy and vigorous agriculture.

I thank you, Mr. President, for the time.

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. GORTON. 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. GORTON. Mr. President, are we still in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

KOSOVO

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on the Tuesday before the recess, I voted against authorizing the air war in Yugoslavia. I did so because it seemed to me that the goal was a goal not worthy enough, not grave enough to begin what amounts to a war, even though under the President's leadership it has only been half a war.

Our goals were to be permitted to send young American men and women into the midst of a 600-year-old civil strife in order to enforce an agreement that neither side wished. I also voted against that proposition, because it did not seem to me that the means were sufficient to gain even this questionable end. I voted against it, because it did not seem to me that the administration began to foresee the terrible consequences that would ensue if, and as President Milosevic has, accelerated his expulsion of Kosovars from their own homeland, or the refugee problem with which we would be faced. In other words, there were no contingency plans.

At this point, almost 3 weeks later, all of those negative consequences have transpired. We are in the midst of an air war. The air war has not been successful. It is being fought apparently by a President who believes that one can have a war not only without casualties on our side but with few, if any, casualties on the other side. You should not begin a war for reasons that do not justify the use of force, and only the gravest national security reasons do so. And, if you get in one, you should not go into it halfheartedly or without a desire actually to win.

Mr. President, what are the potential outcomes? If we are overwhelmingly successful, we may get sometime in the next week, or the next month, or the next year, exactly the privileges that we sought in the first place—the right to send our soldiers into a now devastated countryside in order to require people to live together who do not wish to live together, and perhaps to enforce an autonomy, which I have already said both sides oppose, or, alternatively, maybe we can get the Russians or someone else to help us reach a negotiated solution in which the Kosovars will be worse off than they were before, and in which the barbarism of Mr. Milosevic will at least have been partially rewarded. Or we may end up sending our own troops into that devilishly difficult part of the Balkans, whether from the south, or the west and the north—and we do not yet know—with an escalation of what will still be a halfhearted war with secondary goals, goals that will not include the removal of the present government in Belgrade and the establishment of a real peace. Or, I suppose it is

possible—just remotely possible—that the President and NATO may decide that we want a full-scale war against Serbia until that regime is, in fact, destroyed.

None of these is an appetizing outcome, by any stretch of the imagination. We are left with these alternatives only, I think, because this administration did not seriously consider what it was doing before it began doing it, or seriously consider both the cost and expense in men, material, money, and prestige of the United States for such a dubious goal.

I wish that I had a firm, accurate, and a favorable outcome to look forward to. I wish I could come up with the appropriate means to reach such a goal. However, it seems to me that if we have learned anything in the last several years from other parts of the world, and in the last several weeks from this part of the world, it is that the armed services of the United States should only be used for a vitally important interest of the United States. If they are then to be used, they should be used with a clear and worthy goal, and with a degree of ruthlessness that assures we attain that goal. At this point we have done nothing but worsen our relationships with the Russians and with the neighbors of Kosovo itself at great expense to ourselves and at a horrendous expense to the victims in Kosovo who have been killed, driven from their homes, or driven out of their homeland entirely, without any significant prospect of returning at any time soon.

We do need a serious national debate on the subject and we need a President of the United States who far more clearly articulates our goals and how we are to attain those goals. We have not had that kind of presentation. For that reason, support for the United States efforts is extremely shallow and is almost certain to disappear once the casualty lists begin to be published in this country.

It is time for candor. It is time for clarity. It is time for a clear statement of our goals. In fact, we are well past time for both of those and we have not received them. I think we are faced with an extremely serious challenge with no clear way to that proper and appropriate goal.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:20 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. ROBERTS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business before the Senate at the moment.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

MOTION TO APPOINT CONFEREES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with respect to the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 hour equally divided on the motion.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you, Mr. President. I understand Senator REID has some motions to instruct. I do not think they will be in order unless we yield back the time that has just been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to Senator LAUTENBERG that the situation now is that the motion I made to appoint conferees is pending. There is 1 hour on it. I am prepared to yield back time on that if the Senator from New Jersey is, and then he can proceed to his first motion.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We are OK with that.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back the half hour we have.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. And I yield back the time we have on our side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and the Senate would probably like to know, what he has by way of motions on his side. How many does he think he is going to have this afternoon?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Since the chairman of the committee asked how many I think, I am free to give an answer. I think there are four, but my guess is that we have to wait to see if there are going to be any more or not.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. Is it not correct, now that the time has been yielded back on the motion to appoint conferees, each motion to instruct carries 30 minutes equally divided and that is all the time available at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Unless and until that is yielded back, another motion is not in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Are second-degree amendments to those motions in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; second-degree amendments are in order, and they have 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think we will have one that has to do with praising our men in the military which we will attach to this at some point. Substantively, unless Senator LAUTENBERG proposes something that prompts a second-degree amendment of some type or prompts us to make an amendment, we do not have any contemplated at this time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is hard for me to imagine there is anything here——

Mr. DOMENICI. We can accept them; right?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We will have to kind of slug our way through and see how it goes. I appreciate the introduction that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee presented. We are going to offer our motions on instructing conferees.

Mr. President, are we now in a position to go ahead and offer those?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Just to recount, there is a half hour equally divided on the motions themselves?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion to instruct the conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

Mr. DOMENICI. I reserve the right to object. Is it very lengthy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator reserves the right to object.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object, and let's read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would reserve all Social Security surpluses only for Social Security, and not for other programs (including other retirement programs) or tax cuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

The motion is very simple. It instructs the conferees who are going to be reviewing the budget resolution to include in the conference report provisions that will reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security and for Social Security only—not other programs, including other retirement programs, as has been suggested, and not for tax cuts.

For years, Democrats have been arguing that our top fiscal priority should be to save Social Security first, and we feel very strongly about that. It

is, after all, our party's creation that kicked off Social Security, and we have spent decades since then protecting the program from attack.

In our view, Social Security represents a sacred trust between the Government and the people. It is a trust that should not and must not be violated.

Nearly 44 million Americans now benefit from Social Security, and many of them depend heavily on the program for their survival. For 66 percent of the elderly, Social Security provides half their income. Without Social Security, the poverty rate among the elderly would be 48 percent; roughly 15 million more Americans would be living in poverty than do now. For single, divorced, or widowed elderly women, the poverty rate without Social Security would be 60 percent—60 percent for elderly women.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, under current projections, Social Security is adequately financed only until 2034. At that time, just when millions of baby boomers will be retired and struggling to get by, Social Security may be unable to pay the full benefits to which these Americans are entitled.

We need to act promptly to address this problem. President Clinton has proposed policies which would extend Social Security significantly to the year 2059. Unfortunately, the majority has rejected those policies, and in their place nothing has been proposed. Thus, the budget resolution approved by the Senate included nothing to extend Social Security's solvency by even a single day.

Having said that, while the Senate resolution did nothing to actually help Social Security, it at least seemed to do no harm. The resolution was based on the premise that, at a minimum, Congress should not spend Social Security surpluses on anything else. That would not extend solvency at all, but at least it would not make matters worse.

Unfortunately, we now understand that the Republican leadership has backed off from even this modest commitment. Instead, they reportedly—and we have not really seen the details—have agreed to include in the final version of the budget resolution a provision that could pose a direct and serious threat to Social Security.

Although we have not seen any final language, this provision apparently calls for using Social Security not just for Social Security but for other programs as well. Apparently, the provision would allow Social Security taxes to be diverted to other things that have some connection to retirement security. That could be a catchword. It could mean a new privatized Medicare system. Perhaps it could include civil service or military retirement programs. More likely, I am afraid it could also mean tax cuts for the wealthy that are claimed to somehow affect retirement.

I was stunned when I heard about this provision, and I think it is remarkable that the Republican leadership would even consider using Social Security surpluses for anything other than Social Security. After all, how many times during the debate on the budget did we hear about the Republicans' commitment to preserving Social Security surpluses? That was supposed to be a centerpiece of their whole resolution. But now it appears that when the Republican leadership met behind closed doors, their commitment was overwhelmed with other concerns.

This reversal is especially stunning in light of Republican criticisms about double counting, and now the GOP seems to want to use Social Security surpluses for all sorts of other programs. That sounds like double counting to me, Mr. President. After all, you cannot use a dollar twice. If you use it as a Social Security dollar for Medicaid or tax cuts, that is one less dollar available to pay Social Security benefits.

So we ought to stand up for a simple proposition; that is, to use Social Security surpluses for Social Security. That is the message of this motion to instruct. It is an effort to reverse yesterday's decision and to get the entire Senate on record in support of saving Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and exclusively for Social Security.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle will establish some type of elaborate lockbox that will protect Social Security. But given the agreement that developed yesterday, it makes one wonder: What will Social Security surpluses be locked up for? Will they be locked up for tax cuts? For other retirement programs? For some new type of program that is given the label ''Social Security''? Or will they be locked up to pay guaranteed Social Security benefits, as they are supposed to be?

I think Social Security taxes should be used for Social Security benefits, not for other types of spending or tax cuts that somehow or other can be called retirement security. So I strongly urge the Republican leadership to reverse the decision that was reached last night. Social Security surpluses should be used for Social Security—and I drum the point home—and only Social Security, not other programs, not tax cuts. If we are serious about that principle, let's really make a commitment to it. Let's not endorse open-ended language like retirement security that could encourage future abuses.

I hope and urge that my colleagues will support this motion to instruct to reverse a commitment to language that permits an open-ended use of that money under the umbrella of ''retirement security.''

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has now 14 minutes 55 seconds. The Senator from New Jersey has 7 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me just make a couple points for everyone. First, I think everybody here understands that when you go to conference, you go to conference with the House. You do not go to conference with yourself. If that were the case, we would rule supreme and there would be no need to go to conference, and whatever the House thought about any of these measures would be totally irrelevant. I think everybody understands that isn't the case. We have to go to conference with them.

Secondly, I would like to make two points about what we do in our budget and what the President did so everybody will understand.

Senator LAUTENBERG talks about the Republican budget and the lockbox that we contemplate and speculates that he does not know what it might be used for. Let me tell everybody so they will understand. For starters, in the first 10 years the Republican budget, and that which will be locked in to be spent as we determine in conference, is $300 billion—you got it, $300 billion—more than the President proposes to set aside for safekeeping for the Social Security trust account.

Why is that the case? Because we say, put 100 percent of the accumulated surplus that belongs in the trust fund in the trust fund. For all the rhetoric about who is saving what, we put $300 billion more in there than the President, because the President concocted a 15-year payout for this trust fund. We have never even had a budget that contemplates 15 years. In fact, the President, when he goes beyond 5, he does not even have the programs enumerated in his budget, but he is telling us all, wait 15 years, and we will put enough money in that trust fund that is supposed to be there for some security. We said, put it in now as it accrues year by year—not 62 percent of it; 100 percent.

In addition, for those who are wondering what we are doing about Social Security and what the President does about it, let me remind you, we do not spend one nickel of Social Security, of their money, for any new program. The President of the United States, in his budget, decided that it was not important to save Social Security by keeping their money. He had contemplated spending out of the Social Security trust fund $158 billion. Let me repeat, we now have a motion by the other side of the aisle, our good Democratic

friends, challenging what we are doing, when the President of the United States spent $158 billion, in the first 5 years, out of the Social Security trust fund without any apologies—just said, ''Spend it.'' We say, ''Don't spend it. Keep it in the trust fund, and put it in a statutorily created lockbox that will be tied to debt limits so it can never be spent.''

Having said that, it is really ironic that the other side of the aisle claims the President is doing so much for Social Security, and they would like to join on his coattails, so much for Medicare, and they would like to join on his coattails, and the facts are what I have just told you. The facts are what I have just told you.

Fellow Senators, you do not have to be worried about whether that Social Security trust fund is going to be used for tax cuts, because we cannot direct that any of that money be used for tax cuts. In fact, go read the resolution. It says tax cuts are to come from a mandated reconciliation pot of money that is called on-budget surplus.

Mr. President, forget all the jargon. It means that tax cuts, if any, come out of surpluses that have nothing to do with the Social Security trust fund, by definition. So tax cuts are going to accrue over a decade, and they will come out of surpluses, not the surplus that is accumulated in the Social Security trust fund.

Having said that, once again, the amendment is calculated to play politics, and I see no reason why we should not accept the instruction. So if the distinguished Senator would like us to accept it, we can get on with our business and we can accept it right now. If he would like a vote on it, we will tell all our people to vote 100 percent for it because, remember, we have to go to conference with the House, and we will do our very best, but we will be glad to accept it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I am very happy that the chairman of the Budget Committee is going to agree to Senator LAUTENBERG's language, because there is some confusion here, if you read the press reports today. That wouldn't be the first time there would be some confusion. But what it says here is that ''[t]he final budget resolution will also contain language allowing the entire $1.8 trillion Social Security surplus over the next 10 years to be used for retirement security. . . .'' It could include Medicare, it says.

Here is the nub of the argument that we had in the Budget Committee, of which I am proud to be a member. The Democrats on the committee wanted to see 15 percent of the surplus dedicated to Medicare and 62 percent for Social Security. We had a very good debate, I thought, in the committee about that. And my colleague from New Mexico made the point very clearly that Social Security would be put in a lockbox and would be used only for that. And we really did not get anywhere on the Medicare debate because we did not set aside anything from the surplus. Yes, there is money in there for Medicare at the current level, but there is nothing additional out of the surplus. We wanted to see 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security, 15 percent for Medicare.

Now we read that that 62 percent would be used for Medicare, in other words, stealing that money from Social Security. I am very glad that my colleague from New Mexico is going to accept this language. It will clarify it. I assume that this report is incorrect and that this language will not appear.

I also hope that this newspaper is wrong when it reports that the Dodd-Jeffords language on child care was stripped from the resolution. This was a 59-vote majority in this body, quite bipartisan, to do something about child care.

So I am very pleased that we are going to have agreement on this. I hope when we look at the budget language—and, hopefully, I will be there looking at it with my colleagues—that we will not see such language in the resolution.

I thank you very much and yield back my time to Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California. She is a valuable member of the Budget Committee and works hard in making sure that the commitments we develop are to be met.

I remind my good friend from New Mexico that we are pleased to have his support, that the vagary that develops as a result of this new language ''retirement security'' is kind of a red flag. It tells us that there is something else. Knowing the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee as I do, when he says he is going to do this, I know that he is going to do it. I know when he goes to conference again that he is going to make sure that this is held. I am comforted by that notion, as are millions of Americans who are one day to get Social Security as part of their retirement program.

This is kind of a happy day. I hope that all of the Republicans will support this, as will the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Budget Committee. I do not see how they can resist.

With that, Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico whether he is ready to yield back time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Shall we accept the amendment, or does the Senator want to have a vote?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I would like a roll call.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am just wondering if we can't stack a few votes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That wouldn't be a problem. The question is in terms of whether we have our other amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. If we don't, we will put in a quorum call. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 9 minutes 49 seconds, and the Senator from New Jersey has 4 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield down to 4½, and then we can both yield back the remainder.

Let me say, first of all, I heard that the Senator from California had recently been to my State. Incidentally, I was quite surprised. I walked into the airport in New Mexico, our international airport. I ran into the Senator and asked her if she was coming all the way to New Mexico to try to defeat the budget that we prepared. She told me, ''No. I am here for other purposes.'' I was kind of glad of that, and I surely didn't want New Mexicans to listen to her about the budget when I worked so hard to try to get them to listen to me. She did not quite do that, because I looked around to see how much she got and it was pretty Democratic, what she did, with a big D.

Anyhow, let me suggest, Senator, that you should be careful when you use these percentages. You say that what we want, speaking for you, we wanted 62 percent that the President wanted to set aside, and then we wanted 15 percent for Medicare. The budget is a big document, big numbers, but I just added those two up, and that is 77 percent.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right, of the surplus.

Mr. DOMENICI. Frankly, we have 100 percent in the first 10 years. So the 15 percent that would have gone to Medicare under the proposal in the committee, added to the percent that the President saved of the Social Security trust fund, is the astronomical percentage of 77 percent of the Social Security trust fund. Guess what we did in our budget resolution. One hundred. Let's do that one. What is the difference there? Twenty-three percent additional accumulated surplus in the first 10 years is in the lockbox as we prescribed in our budget. Having said that, I relinquish the remainder of my time, if the Senator will relinquish his.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Lautenberg motion, which would instruct the budget conferees to reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and for

no other purpose. This is what Senate Republicans promised to do in the budget debate just last month. Now, just three weeks later, we are hearing disturbing reports that they are poised to renege on their pledge. The Republican conferees are contemplating a new raid on Social Security. In a move which would reflect a new level of cynicism, the Republican leadership is cutting a trap door in their so-called ''Social Security lock-box.'' Those dollars were raised by payroll taxes expressly dedicated to financing Social Security benefits. However, the Republicans now want to allow that money to be used for any type of ''retirement security'' plan. I hope such reports are wrong. But I fear they might be accurate.

This would open the door to risky schemes that use the Social Security surplus to finance private retirement accounts at the expense of Social Security's guaranteed benefits. Such a privatization plan could actually make Social Security's financial picture far worse than it is today, necessitating deep benefit cuts. A genuine ''lock-box'' would prevent any such diversion of funds, but not the Republican version. A genuine ''lock-box'' would guarantee that all those dollars would be in the Trust Fund when needed to pay benefits to future recipients. The ''lock-box'' in this budget apparently does not.

It is bad enough that the budget passed by Senate Republicans three weeks ago did not provide even one additional dollar to pay Social Security benefits to future retirees, that it did not extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by one more day. To our Republican colleagues, I say: ''If you are unwilling to strengthen Social Security, at least do not weaken it. Do not divert dollars which belong to the Social Security Trust Fund for other purposes. Every dollar in that Trust Fund is needed to pay future Social Security benefits.''

The Republican ''retirement security'' scheme could be nothing more than tax cuts to subsidize private accounts disproportionately benefiting their wealthy friends. Placing Social Security on a firm financial footing should be our highest budget priority, not further enriching the already wealthy. Two-thirds of our senior citizens depend upon Social Security retirement benefits for more than 50 percent of their annual income. Without it, half the Nation's elderly would fall below the poverty line.

It appears that the Republicans may be planning to take these Social Security dollars and to use them instead to finance more tax cuts in the guise of ''retirement security.'' If this occurs, there will be no debt reduction. There will be no strengthening of the Social Security Trust Fund to meet the demands of the baby boomers' retirement. Every one of those payroll tax dollars belongs to Social Security, and should be used solely to strengthen the Trust Fund. If our Republican colleagues have no ulterior motive, the wording of the Budget Resolution should state that principle unambiguously. When instead we see language as vague and open-ended as ''retirement security,'' suspicions are understandably raised. If this gaping trap door is not eliminated, the American people will know that the Republican ''lock-box'' is nothing more than a cynical magician's trick. The millions of senior citizens who depend on Social Security will know that the Republican majority has abandoned them once more.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Lautenberg motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that we not proceed to the vote but, rather, that we have a quorum call now and see if the distinguished Senator can muster up another amendment on his side, and we will just wait for awhile and see.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, before the quorum call is begun, I agree with the Senator's mission here; that is, perhaps we can stack several votes together, but we will work on that during the quorum call.

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. KENNEDY. 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand that it is in order to send a motion to instruct conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Under the time agreement, the motions to instruct have 30 minutes equally divided.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send a motion to instruct on behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would:

(1) allow targeted tax relief for low-and middle-income working families; and

(2) reserve a sufficient portion of projected non-Social Security surpluses to extend significantly the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and modernize and strengthen the program, before—

(A) using budget surpluses to pay for tax breaks that would give most of their benefits to the wealthiest Americans, or

(B) enacting new spending above the levels in the Senate-passed version of the budget resolution, unless it is offset in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to review the motion to instruct very quickly for the benefit of the Members so they have a keen awareness and understanding of exactly what this motion is to the conferees. This motion is to instruct the conferees to include in the conference report the provisions that would allow the targeted tax relief for low- and middle-income working families which has been presented here during the course of the debate on the budget; and, two, to preserve a sufficient portion of the projected non-Social Security surplus to extend significantly the solvency of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund and modernize and strengthen the program. We are effectively asking that there be the allocation of resources to extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

I think the percentage that we had identified earlier during the course of the debate on the budget was 15 percent. What we have indicated here is that it would be important to extend the solvency of the trust fund before using any of the budget surplus to pay for the tax breaks which would give most of the benefits to the wealthiest Americans by enacting new spending above the levels in the Senate-passed version of the budget resolution.

Effectively what this instruction is, Mr. President, is very easy to understand. It says given the size and the significance of the budget surplus that we want to have the sufficient allocations of resources for the protection of Medicare. In an earlier instruction on this particular measure, we included an instruction to have sufficient funding set aside for the solvency of the Medicare trust fund before we provide any tax cuts or tax breaks for the American people. That is basically and fundamentally the issue.

We in this body make choices and make decisions. This is certainly one of the most important ones that we will make, not only for just this year, but for future years. We are saying, given the kinds of resources that we have available, that we are going to do two things with regard to this instruction; that is, to set aside sufficient resources for the solvency of the Medicare program, and be serious about taking the steps to ensure that there will be the changes in the Medicare program that are responding to the particular needs of the Medicare program.

Certainly there are a number of ideas about how we can strengthen the Medicare program. I think one of the most important is the addition of a prescription drug proposal. The President of

the United States, in his speech to the American people on the State of the Union, indicated that one of his high priorities with the restructuring of the Medicare system would be for a program to meet the prescription drug needs of the elderly people in this country.

We want to make sure that we are going to have sufficiency in terms of the savings of the projected surpluses, and that then we will have an opportunity in the remainder of this Congress for the Congress to work its will on the floor of the Senate. I hope that one of the first areas of priority would be in the area of prescription drugs.

As has been pointed out on many different occasions, when the Medicare issue was debated in 1964 it lost narrowly here in the Senate in the spring of that year. It became a primary issue in the 1964 election. There was an extraordinary resonance across the country about the importance of Medicare. There were 18 Members of the Senate that voted one way in 1964 and another way in 1965. They had heard the voices of the elderly people in this country in support of the Medicare program. When we adopted the Medicare program we did not include prescription drugs for one very basic and fundamental reason, and that is because about 95 percent of the private programs at that time did not include prescription drugs. Now they do. The need is out there.

We will have an opportunity to do it, and it will be greatly strengthened with this kind of an instruction to the conferees. If we are able to set aside the kind of surplus that was included in the President's recommendations and included in this instruction, then we will know that we will have a sound Medicare system. The Medicare program will have greater solvency, and we will be able to deal with alterations and changes in the Medicare system. And, hopefully, we will be able to address the prescription drug issue.

This issue is so basic and so fundamental that it is really the question of a priority. Do we think having broad kinds of tax cuts for the American people is preferable to ensuring the financial security and solvency of the Medicare system? That is the issue that is incorporated in this particular instruction. It is as basic and fundamental as that. Do you believe that with the scarce but sufficient resources that are in the various surpluses that we are going to say let's put a priority on Social Security and Medicare? This instruction says we are going to give the priority to Medicare. And many of us who are supporting this also give high priority when we are going to have that financial security to make sure there is going to be a prescription drug provision.

I see my friend and colleague. I would be glad to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding for a couple of questions.

First, I thank him for his motion to instruct conferees. As a member of the Budget Committee, I can tell you that the Democrats on that committee fought very, very hard to get the committee to set aside enough funds from the overall surplus that we have to meet the needs of Medicare. And many of us brought out points that the Senator from Massachusetts has brought out before. I just want to ask him a couple of questions.

Does the Senator not agree that Medicare is really the twin pillar of Social Security for our people? In other words, you save Social Security, but if you do not save Medicare, then our seniors will have to spend their Social Security income to pay for their health care. Doesn't the Senator feel that this is the twin pillar of the senior citizens' safety net?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has made an excellent point and one which I agree with completely. If you look at a profile of who the Social Security recipient is, it is a person that is living alone, $12,000 in income, a woman 76 years of age who has at least one chronic disease and is paying some 19 percent of her income in out-of-pocket health care costs. That is 19 percent out of $12,000—paying that percent of her income out of pocket for health care. If the Senator understands the amount that is being paid out of pocket by even those today that are getting Medicare, it is just about what it was at the time of the enactment of Medicare.

So for those that say, well, we really do not have to have this instruction, we are going to be able to consider the Commission's recommendations, that will effectively require $688 billion over the next additional 12 years to get the kind of economic stability that would be included in our particular instruction. And that is only going to be able to be achieved with higher copays, or higher premiums, or higher deductibles. It is going to come out of the pocket or the pocketbook of that senior citizen. I don't understand how we can do that.

Mrs. BOXER. I have one more question that goes to the heart of the Senator's point. What the Republicans are saying is we can reform our way. We don't think we need additional resources. They proposed tax breaks for the wealthiest people in America instead of saving Medicare. What you do is very clearly say, yes, we will support targeted tax relief for low- and middle-class families, but we want to save Medicare before we give back funds to the wealthiest among us, those at the very, very top tier.

The question I wanted to pose to my friend is this: As I look at Medicare and the numbers we have in the Budget Committee, I want to ask my friend if he agrees with these numbers. We are told that the Medicare program provides health care to 39 million Americans today, but by 2032 the number of Medicare beneficiaries will double to 78 million as the baby boomers retire. So the question for the Senator is basically this: We are looking at a program that is very important, and we are looking at some good news. We are living longer. This is good. We all work toward that. We want to live longer. We want to have a good quality of life. But can we just say we can reform our way out of this problem, or do we have to commit some of the surplus to Medicare?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct in terms of the size of the Medicare population and correct in terms of allocating these additional resources for Medicare. Let's understand that the amount that we are talking about effectively is money that is being paid in by working families. Those are resources that are being paid in by those working families. All we are saying is that we believe those working families' interests should be protected with the previous instruction on Social Security and this instruction on Medicare before we provide tax breaks for individuals who are not participants in paying into the system like the workers have been in terms of the Medicare system and Social Security.

I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I apologize to Senator KENNEDY for not being here. I assume it is fair to say that I probably heard his argument as we put the budget through. It is similar to the one he made before. That doesn't mean I shouldn't have been here. But I just couldn't. When the time is up, let me ask if we could get a unanimous consent on stacked votes.

Mr. President, I would like to talk just for a moment about the Republican budget as it pertains to a blueprint for our country's future. When I have used up about 6 minutes of my 15, will the Chair advise me? I appreciate that.

First of all, let me say to those who are listening that we have a situation that is pretty unique in our country, and it is a situation that we ought to look at very carefully to see what the public policy ought to be and what would be best for America's future.

The American taxpayer has received a bonanza in new taxes. As a matter of fact, there is now going to be over the next decade a huge surplus. ''surplus'' means the taxes collected exceed the expenditures. That is a surplus. We were used to living in a deficit. ''Deficit'' means the expenditures, the program costs, are more than the taxes that come in.

For a variety of reasons, not the least of which is a sustained recovery; low interest rates, partially attributable to good, sound, budget policies; high productivity, because we have added new machines and equipment to the production of service organizations and what they sell to the American people, we have more money coming in than we are going to spend. Over the decade, it is going to be a very large amount of money.

Where we depart from the Democrats who have been arguing on the floor—not all Democrats—the principal position on our side is that we think we don't need some of that big surplus paid in by the taxpayer, which means they are paying more than we need to run the Government year by year; we think a portion of that should go back to the taxpayer by way of tax changes that will help our taxpayers and will help the economy continue to grow and produce jobs and be a strong economy.

We say there are three very important things to take care of, one of which is to give back some taxes to the American people, who are paying in more than they expected in terms of our Government. There are some who say we shouldn't do that or the budget resolution ought to state exactly how we are going to change those tax laws.

Frankly, in the Congress we do things a little differently. There is a committee that will determine our tax reductions and our tax changes. All we can do is say we are making some money available for doing that. What we do is take all of the Social Security surplus—not 62 percent of it as does the President, but 100 percent of it—and we say that accumulation, that surplus, is set aside and cannot be used for tax cuts. Under our budget resolution, it is to be used for Social Security reform to pay for any additional costs. We think that is very exciting, and we think that is better than what the President has in mind. It is 100 percent of that surplus.

There is a Medicare program which is very important to seniors. We have done three things in this budget regarding Medicare. One, the President cut $20 billion more out of Medicare during the next decade, and we said cut nothing, don't cut any more by way of expenditures out of the Medicare trust fund—$19 billion over 10 years. In addition, our budget plan increases Medicare spending by $200 billion over 10 years, an average of $20 billion a year. Then, starting in the sixth year of this budget, there is an additional $100 billion that does not go to tax cuts, does not go to the Social Security fund, that could be used by Medicare if Medicare needed it. In fact, we believe this is a very, very, ambitious program to make sure Medicare is taken care of.

I remind everyone that a strong, powerful economy is one of the best tools to keep Medicare strong. Just a few weeks ago, the trustees in charge said, because things have been going so well, we have increased the life of the Medicare fund from the year 2008 to 2015. We have added between 7 and 8 years by keeping the economy going with a lot of employment and people paying into the Medicare system.

We believe this budget is good policy for America. We think it is just as important to talk on the floor of the Senate about who pays all these taxes as what programs we ought to spend the money on. We don't want to just discuss how we can spend the money; we want to discuss the taxpayers.

We are saying it is time to fix the Tax Code and make it more fair for married couples, put some other reductions in and return some of those tax dollars to the American people, because we are worried about taxpayers; they deserve our concern.

At the same time, we have adequately provided for Medicare and adequately provided for an assured Social Security; that when the changes are made, and only then, will this trust fund money be used for Social Security.

We are involved in an air war over in Kosovo, Yugoslavia, and we are going to need more money for that war. Everybody understands we are going to do that when we are asked. We will have it. It will change how much can go for taxes and how much can be held in reserve. It will change some of that, but actually that is a very high priority.

I say to Senators and my fellow Americans that in our regular budget we provided for some very significant increases in defense and some significant increases in education. If you add that up, it is a pretty good package. We will go to conference with the House. I don't know what we can get out of them, but we will get a good budget. It will be very much like the one we produced.

Having said that, I reserve the remainder of my time and hope the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts might yield back some of his time at some point.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 4 minutes 16 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will use that remaining time so we can move along, then ask for the yeas and nays in accordance with the leadership proposal, and vote.

Mr. President, according to the trustees' report on the Medicare trust fund, this particular measure will add some 7 years to the Medicare trust fund. Now it will be—instead of 2008, in the most recent figures it is 2015. With 15 percent, as we talk about, a substantial increase, it will provide the stability and solvency of the trust fund to the year 2027. That is what this amendment does.

If we do not take this action, then, if we look over a 25-year period, it is going to mean benefit cuts of 11 percent in 25 years, 25 percent in 50 years, and 31 percent in 75 years, to make up for the shortfall.

It seems to me, given the special circumstances, we ought to protect Social Security and protect Medicare. We still have resources, even after that, for individual accounts, as the President suggested—close to $500 billion for individual accounts, for savings and for investment for individuals—and we also have resources that will be available for a tax cut.

But let us say, with regard to Medicare, we are going to provide these additional resources and we are going to commit them to our Medicare system and then in this Congress we are going to get about the possibility of making the alterations or changes in our Medicare system, primarily in the area of enhancing prescription drugs, and also other changes that will strengthen the Medicare system even further. This is a sound, prudent investment.

Finally, the greatest percentage of the surplus was paid in by working families. Working families often become dependent primarily on Social Security and Medicare as they age. Some of them get some pensions from companies they have worked for. But if you look over what is happening, even in terms of the pensions, they are gradually being cut back. They are gradually being reduced every single year. Medicare and Social Security are the rocks on which our elderly and seniors really depend. We have an opportunity to go on record on that measure here today with this amendment, and I hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise to support this motion to instruct the conferees to set aside some of the on-budget surplus for Medicare.

The Budget Resolution approved by this body in March made the correct decision with regard to Social Security by devoting the off-budget, or Social Security, surplus to paying down the publicly held debt. That was the right thing to do, especially if we are not going to come to closure on a true Social Security reform plan that brings down future liabilities.

While the direction on Social security was the correct course, failure to hold some of the on-budget surplus to deal with Medicare takes us down the wrong fiscal path. Medicare's financial problems are not only more acute than Social Security's but also much more difficult to solve. The fact of the matter is that even under the reform plan considered in the Medicare Commission, solvency would not be significantly extended.

Given these facts, it seems to me that the smarter fiscal policy over the long-term would be to leave some of

the on-budget surplus to address Medicare. Using it all for a tax cut significantly reduces our flexibility to prepare for the retirement of the Baby Boom generation and the demands on Social Security, Medicare, and our overall budget that will result from the doubling of beneficiaries eligible for these programs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct if they are serious about acting in a fiscally responsible way to shore up Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I propound the following unanimous consent request, and it has been cleared on both sides. It has nothing to do with the amendment that is pending.

I ask unanimous consent the pending motion and any motions or amendments regarding the appointment of conferees to the budget resolution be stacked to occur in the order in which they were offered at the conclusion or yielding back of time on the motions. I further ask that there be 2 minutes before each vote for the explanation and the votes in the sequence after the first vote be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Were the yeas and nays included, Mr. President? Reserving the right to object—I do not intend to —will the Senator ask it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays at this time for all of those amendments?

Mr. DOMENICI. No, Senator; we want to wait until the time has expired.

You want to get the yeas and nays now?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, please.

Mr. DOMENICI. We can still amend. You could not, but we could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to yield it back.

Mr. DOMENICI. If he yields his back, I am going to yield mine back.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield mine back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 252 TO THE KENNEDY MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, at the end of the Kennedy motion add the following: Include in the conference report, No. 1, amendment No. 176, offered by Senators ROTH and BREAUX, regarding Medicare reform; and section 209 of the Senate-passed resolution to the budget offered by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN, regarding the use of on-budget surpluses for prescription drug benefits.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 252 to the Kennedy motion to instruct the conferees.

The amendment follows:

At the end add the following in the conference report:

(1) Amendment No. 176, offered in the Senate by Senators ROTH and BREAUX, regarding Medicare reform; and

(2) Section 209 of the Senate-passed resolution, offered in the Budget Committee by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN, regarding the use of on-budget surpluses for a prescription drug benefit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 20 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me explain to Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will make a copy of that amendment and distribute it.

What we are going to do with this amendment is simply add to the end of the Kennedy amendment two provisions that were voted on by the Senate during the debate, just as most of his instruction was already voted on. These two sections are essentially as follows: No. 1, the Roth, Breaux, and others amendment regarding a bipartisan proposal on Medicare; and, No. 2, an amendment offered by the Budget Committee in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, which essentially said that any additional on-budget surplus, non-Social Security money, that existed beyond the tax cut—which is, as I understand, about $102 billion starting 5 years from now—could be available for prescription drugs.

Essentially, what we will then do is we will get a request for the yeas and nays on our amendment. I understand, pursuant to the unanimous consent, when it gets called up in order, we will get an additional 2 minutes, 1 minute per side, to explain it.

So, essentially I am just asking we add to the end of yours, two proposals that have already been adopted by the Senate: One, the Roth-Breaux et al. on the bipartisan Medicare proposal; and, second, the Budget Committee portion, which was Senator SNOWE's amendment, which said any excess surplus beyond the tax cut and Social Security could be used for prescription drugs.

So we will vote on ours first and see what happens to yours.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator to Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator obviously is entitled to conform with the Senate rules. But we are as well. So we will continue to go along on this merry chase until we have an opportunity to vote on this measure. We are glad to spend whatever time debating Medicare that the chairman of the committee wants.

You can load this up as the rules permit, but the rules also permit us finally to get a rollcall, and we are going to take full advantage of the rules to make sure we do. I will just let the membership understand that now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Jersey could tell us, were there any other instructions?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have potentially two more. The Senator from Connecticut is going to be offering a motion to instruct, and there may be a question about another, which we will find out about in just a few minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how does this proceed?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask Senator KENNEDY if he will yield back time on my amendment. I yield back mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Massachusetts willing to yield back time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Are you talking about the second-degree amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it is the first-degree amendment to your motion.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, not at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. 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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to the issue that is before us, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to votes in order to the motion to appoint conferees, the Domenici amendment No. 252, which I have just described, be considered a separate motion to instruct and the vote occur on, or in relation to, the Domenici motion,

to be followed, pursuant to the consent agreement, by a vote in relation to the Kennedy motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Having said that, with reference to mine, I yield back any time I have.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. May I inquire of the chairman, I can offer a motion?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, indeed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000, to include in the conference report the Dodd-Jeffords amendment No. 160, as modified, which passed the Senate on March 25 by 57–40.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, how much time is allowed on this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes equally divided, 15 minutes per side. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I thank the President.

Let me begin these brief remarks by once again commending my dear friend from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee. We use the word ''friend'' around here to describe each other with great frequency. On numerous occasions, we actually mean it, and this is one of those instances. He is one of my best friends in the Senate. So it is with a degree of reluctance I rise to offer this motion because this is in regard to an amendment that was passed by a pretty good vote, Mr. President, 57–40, during the consideration of the budget resolution.

Occasionally, there are matters that are bipartisan on these budget resolutions. I argue strongly this is one of them. Child care is an issue that does not have an ideological parent, does not have a partisan parent, if you will. This is an issue of which I believe people all across the country appreciate the importance.

The average cost of child care is $4,000 to $10,000 per child. Even families that have decent incomes and have two or three children can appreciate the cost of child care. One can imagine then, when talking about working families who are struggling to keep food on the table, how important this kind of a proposal is for them.

The amendment that was adopted expands an existing program—it does not create a new program. It was almost a decade ago that my friend from Utah, Senator ORRIN HATCH, and I offered the child care block grant, which was adopted. President Bush, to his credit, supported and accepted the block grant proposal.

For almost 10 years now we have had this child care block grant. And it's only drawback is that it doesn't have enough funding to reach all eligible children—only one in ten can currently receive assistance. So Senator JEFFORDS and I offered, along with 55 other Members of this body—12 members of the majority and 45 members of the minority—a proposal that would increase the child care development block grant by $5 billion over 5 years, about $1 billion a year. It amounts to little more than $12 billion over 10 years. We pay for that by reducing the $780 billion proposed tax cut by the same amount.

We also said in this amendment that it is our preference, if there is a tax cut proposal, that we also do a child care tax cut for all working parents as well as for stay-at-home parents.

Why do we need to add money to the block grant? When we passed the welfare reform package a few years ago to move people from welfare to work, all across the country States took what little money they had for child care and provided it to the welfare recipient as they came off welfare and went to work.

But tragically, what has happened in Idaho, Connecticut, and many other places is, the family that was not on welfare, that was on the margin and working, now loses child care assistance. It is a great irony in a way.

So what Senator JEFFORDS, Senator CHAFEE, Senator COLLINS, Senator SNOWE, Senator ABRAHAM, Senator FRIST, Senator HATCH, Senator DEWINE, Senator ROBERTS, Senator CAMPBELL, Senator SPECTER, Senator WARNER and I, and others, are asking here in this budget resolution is that we ought to try to do something about this.

The people who need this are working people with young children. They need the kind of help this block grant can provide. Some people have mistakenly said, ''Well, I don't like this program because it says that a parent couldn't choose a church-based child-care program.'' That is not true. This money can go to church-based programs, neighborhoods, families. It is not restricted as to the kind of child care setting that a family can choose to use.

This is a good bipartisan proposal. It is with a great degree of reluctance that I offer this motion to instruct. But the reason I have to do it—and, again, I have such great affection for my colleague from New Mexico; and he can straighten me out on this if he cares to; in fact, I wish he would—but I am reading now from this report—the ''Daily Report for Executives''. ''U.S. Budget, Domenici and Kasich agree on final budget.'' This is dated April 13, Tuesday, today. It says, my friend:

Domenici and Kasich also said they had stricken from the final budget plan a Senate-passed amendment sponsored by [yours truly] Sens. CHRISTOPHER DODD [of Connecticut] and JAMES JEFFORDS [of Vermont] that would have reduced the size of the tax cut by $10 billion [over 10 years] and made that money available to a child care program.

''What they're going to do is they're going to have some language in there that's going to say that out of the $780 billion tax [cut] some consideration ought to be given to families that have child care needs,'' Kasich said of the language in the final budget that will replace the Dodd-Jeffords amendment.

''And we'll drop all add-ons like Dodd-Jeffords,'' Domenici added.

Kasich [then] said they had no intention of creating a new child care entitlement—

This is not new. It is a 10-year program. I am just adding resources to it; no question about that—

but suggested that the final budget will recommend that the child care-related tax [cut] relief be looked at by the tax-writing committees ''because there are needs out there.''

I appreciate the last phrase, ''because there are needs.''

The problem, of course, with just tax writing is that if you pay taxes, you may get the benefit of it. But if you are down at that $20,000-a-year level—this is not a great mystery to anybody—the idea you are going to get a tax break at that income level that can meet the cost of child care is just a fantasy.

So we want to increase the block grant by $12 billion over 10 years nationwide to help these families. I think this body, regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on, ought to be able to find room in our hearts and our budget for this, if we care about these working families.

We understand the pressures, the tremendous pressures, on these families. I was at a child-care center at the Justice Department yesterday here in Washington. It is a magnificent child-care center. As you can well imagine, they have done a good job down there. But that good care costs.

I spoke to a woman who is a lawyer with the Justice Department and has children at the center. Her husband is a public interest lawyer. They have three children in that child-care center, twins and a young child. It cost them $26,000 a year—$26,000 a year. And they are happy just to have a place. The waiting list is a mile long, which is another problem we face here and why I offer this motion.

All over the country we see this scenario replicated—in the State of California the waiting list is some 200,000 children. In Texas and Florida, there are similar lists.

So, Mr. President, again, I would love to hear the members of the Budget Committee say, ''Listen, you know, we didn't like this amendment terribly, but we did have a strong bipartisan

vote''—that is a pretty strong vote, almost 60–40 here on this amendment; it was sponsored in a bipartisan fashion; it was passed in a bipartisan fashion—''while we weren't enthusiastic about this initially, this is one we are going to take.'' If that is the case, then I do not want to have our colleagues have to vote twice on something here. I do not like doing that. But when I read here that I am dropped, I am history, I am being kind of written off, then you do not leave me much choice but to defend myself.

I am forced to defend it for the families out there who got excited about the fact that in this budget resolution we had made a place, for the first time in years, to provide some assistance.

So I plead with my colleagues here to not oppose this, in fact even accept this instruction, if you will, and let's see if we can't convince some of those recalcitrant voices who do not want to embrace the idea that this Congress could do something about working families and their children.

With that, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does Senator DODD have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator DODD has 4 minutes 49 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator DODD, let me just put in perspective what we are going through here this afternoon.

I am a mild-mannered guy.

Mr. DODD. Yes, you are.

Mr. DOMENICI. That does not mean I do not get excited about things. Look, everything we are talking about here on the floor we just voted on. You either won or you lost. You happen to have won. Senator KENNEDY has a proposal. That already was voted on. He lost. Let's see, what else do we have? Oh, Senator LAUTENBERG has an instruction. We already voted on that.

It is interesting. I would just put in perspective for the Senators and for those listening, normally—I have been here for a while; I have wrapped up a lot of budget resolutions—we appoint the conferees. That is what we are doing here, this little administrative job of appointing conferees. We normally do it at the same time we pass those resolutions. So if we finish at 10 o'clock at night, by 10:15 this is gone, they have been appointed. Nobody moves to instruct the conferees, because they just voted on it; they already got their instructions through their votes.

We made a mistake. We made a mistake. We should never have seen the press last night. We were not obligated to tell the press we had a meeting. We like to keep them informed. But now, because of everything they said about what we discussed, Senators are saying, ''Well, maybe they are not going to do in that conference what the Senate said we should do, so we are coming to the floor and reproposing the whole thing,'' bringing the issues all back up, even if they lost on them or even, in Senator DODD's case, where he won on them, and we are going to have to vote again.

Actually, everybody should understand, an instruction to the conferees, through the process we are doing this afternoon, is nice. It is a wonderful thing. You should be very pleased if you win. But the House isn't bound by it. That is just the simple truth of it. The conference is not between Senators asking for a second vote which will make their will the law; they are asking that we do something with the House to make them go with us. I am not promising that I can do that. If you win here on the floor, I am not promising that I can do that. As a matter of fact, some Senators think I can, that if we are to vote again on Dodd-Jeffords, I should just go over there and I will win that.

Well, it isn't quite that easy. I do a little better here on the floor sometimes with all these Senators from both sides than I do sometimes in those conferences. I am not going to offer a second-degree. We all understand the issue. If you want to vote, we will have a vote.

I guess I could tell you for myself, I understood very clearly who voted. There were some Republicans who voted with you. I didn't happen to be one. But I am not going to be able to carry any more water with any more assurance or any more power in the water that I carry because we vote again this afternoon than to go to that conference and wrap it up and say, Senator DODD and Senator JEFFORDS won—not that they won this instruction. That would be there. So if you want to save some time, you might just urge me to do it better than the news reports, and I tell you I am going to try. I tell you that if we can't do that, I am going to find some way in the tax instructions to see if we can't do something significant in the area of child care through the Tax Code. But if you would like a vote, that may be an easier way.

I say, though, there is a reason that we do not need to vote in additional money for this program. I will tell you what it is. I do not know the ultimate number, but I understand that almost all the States have a very large surplus in the TANF program, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. That is the successor to the welfare program, Mr. President. When we sent them the money, we sent them a block of money predicated upon a significant caseload and estimates about how much it would be reduced.

It turns out that almost every State has a very large surplus there. What they plan to do with it, not every State but a very large number of them, is to use it for this program. As a matter of fact, I understand the regulations have been approved just yesterday which will authorize the States to use their TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, excesses for the block grant program, which we would still be funding for child care. So essentially I think we are going to have an expanded child care program. I do not think we need to do this, but I do not go to conference based on that. That is just an explanation to the Senate as to why a number of Senators did not think we needed to vote for that when it first appeared and won.

Now I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD. Before my colleague does that, again, I appreciate my colleague from New Mexico, the chairman, has a difficult job. Having served on the Budget Committee for many years with the chairman of the committee, I have a great admiration for his ability and the difficult job he has. I appreciate as well the fact that this is a somewhat unique procedure, although we have used it in the past. It is not uncommon for it to be done. I hope my colleague appreciates, that when I pick up and read that my amendment has been pushed out, before the conference has even met, that it makes it kind of hard on me and hard on those of us who supported that amendment.

So, yes, this is taking advantage of a unique situation here, but maybe, just maybe if we go into that conference—and I know the chairman does not agree with this amendment, but I know he has historically respected the will of the Senate even when he disagrees with it, which is the mark of a good chairman, in my view, and he goes on and says, look, ladies and gentlemen here, not only this crowd in the Senate, over my objection voted for this once, they did it twice. The bipartisan Senate cares about this and thinks it is an important priority. To that extent, it may have some value.

Mr. President, whatever time I have remaining, I see my colleague from Vermont.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just want to say, whatever time Senator JEFFORDS needs, a few minutes, we will make sure he gets them. I would like to tell you, since you indicated that you and I have worked together on a lot of things, do you know what you could do for me that would be the best thing going? Not to have so many votes on budget resolutions. What is happening, we spend so much time voting on them that Senators are wondering what this whole process is all about. This year probably 50 percent of the votes, maybe 60 are all on the budget resolution and the four or five today. My job is getting more difficult because of that. Pretty soon Senators will be saying maybe it is not worth all this trouble.

How much time do you need?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Five minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do you have any left?

Mr. DODD. I don't know if I do or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 2 minutes 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. You yield your 2, and I yield him 3.

Mr. DODD. Absolutely.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rushed over here in hopes of getting to the floor on time, and I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak on this very important issue.

I have worked with the Senator from Connecticut for years on child care. Every time we think we have a victory, it somehow disappears. Yet the need for quality child care does not disappear. The need continues to increase. We must take advantage of the information we have learned and recognize that the early years of life are so incredibly important in a child's development. The first 3 to 5 years are critical. At this point, we do little or nothing for this age group and these are the most important years of your life in many respects. Fortunately, few babies get totally ignored during that period. But this is the period in time which the brain develops most rapidly. It is the one which can be most damaged by the lack of adequate child care.

I will be introducing on Thursday and I thought it was going to be the filler for what we did on the budget bill. We were all ready to go, and now we are back to ground zero on this issue. Well, I am going to introduce the bill on Thursday in hopes that this issue does not go away and that it will continue to be heard before the conference. We must continue to try to do what must be done for the children of this country.

In addition, we have to look at businesses and do something to give them the incentives to have their own child care. We have to make sure that we take care of the most critical thing and to make sure that we deliver quality child care and learn how to maximize the period of time in a child's life which is so critically important.

I want to do everything I can, and I am sure the Senator from Connecticut joins with me in saying we are not going to let this issue go away. We will do whatever it takes to make sure this country is in a position to allow our children to maximize their opportunities in school by having the best child care possible.

This is an incredibly important issue. I know that the Senator from New Mexico is with us in the sense that he understands the essential aspects of maximizing opportunities during the most critical period in a child's life. In the past, the Senator has been supportive of us, and I hope he continues to do so. At this point, I will close and say, I am going to plow forward. I know we will work with the Senator from Connecticut and we are not going to let this issue go away.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that means we have one proposal left, as I understand it.

I yield the floor.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, moves to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would provide additional funding for income assistance for family farmers above the level provided in the Senate-passed resolution.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are dealing with the budget and the naming of conferees, and a number of priorities have been discussed here on the floor of the Senate. That is what a budget is, establishing priorities. I offer this motion to instruct, and it is very simple. The Senator from New Mexico said he would like to take this, and if he does, I will not ask for a recorded vote.

In this motion, I move to instruct the conferees on H. Con. Res. 68, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, to include in the conference report provisions that would provide additional funding for income assistance for family farmers above the level provided in the Senate-passed resolution.

Why am I asking for favorable consideration on this motion? Yesterday, I read on the Senate floor a letter from a North Dakota woman that I want to read today. Her name is Susan Jorgenson. She wrote in her letter, describing the plight of family farmers, something that I think everybody listening to this debate should digest. Susan Jorgenson has lost her husband. He died last August. She said he had diabetes, but she said:

. . .what I really feel caused his death was trying to make a living as a family farmer.

She said:

I had an auction last week to sell the [farm] machinery so I can pay off some of the debt that [we] incurred after 26 years of farming. I have a 17-year-old son who would not help me prepare for the auction and did not get out of bed the day of the [auction] sale because he was so heartbroken that he could not continue [to farm] this land [that he loved].

She said this of her husband:

He chose to farm rather than to live in Phoenix where he had a job with Motorola [early on] because he wanted to raise his children in a place with clean air, no crime, and good schools. He worked very hard, physically and emotionally, to make this farm work and its failure was . . . no fault of his own.

That is what this farm wife says about her deceased husband.

What is happening on the family farm? Everybody is making money but them. They raise the crop and give it to a railroad; the railroad makes a record profit hauling it. They raise steer and sell them to the slaughter house; the slaughter house makes a profit and the farmer goes belly up. They raise grain and put it into a cereal manufacturing plant, and they then take that wheat or rice and puff it and send it to a grocery store as puffed wheat or rice. The company that added the puff makes a mint and the farmer goes broke. Everything that touches what the farmer raises makes record profits, and the farmers are going broke in record numbers.

We have a serious emergency on family farms. Here is a headline concerning prairie dogs. Some groups have now decided —including in the Government—that we have a big problem, that we have to save prairie dogs. I don't know if these folks have driven around my part of the country much, but we have lots and lots of prairie dogs. We don't need a Federal program to ensure that we are going to have them in our future. Prairie dogs will take care of themselves, thank you.

What we lack are family farmers. Every day in every way, every week, every month, and every single year, we lose more and more family farmers. Now, we have farmers raising wheat and selling it for Depression-era prices in constant dollars. How would you like to be receiving wages that are Depression-era wages right now in constant dollars?

How about a minimum wage for family farmers? We debate minimum wage here on the floor of the Senate and I always vote for it. I think the folks at the bottom end of the ladder need to be given the chance to raise themselves up a bit.

What about an opportunity to provide a fair price for farmers? Wheat prices and grain prices have collapsed. Cattle prices and pork prices have collapsed. Farmers are having auction sales and 17-year-old boys won't get out of bed because they are so heartsick about losing their farms.

We are told by people around here: Well, that's just the way the market system works. That is not a system that works at all. The system says to those who gas the tractor in the spring, plow the ground, plant the seed, and harvest the crop that their work has no

value but the giant agrifactories that make a fortune with it have value. I am saying that this Congress must do something about that. This Congress must decide that family farmers matter in this country's future.

I have watched the chairman of the Budget Committee fight for things that matter to him. I have watched him fight for the National Labs and so many other things that are so important to him and there is no more tenacious of a fighter in the Senate than the Senator from New Mexico about the things that matter to him. I feel the same way about family farmers. That is what matters to me. I am not saying that [farming] doesn't matter to him or anybody else. I am not making a judgment about that. I am just saying that we have a full-blown emergency in rural America.

I held up a chart yesterday that showed the counties in this country which are losing population, which have lost over 15 percent of their population in the last 15 years. What you have is a huge red swath in the middle of America being depopulated—the middle part of our country.

We need a farm program that works. And when we see auction sale posters from wall to wall in small towns, and small town businesses boarded up—so many auction sales that they have to call retired auctioneers out of retirement to handle the sales—we ought to understand that this counts for something in this country and that we need to develop a public policy that says we are going to try to do something to stop the flow of family farmers who are leaving the land and discovering that their hopes and dreams have come to an end.

Every single month, we add a ''New York City'' in population to this Earth. Every month, a new ''New York City'' is added in population to this Earth. Yet, farmers are told that the food they produce has no value. The market system says it has no value. That is not logical. Over half of the people on this Earth go to bed with an ache in their belly because they don't have enough to eat.

I have mentioned time and again—and I will do it again—that in Sudan people talk about old women climbing trees to gather leaves to eat because there is nothing to eat. Ask yourselves about the people in refugee camps today and what their needs are. It is food. Somehow this system of ours, in a Byzantine way, says that those who produce the food ought not to get full value for it, but those who make it into cereal, those who haul it, those who add value somehow should achieve record profits. There is something wrong with that system.

I hope this Senate will go on record saying that we need to do more and better. My personal feeling is that we need to take the caps off the loan rates. The farm bill—which I didn't vote for because I didn't think it was a good bill—was saying we will take away with the fine print what we promised to give you in the large print. We promised a loan rate, and we promised that that loan rate would produce $3.25 in wheat, but in the small print it was limited to about $2.58.

Let's take away that provision that limits the amount of support and help farmers during this period of collapsed prices and see if we can give them the opportunity to have a decent income when prices collapse. If we don't build a bridge across those valleys, nobody will do it. We will be left with a country full of giant agrifactories farming from California to Maine. We will get the food all right, but it will be more expensive, and nobody will be living in rural America. We will have lost something very important—family farmers, small towns, main street businesses, and a very special and unique part of this country's character that comes from that part of America.

So I am offering this motion to instruct conferees to ask that money be added above the Senate level for income support for family farmers.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I greatly appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend, and I say to him that on some of the issues he cares about, such as agriculture and the problems of the family farm, he has as much tenacity as anybody around here. I compliment him for that.

We are going to accept his motion because it says we ought to try to do better in conference than we did here, and everybody understands that we will do that. If the Senate accepts this, we will try to do that. However, in defense of the budget resolution, I will make two big points that are very important.

The budget resolution increased the mandatory spending, the spending for agriculture, $6 billion over what it would have been but for the change we have made—$2 billion in each year, more or less, in this budget resolution.

At first we decided we would do $4 billion at the behest of some Senators from the middle of the heartland of the agriculture country. They asked for more. We put $2 billion more in. That has been done. Why do I say that? Because the President of the United States, who has his agriculture Secretary traveling all over the United States in agriculture country talking about the needs of the family farm and the needs of the farmers, did not put one penny of increase for agriculture in their budget. I don't know whether they expected that we would come along because we have Senators who really pushed this and we would put the money in.

But I believe for a President of the United States in the midst of an agriculture disaster, more or less, to leave it up to Senators to have to put more money in for agriculture—but you can count on it. They won't be remiss in going out there and talking to the farmer about what they did. They should put up their hand, like this, and say they did zero. At least we put $6 billion new money in for which the distinguished Senator has thanked the Budget Committee when we put it in. And so did his colleague from his State. He thanked the committee. You put in $6 billion. Nobody did at the White House. There was nothing.

So it isn't as if we are not concerned and as if we did nothing. As a matter of fact, we have been spending a very healthy amount of money for agriculture. And we are going through some cyclical problems in agriculture, with parts of the worldwide economy not in very good shape. And they used to buy a lot of our agricultural products. We know that. We are getting better at producing more with less acreage, and there seems to be no limit to that. We get better all the time. In other words, the farmer is producing prolifically in the United States, be it the family farmer or the corporate farm. We are producing large amounts.

Having said that, I don't know ultimately how we resolve this issue, but for now we are going to conference with this proposal saying we ought to do more, if we can. And, frankly, I appreciate the Senator bringing it to all our attention.

It will be accepted now, if he doesn't mind.

I yield any time I have.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CONRAD, wanted to speak for at least 5 minutes. I understand he is on his way. I hope we can wait for just a moment. It appears he could use the remaining 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that I be vested back with any time that I had remaining. I thought we would finish. That is why I yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me take a minute to say that I understand the point the Senator from New Mexico made. I appreciate the additional $6 billion that was added over the 5 years. My point is, it is far short of what we need in terms of income support. It is the case that the administration budget did not do nearly what it needed to do. But there comes a time at some point when the urgency of the situation in rural America really requires us to say this isn't about us or them anymore; it is about what we are going to do together to respond to a real problem of significant consequence to this country. We will simply not have family farmers left unless we together, Republicans and Democrats in Congress,

recognize that we have a farm bill that says when market prices collapse, it's response is too bad. That can't be the farm bill response.

When market prices collapse, if we want to save family farmers, we have to build a bridge across those valleys. Only the largest corporate farms will survive a collapse in market prices. They are big enough and strong enough to survive. Family farmers can't and won't. So if we care about having people live out on the land, if we care about the special quality family farms and small towns give this country, then we must reconnect and provide some kind of basic safety net for family farmers.

Again, I see all these headlines about prairie dogs. They are going to save the prairie dog. God bless the prairie dog. There sure are plenty of them in my State. We don't need a special effort to save prairie dogs. We need to save family farmers. That is the message, and that is the urgency, in my judgment, for a public policy debate here in Congress and the establishment of the correct priorities in this budget to say to family farmers, ''You matter.'' Some say we need a national missile defense system. Yes, that might be the priority for some. But I happen to think we need a farm program that works for family farmers. In the absence of it, we are going to see wholesale bankruptcies and more and more auction sales, and this country will have lost something that is very important to its character and its economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to the Senators who are not here but are listening to what is going to be going on on the floor, that in about 6 or 7 minutes, I hope not much longer than that, we are going to start voting. There is already a consent agreement to vote on everything. All votes are stacked this afternoon. That means we will have about five or six votes. After the first one, they will be 10 minutes, with both sides having 2 minutes to explain each proposal, and on each instruction 1 minute on the side. So we ought to be starting by 4:15, and perhaps in an hour we will be finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator DORGAN, for offering this motion, and for bringing to the attention of our colleagues in the Senate the disastrous circumstances we face in American agriculture.

I represent North Dakota. I can tell you that in agriculture in our State we are on the brink of a depression. We are the victims of a triple whammy of bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy. Bad prices are the lowest prices for farm commodities in 52 years. The bad policy is the last farm bill that was passed, and some of our trade policy that has left America vulnerable to a very intense effort by our competitors. Mr. President, our chief competitors—the Europeans—are spending 10 times as much to support their farmers as we are spending to support ours. We are, in essence, saying to our farmers, you go out and compete against the French farmer and the German farmer, and, while you are at it, take on the French Government and the German Government as well. That is not a fair fight.

In addition to the bad prices and the bad policy, we are also stuck with bad weather. We have had 5 years of overly wet conditions in North Dakota. The result has been the development of a disease called scab. That is a fungus. It has dramatically reduced production. There are parts of North Dakota that saw their production reduced 40 percent.

So you put all of this together, what do you have? You have an economic calamity, a disaster of its own, with the lowest prices in 52 years and production reduced because of bad weather, and because of an outbreak of disease that is unprecedented in this century, and couple that with the bad policy of a bad farm bill that has been put in place that makes no note of what happens to farm prices but that cuts each and every year the support that is given to American agricultural producers at the exact time our competitors are dramatically increasing what they are doing for their producers.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, this is an emergency. It is a disaster. It is stunning in its proportion. I just completed a series of meetings across the State of North Dakota. Everywhere I went, producers took me aside and said unless something is done and done quickly, we are faced with a calamity of losing tens of thousands of family farmers across the heartland of America.

I hope very much that our colleagues will support this motion that instructs the conferees to provide additional funding for agricultural policy reform. It is critically needed. It must be done. The consequences could not be more serious. A failure to act will lead to the unraveling of the farm safety net in this country and will mean we will lose literally tens of thousands of farm families this year. We are not talking about sometime in the distant future. We are talking about right now. We are talking about an economic calamity.

Again, I hope my colleagues will support this motion. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't believe I need to respond. I gave my response to the principal sponsor. We have agreed to accept the instruction.

I yield back any time I might have and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, perhaps we could engage in a parliamentary discussion regarding order. If I am correct, the first vote would be on the Lautenberg Social Security motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. There is 1 minute on each side to discuss the motion.

The second vote will be on the Domenici motion. We will explain that when the time comes. Then we will vote on the Kennedy Medicare tax breaks motion. Then we will vote on the motion of Senator DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. DOMENICI. 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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for all Senators who might be listening, the first motion to instruct is Senator LAUTENBERG's on Social Security. This is essentially consistent with the budget resolution that we voted for on our side of the aisle. I ask every Senator to vote for it.

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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON LAUTENBERG MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have 1 minute and the Senator from New Jersey has 1 minute. Have the yeas and nays been requested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senators should be on notice we will start this vote in 2 minutes.

This motion to instruct says to the conferees, adopt the language regarding the Social Security trust fund that is in the budget resolution which passed the Senate with every Republican and one Democrat supporting it. Since it is consistent with the budget resolution, and I still have to go to conference with the House under all circumstances, I recommend on our side, at least, that everybody vote for it.

I yield back any time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this motion is pretty simple. It instructs the conferees on the budget resolution to include in the conference report provisions that would reserve all Social Security surpluses for Social Security, and only Social Security—no other programs, including other retirement programs, and not for tax cuts.

I hope when the conference is held that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Budget Committee will be there to say, ''Here is a vote that is potentially 100–0 or 95–5. This is serious.''

It is not part of a scheme to go into conference and say, ''Sorry, we are dropping it.'' We don't want it dropped. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee doesn't really want it dropped.

We can differ about the approach, but all of us will make a single statement: If Social Security has a surplus, we want it there for the people who are going to retire when their time comes. It is as simple as that.

I am pleased to have the support of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote ''Aye.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	DeWine	Johnson
Akaka	Dodd	Kennedy
Allard	Domenici	Kerrey
Ashcroft	Dorgan	Kerry
Baucus	Durbin	Kohl
Bayh	Edwards	Kyl
Bennett	Enzi	Landrieu
Biden	Feingold	Lautenberg
Bingaman	Feinstein	Leahy
Bond	Fitzgerald	Levin
Boxer	Frist	Lieberman
Breaux	Gorton	Lincoln
Brownback	Graham	Lott
Bryan	Gramm	Lugar
Bunning	Grams	Mack
Burns	Grassley	McCain
Byrd	Gregg	McConnell
Campbell	Hagel	Mikulski
Chafee	Harkin	Murkowski
Cleland	Hatch	Murray
Cochran	Helms	Nickles
Collins	Hollings	Reed
Conrad	Hutchinson	Reid
Coverdell	Hutchison	Robb
Craig	Inhofe	Roberts
Crapo	Inouye	Rockefeller
Daschle	Jeffords	Roth
Santorum	Smith (OR)	Thurmond
Sarbanes	Snowe	Torricelli
Schumer	Specter	Voinovich
Sessions	Stevens	Wellstone
Shelby	Thomas	Wyden
Smith (NH)	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—2

Moynihan	Warner

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if you would get everyone's attention, I will tell everybody where we are going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have three remaining votes. There is 1 minute in between each one. Then we are finished.

I say while many of the Senators are here, I am sorry that we have to vote over again on the same issues we voted on 2 weeks ago, but essentially most of the motions are revoting on what we already voted on. Had we appointed conferees the very night we did this budget resolution, there would not have been any time to have motions to instruct the conferees. So I am trying to hurry through, but I cannot do any better.

VOTE ON DOMENICI MOTION TO INSTRUCT

What is up now is the Domenici motion to instruct. It reaffirms the Senate position on the Roth-Breaux amendment calling for Medicare reform. That really extends solvency.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, can we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will those having conversations in the well cease their conversations. We are not going to be able to proceed until the conversations cease or those having them go somewhere else.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me just finish quickly.

The Domenici instruction takes into consideration the Breaux-Thomas bipartisan plan which includes prescription drugs as part of the reform. And this instruction includes that we adopt the Snowe-Wyden provision which allows budget surpluses not currently allocated to the Social Security trust fund, because it is not needed there for taxes, that those surpluses may be used for major Medicare reform.

I hope we will adopt this motion. It will be followed by a Kennedy motion that I will speak to later.

I yield back any time I might have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. My friend and colleague, as we could expect, explained correctly what this motion effectively does. If you vote in favor of the motion, effectively you are saying you are not going to use any of the surpluses of the Federal budget for the Medicare system, No. 1, because that is the recommendation of the Commission. And secondly, before we get overly excited about a reserve fund on the prescription drugs, just read page 90 of the report and you will see that the trust fund is not utilized until there is significant extension of solvency for Social Security. That is defined as 9 or 12 years. That comes to either premium increases or cost benefits of some $686 billion. So it is never going to go into effect.

I am all for having an existing fund. But this isn't it. It is right here on page 90, the requirements for the fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. And it says it will not go into effect unless there is significant solvency from 9 to 12 years. That is what the trustees say, $686 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Domenici motion to instruct the conferees. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Breaux	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kerrey	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Enzi	Mack	Warner

NAYS—42

Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Lieberman
Bayh	Feinstein	Lincoln
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON KENNEDY MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there are now 2 minutes evenly divided on the Kennedy motion to instruct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this motion is very simple. It says to devote a portion of the surplus—not all of it, just some of it—to saving Medicare before using it for a tax cut or new spending. This policy is supported by Alan Greenspan and by 100 leading economists because it makes economic sense and because it makes sense for Medicare.

My friend across the aisle has talked at length about how much he and his party care about Medicare, but that budget resolution does not devote one thin dime of new resources to Medicare beyond those required by law. This vote is a test: Tax cuts versus Medicare. That is the issue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate rejected an amendment on this by a vote of 56–43 just a few days ago. It is the identical issue.

Senator KENNEDY would have us believe that the President's approach to putting 15 percent of the surplus into IOUs in the Medicare trust fund will help Medicare become solvent. He also suggests, Mr. President, that leading economists support the President's IOU; that is, we will pay for it later. They support that. They support it because we are not spending the money. But we already save $400 billion more than the President and we would apply it to the national debt, which is what the economists thought was good. Our budget is better than this in that regard and it does not put IOUs into a fund, which in this case is a postdated check that somebody will pay for later on—our kids and grandkids.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the IOU is a payroll tax. This is the full faith and credit of the United States. That is what we are talking about. It is very clear what this issue is. Let's make sure we have solvency in the Medicare system before tax cuts.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to table the Kennedy motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Bunning	Gregg	Santorum
Burns	Hagel	Sessions
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchison	Snowe
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Jeffords	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Enzi	Mack	Warner

NAYS—45

Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Lieberman
Bayh	Feinstein	Lincoln
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Schumer
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON DODD MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Vermont, myself and many others who supported this 2 weeks by a vote of 57–40 I want to express my gratitude to my Republican colleagues for supporting that amendment that day. Unfortunately, the House conferees, or potential conferees, have indicated they intend to drop this amendment which would add over 5 years $5 billion to the existing child care and development block grant, despite the fact that this was a bipartisan amendment supported by a bipartisan coalition of Members here in the Senate.

I would not be asking for this vote except I think it is important we send a clear message out of this Chamber that we care about working families who need child care assistance.

With the few seconds remaining, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote in favor of this motion. It will keep the issue alive.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate voted by a vote of 57 to 40 to approve this amendment when we had the budget resolution. We are going to go to conference and try to work it out. I am not asking anyone to vote against it. In terms of the chairman's position, vote however you wish. I don't think there is a total Republican position because 15 Republicans voted for it last time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID, I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is absent due to surgery.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), would vote ''aye.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abraham	Edwards	Levin
Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Lincoln
Bayh	Fitzgerald	Lugar
Biden	Frist	McCain
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Harkin	Reed
Bryan	Hatch	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Campbell	Hutchinson	Roberts
Chafee	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Cleland	Inouye	Sarbanes
Collins	Jeffords	Schumer
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Daschle	Kerrey	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Torricelli
Dodd	Kohl	Voinovich
Domenici	Landrieu	Warner
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—33

Allard	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Roth
Bond	Gregg	Santorum
Brownback	Hagel	Sessions
Bunning	Helms	Shelby
Burns	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kyl	Stevens
Craig	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	Mack	Thompson
Enzi	McConnell	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—1

Moynihan

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the underlying motion to authorize the Chair to appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer (Mr. SMITH of Oregon) appointed Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. BOXER and Mrs. MURRAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. VOINOVICH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CRISIS IN KOSOVO

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to vehemently oppose sending American ground forces into Kosovo and to demand that if the President contemplates sending in ground troops, that decision be deliberated and authorized by the Congress of the United States.

I am an American of Serbian-Slovenian ancestry. My father's family is from southern Croatia, which is known as Krijna, and my mother's family is from Ljubljana and Stranje in Slovenia.

I want to make it clear—I don't oppose sending ground troops into Kosovo because I am Serbian. I oppose it because it is bad policy. However, my ethnic heritage does give me a special insight into the situation that someone else might not have.

I have always opposed the leadership of Slobodan Milosevic. Like most Americans, I consider him to be a war criminal.

However, Mr. President, I was 1 of 41 Senators who voted against the bombing because I was concerned that this bombing would not achieve our end of bringing Slobodan Milosevic to the negotiating table as contemplated by the Clinton Administration and NATO.

These negotiations were designed to get Milosevic to sign the Rambouillet agreement or something very similar, thereby guaranteeing the basic human rights of the Albanian Kosovars and avoiding ethnic cleansing.

I also feared the bombing would only solidify Milosevic's leadership with the Serbian people and ruin any chance of cultivating alternative leadership within Serbia.

I have to say that our problem has not been with the Serbian people, but with their ruthless leader.

The main thing this bombing campaign has managed to do is fan the flames of centuries-old Serbian nationalism. Individuals who until the bombing campaign had little support for Milosevic and his activities in Kosovo, now firmly believe their national pride is at stake. They have thrown their support behind Milosevic and have expressed a willingness to follow his leadership and fight for their country.

It is extremely important to remember—this is very important—Kosovo is to the Serbian people what Jerusalem is to Jews, Christians and Muslims. To the Serbians, it is a holy place. It is the scene of the most important event in Serbian history—the battle of Kosovo in 1389 between the Turks and the Serbs, led by Tsar Lazar.

The battle of Kosovo has lived for centuries in Serbian literature. To this day, Serbian children sing songs and read epic poems celebrating this event.

The interesting thing about the battle of Kosovo is how outnumbered the Serbian people were—and they knew it. And even though they lost, it is considered a glorious defeat because they fought valiantly against overwhelming odds. To quote from the epic poem ''The Battle of Kosovo'':

> Then the Turks overwhelmed Lazar, And the Tsar, Lazar, was destroyed, With him was destroyed his army of seven and seventy thousand soldiers. All was holy, all was honorable and the goodness of God was fulfilled.

History, pride and heritage are deeply-seeded in Serb culture. That's why it is significant that Milosevic started his rise to political power in Kosovo and probably the most important event in his political career was when he spoke to 1 million citizens on the 600th Anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo—at the very site of the battle! I want you to also know, Mr. President, the most sacred Serbian Orthodox monasteries are located in Kosovo.

Considering Serbian history, and where Milosevic started his career, American and NATO leaders should have known that Milosevic couldn't give in without losing face. Especially when he was told ''either sign this or we'll bomb you''. Unfortunately, the Clinton administration presented Milosevic with an ultimatum which foreclosed all other options that could have led to a negotiated settlement.

Our bombing campaign has given Milosevic cover to move forward expeditiously with his policy of ethnic cleansing—precisely what we were trying to avoid in the first place. Now, because he and his forces are not being tightly monitored—and that's because all the observers were kicked out as soon as the bombing started—they can do as they wish. Therefore, we hear evidence of massacres and rape, and we have witnessed the forced relocation of hundreds of thousands of people and the total devastation of Kosovo.

To me there is no question that the decision to bomb Kosovo and Serbia was a terrible mistake in the first place, but now we face three bad choices—stop the bombing, continue the bombing, or go in with bombing and ground troops.

Although I disagreed with bombing in the first place, of the three, I believe the least objectionable is to continue the bombing campaign in hopes of securing the very negotiated settlement that has eluded us so far.

Many public officials and foreign policy experts are loudly advocating the introduction of ground troops to Kosovo in an effort to force Milosevic to yield his grip on the Kosovar Albanians and to ultimately ''win the war''. They claim it's the only way.

Let me say that I support the goal of restoring peace and stability to the region, returning to Kosovo those refugees that want to go back, negotiating a new agreement that will guarantee their safety and self-determination and establishing a multinational force to monitor the negotiated settlement. I support all this—but I absolutely oppose the use of American ground troops to implement this goal.

I oppose using American troops in this manner not because I don't think they can get the job done. Far from it. I believe our armed forces have performed magnificently, and I wholeheartedly admire the effort that each of them has been giving during the campaign in Kosovo. They are doing the job we have asked them to do.

However, I see a situation developing in the Balkans that could be just as brutal as that which developed in Vietnam. As opposed to the flat deserts of the Persian Gulf area, the Balkans are a very mountainous region that is ideal for a sustained campaign of guerrilla warfare.

A smaller, and less well-armed force could have the ability to use this natural terrain to impede the progress and mobility of a NATO invasion force for an extended period of time while racking up vast numbers of casualties.

Remember that in World War II, more than 500,000 Nazi soldiers thought that they could just roll through Yugoslavia. They did not, due in large part,

to the determination of the Serbian people.

It has been reported that it will take 6 to 8 weeks to even prepare for a ground invasion. And I believe it will probably take even more than that because we don't even have the troops in the region, we haven't even mobilized and we haven't established a staging area.

This will give the Serbs ample time to disperse, fortify defensive works, stockpile their arms, and so on. The steps the Serbs take now will allow them to later harass the invasion force at every conceivable opportunity. It will make it that much more difficult for NATO to secure a victory without incurring heavy losses.

The most important thing I think the American people should know—if we put ground forces in Kosovo, we will go to war with Serbia. Period.

We will have to accept the fact that we will be at war, and that we will have to take out Milosevic. And that means a long, extended war with loss of life and a total destruction of the infrastructure in Serbia, in Kosovo, and what about Montenegro?

And another thing—we have to be seriously concerned about igniting the entire southeast Europe region with our actions. What will the neighboring nations do? What will Russia do? Will NATO's action perhaps cause the radical elements in Russia to come into power?

These are serious questions that may not be of concern now, but the consequences of our actions today may come back to haunt us tomorrow.

We must remember—our goal is to bring peace and stability to this region. I am concerned that the introduction of ground troops may have just the opposite effect and destabilize the region over the long term.

And what happens after we win that war? And it will be won, although at a high cost in terms of lives and infrastructure. What will happen? What will be the disposition of the Kosovar Albanians, hundreds of thousands of whom are now refugees? Are we going to have a greater Albania?

Who will monitor the ''peace'' and who will pay for the rebuilding of the infrastructure in Serbia and Kosovo? What kind of commitment will NATO have to ''Pick up the pieces'' and rebuild Serbia? Will it fall on the United States?

Make no mistake: the introduction of ground troops guarantees that we as a nation are committing to be involved for an extended period of time and the expenditure of many billions of dollars. In order to compare, my colleagues should remember that we have already spent—we have already spent—over $12 billion in Bosnia.

I can't help but feel touched at times like these, in the face of situations of national importance, to contemplate the times that I have visited the Vietnam Memorial. All of us who have done that cannot help but be moved. And I know on my part, tears always well up in my eyes.

Seeing the names carved on that wall, knowing that each name represents an individual who had loved ones and friends and had hopes, dreams and aspirations, is a poignant reminder of what it means to send young men and women into harm's way.

But let me just say that while I disagreed with the policy pursued to stop the humanitarian abuses in Kosovo, those abuses cannot be overlooked by the international community. You just can't turn your head and forget about it. This morning, I participated in a commemoration of the Holocaust here in our Nation's Capitol. Let us remember so that we never forget.

I believe that in addition to pursuing our strategic interests and our trade interests, we must not forget that our status as a world power gives us a moral responsibility to defend human rights. I call upon my colleagues and all Americans to work toward a consensus on how we as a nation respond to acts of genocide internationally.

Looking away in Croatia was a failure when 250,000 Serbs were driven out. As President Clinton acknowledged, looking away in Rwanda was a mistake where almost a million people were killed between the Tutsi's and the Hutu's. And what about the Kurds in Iraq and Turkey, and all the other areas of the world where such troubles exist? We have it in many, many places in the world.

Thus far, full engagement through bombing has been a failure in Kosovo. Our moral responsibility is to identify the means and the goals available to us to deal with such incidents before they escalate beyond peaceful resolution. We would be well-served—we would be well-served—to have a coherent policy to guide us in the future as to when we go in and when we do not go in.

Mr. President, what this country does in the name of NATO over the next several weeks in regard to Serbia and Kosovo will have a dramatic impact on this country's future. It is our obligation to the American people to exercise our due diligence before we commit to a course of action from which we cannot extricate ourselves. This is very, very serious business that we are now considering.

We should pray to the Holy Spirit for the enlightenment to make the right decision for our country, for southeast Europe, and for the world. Let us be constantly reminded of Jesus's exhortation on the Sermon on the Mount that ''blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.''

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

THE MILLENNIUM DIGITAL COMMERCE ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to recognize the efforts of Senator ABRAHAM who authored and spearheaded the effort to pass the Government Paperwork Elimination Act during the 105th Congress.

This good government measure, which the President signed into law last year, requires federal agencies to automate their forms and allows computer users to complete, electronically sign, and submit government forms online.

Aside from saving thousands of square feet of storage space, this landmark legislation will significantly reduce the amount of time it takes Americans to complete government paperwork. The millions of hours freed up translates into billions of dollars saved over time. This legislation, which was supported by the Administration, will also help the federal government transition to a paperless document management system. One that allows agencies to collect and maintain forms and other records faster, easier, and cheaper.

Mr. President, Senator ABRAHAM, my friend and colleague, has once again demonstrated his leadership on electronic commerce issues by recently introducing the Millennium Digital Commerce Act. This bipartisan measure, which I cosponsored, is a direct outgrowth of and a natural extension to the Government Paperwork Elimination Act. It provides a national framework for online business to business transactions. This important interstate commerce measure provides legal standing for electronic signatures on contracts and other business transactions without preempting state law on intrastate commerce.

Electronic signatures are the equivalent of an online ''royal seal.'' Electronic signatures are highly controlled and are far more secure than manual signatures. As my colleagues are aware, it is not difficult to mimic someone's handwritten ''John Hancock.'' An electronic signature, however, is verifiable and it becomes invalid if any of the data in the electronic document is altered or eliminated. This revolutionary communication tool can also time and date stamp someone's unique electronic signature. It is an emerging technology that will serve as a springboard for electronic commerce.

Over the last few years, states have recognized the importance of authentication technology on trade and have already adopted rules governing its use. However, of the more than forty states that now have laws on the books, none has adopted the same approach. Congress should not allow an electronic signature hodgepodge to thwart the exponential growth occurring in electronic commerce.

In our fast-paced global and highly technical environment, where time is money, companies transacting business across state lines need assurance that electronically signed documents are fully and legally executable. Senator ABRAHAM's Millennium Digital Commerce Act will ensure that businesses located in different states are held to their agreements and obligations even if their respective states have different rules and approaches concerning electronically signed documents.

This much needed and timely legislation is a necessary precursor to state-by-state adoption of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA). Once UETA is finalized, its enactment by all fifty states is not expected to occur for several years.

The Millennium Digital Commerce Act is an important interim step towards eventual national uniformity. It merely establishes the legal certainty of electronic signatures when used for interstate business transactions. It strikes a necessary balance between a state's individual interests and the need for reciprocity among and between states. It fosters the expansion of trade on a state-wide, national, and international basis while promoting continued innovation.

The Millennium Digital Commerce Act is technology neutral and allows businesses to determine the methods they want to utilize for executing an online transaction. This legislation also establishes guiding principles for the use of electronic signatures for international transactions. A framework based on open, non-discriminatory standards. Lastly, Senator ABRAHAM's bill requires federal agencies to identify rules or regulations that impede electronic commerce and recommendations for improvements.

Mr. President, the United States cannot lag behind our industrial trading partners. Already, the United Kingdom has called for the legal recognition of electronic signatures.

I look forward to working with Senator ABRAHAM and Chairman MCCAIN as the Commerce Committee gives prompt consideration to this important pro-technology, pro-electronic commerce legislation.

The Millennium Digital Commerce Act will help move our nation's economy forward into the 21st Century. I hope the rest of my colleagues will support this responsible measure which will benefit both American consumers and American businesses.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 12, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,663,866,732,410.23 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-three billion, eight hundred sixty-six million, seven hundred thirty-two thousand, four hundred ten dollars and twenty-three cents).

Five years ago, April 12, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,565,109,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred sixty-five billion, one hundred nine million).

Ten years ago, April 12, 1989, the federal debt stood at $2,771,368,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred seventy-one billion, three hundred sixty-eight million).

Fifteen years ago, April 12, 1984, the federal debt stood at $1,486,599,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred eighty-six billion, five hundred ninety-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, April 12, 1974, the federal debt stood at $473,967,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-three billion, nine hundred sixty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,189,899,732,410.23 (Five trillion, one hundred eighty-nine billion, eight hundred ninety-nine million, seven hundred thirty-two thousand, four hundred ten dollars and twenty-three cents) during the past 25 years.

RETIREMENT OF RON KAVULICK

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, while the Senate was in recess for the Easter/Spring break, a member of the Senate family ended his Senate career. Ron Kavulick, the Chief Reporter of Debates, retired.

As a matter of fact, Ron was to have ended his Senate career at the close of the 105th Congress, but remained in his position as the Senate conducted the impeachment trial of the President. Ron's expertise and dedication to detail were needed throughout the tedious proceedings of the trial.

Ron became an Official Reporter of Senate Debates in 1979 and served ably in that capacity until he was elevated to the position of Chief Reporter in 1995.

Ron has a very impressive reporting background. He was an official court reporter in the Air Force's JAG office. While employed with Alderson Reporting Company, Ron had the opportunity to work at the White House. Ron traveled extensively both with President Johnson and President Nixon.

Ron spent many hours and many nights working in the West Wing of the White House providing official White House transcripts of state dinners, press conferences and news briefings. Certainly Ron's experiences at the White House were helpful as he endured many a late night in the Senate.

My staff and I personally cannot thank Ron enough for his service. Since my arrival at the Senate in 1987, I have relied on Ron's institutional memory and unfailing kindness. He has always been available, day or night, for any help that my staff or I needed. It would be impossible for me to count the times that Ron and his very able staff have assisted us. Having said that, no one deserves a rest from the long, sometimes grueling hours of the Senate more than Ron Kavulick. I can attest to the fact that he will be greatly missed here in the Senate.

As Ron goes on to enjoy time with his wife, Pat, his children and granddaughter, Allison, I thank him for his diligence and perseverance in his service to his country and for his friendship to us here in the Senate. My staff joins me in wishing him all the best in the years to come.

Ron, good luck and Godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO ISABEL ''BELLA'' ROMERO

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a truly remarkable woman, Mrs. Isabel ''Bella'' Romero, of Greeley, Colorado. This gallant woman's life was prematurely cut short last year after courageously fighting ovarian cancer for six years. Bella's dedication to improving our world transcends her career as an inspirational middle school principal and educator and as a woman devoted to her family. Her selfless pursuit of bringing out the best in all she came in contact with has made her passing that much greater. She is fondly missed by her friends and family, but her legacy lives on through all those whose lives she touched.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Denver Post on this remarkable Coloradan be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 25, 1999]

BELLA ROMERO'S LIFE DISPLAYED THE ELOQUENCE OF ACTION

(By Tomás Romero)

''In our world of big names, curiously, our heroes tend to be anonymous.''—Historian Daniel J. Boorstin

Americans tend to compartmentalize their emotions too much: Feeling patriotic on July 4, remembering the deceased on Memorial Day and putting on a happy face for the holidays.

Hispanics, though, see tragedy and joy as part of an ever-intertwined continuum—so why not acknowledge them concurrently as we do with *Los Dias de Los Muertos?* Thus, just before Christmas, I've chosen to write a belated tribute to one of those anonymous heroes described by Boorstin. After all, what time could be better to celebrate a woman who gave so many gifts to so many people?

My friend Isabel ''Bella'' Romero of Greeley died this year after an unbelievably valiant six-year battle fought against a cruel, unforgiving foe—ovarian cancer.

Action is eloquence. And the eloquently lovely manner with which Bella Romero conducted her life journey must be remembered: an unmatchable, deliberately executed, constantly positive pattern for living.

She was a loving wife to Ray, a loving mother to Denny, Mark, Juan and Andrea, and a passionate advocate for every school child in need of a good past. As a Longmont middle school principal, Bella knew that a child without a good past couldn't easily aspire to a better future.

Bella was not related to me by blood, but she was my sister in spirit since we were kids together in Brighton. This winsome girl was married and a mother by age 16. She worked in a cannery to help Ray attend the then-Colorado State College in Greeley. It was an experience filed with bare food cupboards, living in dingy basements. Ray became a teacher/university administrator and successful civic leader.

Then it was Bella's turn to bring dreams to fruition. ''I've decided to go to college and become a teacher,'' she announced. Armed with a GED, she began a daily round trip from Brighton to Greeley. Family needs still came first. Only when everyone was asleep would she sit at a kitchen table to study. In three years, Bella received her diploma—with a straight A average. Later she fulfilled another aspiration and became a respected principal—one of the state's best. Probably her greatest skill was being able to defeat an enemy by making them a friend.

Then came sudden, unexpected pain and a doctor's diagnosis of ovarian cancer. Bella's war had begun. With prayer, traditional medicine, visualization, holistic health tactics—and, yes even laughter—Bella beat back her vicious enemy. Tauntingly, cancer would retreat and then return. Bella wept when she was finally forced to give up her position as principal. '''It was six years of increasingly difficult anguish for us and pain for her,'' husband Ray says.

''Death be not proud,'' I said in a eulogy. ''Bella's intent was never to defeat death—no one does—it was to win at life.'' Through study and reflection, Ray believes, Bella found a spiritually higher level—a place beyond pain's reach.

She endured beyond our comprehension to understand why she simply didn't just let go. Never did she relinquish personal power or allow physical frailties to become spirit-dominating indignities. University of Northern Colorado President Howard Skinner gladly came to her home when asked to join forces for worthwhile programs. Bella wanted to leave Earth on her terms—''thoroughly used up,'' as George Bernard Shaw wrote in a poem.

Every grandchild of Bella's received a personal videotaped message. So, too, were family members counseled, parents called from a hospital bed and told goodbye. When visitors came to her, she found strength to console us and offer advice. When we'd been prepared to get on with our lives without her, she left us.

It's been six months since Bella died, and sister Anna Lee still mourns for a best friend.

Bella was Cathy Gleesing's mentor and school principal. Cathy became a valued friend and was always there to offer love and support in time of trying need. Bella ''led with elegance, grace and style,'' Cathy says. '''I wish for Bella when I strive to be excellent in my work, mood and relationships.''

In other words, always.

Ray lost a beloved companion, one who at day's end every day for 40 years would join her partner to talk and reinforce *familia* and values.

We have all lost, and during this holiday season we need to learn from her gift.

THANKING KIM KOIVISTO FOR A JOB WELL DONE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Today marks the final day of work in the Senate for Kim Koivisto, the associate director to the Democratic Steering and Coordination Committee. I didn't want the day to pass without taking a moment to thank Kim for a job well done.

The Democratic Steering and Coordination Committee is the liaison office between Senate Democrats and a good portion of the rest of the country, including representatives of state, county and local governments and people from every imaginable interest group. The committee is an important part of our caucus's efforts to talk with and listen to Americans from varying perspectives.

Kim has worked as associate director of the committee for the past two years. During that time, she has consistently demonstrated the highest level of commitment, professionalism and creativity. She has worked most intensively on women's, Hispanic and labor issues.

One highlight of Kim's tenure is the creation of a new outreach program to strengthen relations between our caucus and national Hispanic organizations, Latino elected officials and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. She also used her fluency in Spanish to translated materials into Spanish, and to organize Spanish-language press conferences for Senate and House Democrats.

Kim has also worked closely with labor organizations and women's groups to advance causes that are important to American families—and to Kim personally. Issues she worked especially hard on include closing the pay gap between men and women, raising the minimum wage, and strengthening the federal commitment to breast cancer research. Kim was also active in the fight to retain the Federal Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program last year as part of TEA–21, the new Federal highway bill.

Kim's immediate plans include traveling through Indonesia. She will attend the Graduate School for Counseling at the University of Maryland in the fall.

On behalf of all Senate Democrats, I'd like to thank Kim for her hard work, and wish her the best of luck in her travel and studies. She will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BAXTER WILSON

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourned for the Easter recess, my State of Mississippi suffered the loss of one of its finest citizens, Richard Baxter Wilson, who died on Monday, March 15. He was a national leader in the electric power industry. He served as a member of the board of directors of Middle South Utilities, Inc., the Edison Electric Institute, and the National Association of Electric Companies.

In addition to serving as president and chairman of the board of Mississippi Power & Light Company, he was also a member of many other corporate, charitable, civic, and educational institution boards.

He was a personal friend of mine whose advice and counsel I appreciated and relied upon, to my great benefit. His two children, Richard B. Wilson, Jr. and Miriam Weems, are two of my closest and dearest friends. And I extend to them, and all the members of the family, my sincerest condolences.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary that appeared in The Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, MS, of March 16 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clarion-Ledger, Mar. 16, 1999]

RICHARD BAXTER WILSON, EX-COMPANY PRESIDENT

MADISON—Richard Baxter Wilson, 93, a former president of Mississippi Power & Light, died of heart failure Monday at his home.

Services are 10:30 a.m. Wednesday at First Presbyterian Church of Jackson. Visitation is 4–6 p.m. today at Wright & Ferguson Funeral Home and 9:30 a.m. Wednesday at the church.

Mr. Wilson was a Yazoo City native. He graduated from the University of Mississippi in 1927.

He began working with Mississippi Power & Light in 1926 and worked in Cleveland before moving to Jackson. He was president of the company from 1954–69 and chairman of the board until his 1976 retirement. MP&L's largest plant in Vicksburg was named after him.

Mr. Wilson also served as chairman of the Jackson Airport Authority, Jackson Planning Board, State National Alliance of Businessmen, Mississippi U.S. Savings Bonds Committee and was national vice president of the American Red Cross. He had helped develop the Jackson Municipal Airport and other projects for Mississippi's economic development office. He was an organizer of the Pearl River Development Association and was chairman of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce Committee that promoted development of the Ross Barnett Reservoir.

He was president of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Clubs of Jackson and Cleveland, the Andrew Jackson Council of Boy Scouts of America, Southeastern Electric Exchange, Beauvoir Foundation and the University of Mississippi Alumni Association. He was a member of the Newcomer Society of North America.

Mr. Wilson chaired several fund drives including the Mississippi Baptist Medical Center and Salvation Army.

He was a member of First Presbyterian Church in Jackson where he was a deacon for nearly 50 years. He was a Mason and a member of the Wahabi Temple of Shriners.

Mr. Wilson was a director and vice-president of Middle South Utilities, Inc. He was a trustee at Deposit Guaranty National Bank, Belhaven College, University of Mississippi Alumni Association, National Association of Electric Companies, Edison Electric Institute, Southeastern Electric Exchange, Mississippi Economic Council, Magna Corporation, Standard Life Insurance Co., Mississippi Agricultural & Industrial Board and Southern Research Institute.

Mr. Wilson had an endowed fellowship at UM in his honor and the First Federal Award

for distinguished service to the state. He had received several other distinguished awards.

''No man has expressed greater faith in, or worked harder for the development of Mississippi than Baxter Wilson,'' said a *Jackson Daily News* editorial in 1970.

Wilson's goal and recurring motif, the editorial said, was ''helping build Mississippi.''

He was a charter member of Epsilon Xi chapter of the Sigma Nu fraternity at UM and was a member of the Mississippi Society of Professional Engineers. He received from the university the Distinguished Alumnus Award in 1979 and Engineer of Distinction in 1984. He became a Paul Harris Fellow of the Rotary International Foundation in 1987.

He was the widower of Katherine Owen and Edwina Ford Barker.

Survivors include a son, Richard Baxter Wilson Jr., of Jackson; daughter, Miriam Weems of Jackson; and two grandchildren.

Memorials may be made to French Camp Academy, R. Baxter Wilson Fellowship Fund at the University of Mississippi in Oxford or to a favorite charity.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY EUDORA WELTY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today one of my State's most famous citizens of all time celebrates her 90th birthday. Eudora Welty is known around the world as a writer of enormous talent and accomplishment. She has lived for most of her life in Jackson, MS, and she enjoys a level of popularity in our State that a politician can envy but not match.

I invite the attention of all Senators to the May issue of Vanity Fair which contains a toast to Eudora by my friend and fellow Mississippian, Willie Morris.

In today's edition of the Jackson Clarion-Ledger, an article describes other activities that will be taking place in our State to honor Miss Welty on her 90th birthday.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that newspaper article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clarion-Ledger, April 13, 1999]

MORRIS' TRIBUTE TO WELTY IN 'VANITY FAIR'—MAGAZINE ARTICLE HONORS JACKSON WRITER ON 90TH BIRTHDAY; CELEBRATION SET

(By Billy Watkins)

Eudora Welty, the Pulitzer Prize-winning author from Jackson, turns 90 years old today.

To help commemorate the occasion, fellow Mississippi author Willie Morris wrote a 4,000-word story about Welty for Vanity Fair magazine's May issue, which is on newsstands now. Morris calls it his ''toast to Eudora.''

''And I call her Eudora because she's been my friend since I was a little boy,'' Morris says. ''I very strongly support the idea that she is the greatest living American writer. She's full of wackiness and humor and loyalty to her friends. She's just so generous. Always has been.''

Morris will participate in a tribute to Welty 5–7 p.m. today at Lemuria Book Store in Jackson. Although Welty will not be able to attend, Morris, along with Mississippi writer Ellen Douglas, will be present at the celebration where two new books will be unveiled.

University Press of Mississippi will release The First Story, a limited edition reprint of Welty's first published short story, Death of a Traveling Salesman. It includes an essay by Welty looking back at that story. Only 500 hardcovers have been printed. They sell for $75 each.

Hill Street Press of Athens, Ga., will debut Eudora Welty: Writers' Reflections Upon First Reading Welty. It includes essays by Morris, Douglas, Barry Hannah, Reynolds Price and others.

John Evans, owner of Lemuria, says Welty books still sell well.

''We sell a lot to out-of-towners and people who just moved here who know about Miss Welty,'' Evans says. ''And I keep her work stocked. I feel like it's our duty that if somebody asks for something by Miss Welty, we should have it.''

Morris' piece for Vanity Fair was originally 18,000 words but had to be edited down. ''I was pleased with the way it turned out,'' Morris says. ''I'll include the entire story in my next book of essays, which will come out in about two years.''

Morris contacted many notable writers—Shelby Foote and William Styron among them—and included their views on Welty. ''I sent out more than 30 letters to people who have known her for years,'' Morris says, ''and I got 100 percent response. I think that ways what people think of Eudora, the fact that they took time to respond.

''I really believe most people who love writing will read this story—not because of me, but because of Eudora. She's loved universally. And I was honored to write the story.''

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DODD. I just say to my colleague from Mississippi, I commend him for his statement recognizing the contributions of Eudora Welty. This Connecticut Yankee loves her writing. And for my birthday present this year I received a first edition copy of one of Eudora Welty's novels.

I prize and cherish her work. She is a Mississippi treasure, but she is also a treasure for this great country of ours. And I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Mississippi and commend him for recognizing this remarkable woman who has made such a rich contribution to the literary heritage life of our Nation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the distinguished Senator very much for that.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 15. An act to designate a portion of the Otay Mountain region of California as wilderness.

H.R. 154. An act to provide for the collection of fees for the making of motion pictures, television productions, and sound tracks in National Park System and National Wildlife Refuge System units, and for other purposes.

H.R. 449. An act to authorize the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 911. An act to designate the Federalo building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building.''

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the opening ceremonies of Sunrayce 99.

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the bike rodeo to be conducted by the Earth Force Youth Bike Summit.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 388. An act to authorize the establishment of a disaster mitigation pilot program in the Small Business Administration.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 440) to make technical corrections to the Microloan Program.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. KASICH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. MCDERMOTT as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 98. An act to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program and to amend the Centennial Flight Commemoration Act to make technical and other corrections.

The message further announced that pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the

Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

The message further announced that pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House to the National Publications and Records Commission: Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

The message also announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 1295(h), the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. KING of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to U.S.C. 4355(a), the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mrs. KELLY of New York.

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico, Mr. GILCHREST of Maryland, Mr. TANNER of Tennessee, and Mr. HOYER of Maryland.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. STARK of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MINGE of Minnesota, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803) the Minority Leader appoints the following named persons to the Congressional Award National Board of Directors: CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ of Puerto Rico, Dolores M. Beilenson of California, Timothy J. Keating of Pennsylvania, and Robert J. Kelley of Missouri.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 15. An act to designate a portion of the Otay Mountain region of California as wilderness; the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 154. An act to provide for the collection of fees for the making of motion pictures, television productions, and sound tracks in National Park System and National Wildlife Refuge System units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 449. An act to authorize the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The following concurrent resolutions were read and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the opening ceremonies of Sunrayce 99; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the bike rodeo to be conducted by the Earth Force Youth Bike Summit; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 2-month extension for the due date for filing a tax return for any member of a uniformed service on a tour of duty outside the United States for a period which includes the normal due date for such filing.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JEFFORDS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Special Report entitled ''Report on Legislative Activities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources during the 105th Congress 1997–1998'' (Rept. No. 106–40).

By Mr. MCCONNELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration: Special Report entitled ''Review of the Legislative Activities of the Committee on Rules and Administration During the 105th Congress 1997–1998'' (Rept. No. 106–41).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary: Report to accompany the bill (S. 247) to amend title 17, United States Code, to reform the copyright law with respect to satellite retransmissions of broadcast signals, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–42).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 768. A bill to establish court-martial jurisdiction over civilians serving with the Armed Forces during contingency operations, and to establish Federal jurisdiction over crimes committed outside the United States by former members of the Armed Forces and civilians accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 769. A bill to provide a final settlement on certain debt owed by the city of Dickinson, North Dakota, for the construction of the bascule gates on the Dickinson Dam; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 770. A bill to provide reimbursement under the medicare program for telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBB:

S. 771. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the memorialization at the columbarium at Arlington National Cemetery of veterans who have donated their remains to science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

S. 772. A bill to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the computations of certain civil service retirement system annuities based on part-time service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the active business definition relating to distributions of stock and securities of controlled corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 774. 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 Finance.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

S. 775. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a feasibility study for applying airport bubbles as a method of identifying, assessing, and reducing the adverse environmental impacts of airport ground and flight operations and improving the overall quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 776. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to conduct a feasibility study for the preservation of the Loess Hills in western Iowa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 777. A bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 778. A bill for the relief of Blanca Echeverri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 779. A bill to provide that no Federal income tax shall be imposed on amounts received by Holocaust victims or their heirs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 780. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the participation of the Secretary of the Interior in the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 781. A bill to amend section 2511 of title 18, United States Code, to revise the consent exception to the prohibition on the interception of oral, wire, or electronic communications that is applicable to telephone communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 782. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the exception to the

prohibition on the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications to require a health insurance issuer, health plan, or health care provider obtain an enrollee's or patient's consent to their interception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 783. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. FRIST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 784. A bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Frances Schochenmaier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. LOTT):

S. 786. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies, subject to a reduction of 50 percent if the recipient dies during the first 15 days of such month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 787. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to enhance consumer disclosures regarding credit card terms and charges, to restrict issuance of credit cards to students, to expand protections in connection with unsolicited credit cards and third-party checks, and to protect consumers from unreasonable practices that result in unnecesary credit costs or loss of credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 788. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide that a quality grade label issued by the Secretary of Agriculture may not be used for imported meat and meat food products; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 789. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of special compensation to certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 790. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of bottled water to submit annual reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution honoring World War II crewmembers of the U.S.S. Alabama on the occasion of the 1999 annual reunion of the U.S.S. Alabama Crewmen's Association; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 768. A bill to establish court-martial jurisdiction over civilians serving with the Armed Forces during contingency operations, and to establish Federal jurisdiction over crimes committee outside the United States by former members of the Armed Forces and civilians accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MILITARY AND EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Military and Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 1999. This bill will close a legal loophole through which civilians who commit crimes while accompanying the Armed Forces overseas evade punishment. Today, when a civilian accompanies the military outside the United States, whether a relative, a dependent, or a civilian contractor—and there are many—the civilian is not subject to prosecution under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and does not fall under any of the general Federal criminal laws.

These individuals can only be prosecuted for their crimes if the host country chooses to do so. However, there are many circumstances in which the host country does not choose to prosecute. They just often do not have an interest in the case. Additionally, in situations such as Somalia and Haiti, when our troops are rapidly deployed, typically no agreement exists governing how civilians will be prosecuted until months into the operation. Indeed, many times there are no laws in effect really in those countries. So we believe that something must be done in this regard.

There is a glaring deficiency here and it has come to my attention through a tragic incident. A U.S. Army dependent, not a soldier, living on an Army base in Germany, sexually molested two dependent children. The Army investigators found probable cause to believe that the sexual acts had occurred. However, under German law, no action could be taken against this juvenile.

Sometimes prosecutors are restricted by legal prohibitions, and sometimes they just have no interest in prosecuting a case involving Americans.

As of March 31, 1996, there were more than 240,000 family dependents and 96,000 civilian employees overseas. These persons accompany our troops to represent the United States, but many times they are in effect outside the law.

In addition to the sexual molestation incident that I have already mentioned, examples of crimes that have gone unpunished due do this loophole are rape, assault, battery, vandalism, and drug dealing. Although the offenders may receive some sort of administrative punishment, such as being barred from certain areas of the base or monetary fines, these administrative noncriminal penalties are inadequate for the more serious violations.

Because the military continues to rely heavily on civilian assistance and support, the United States must develop an appropriate and effective criminal process to deal with the misbehavior of civilians. It is important to the morale of our military forces that enlisted men and women working outside the United States along with civilian personnel do not believe that civilians who may commit a crime against them are beyond criminal prosecution.

This bill would extend the reach of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code to include those civilians that accompany the military outside the United States. When one of these civilians commits an offense that Congress has established as a maritime crime, the U.S. attorney's office would have the option to exercise jurisdiction and prosecute the offender in the United States. The bill would employ title 18, United States Code section 3238, which provides that an accused be tried in the U.S. district court where the offender first appears when he is brought back to the United States.

Finally, in order to prevent legal conflicts with a jurisdiction recognized by the United States, this bill only applies if the host country has already prosecuted or is in the process of prosecuting the accused.

The need for this legislation was most recently described in a report submitted by the Overseas Jurisdiction Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and to this Congress. This panel was established in section 1151 of the 1996 National Defense Authorization Act.

In the act, Congress recognized this jurisdictional loophole needed to be examined so it established this advisory committee to study the problems of civilians who commit criminal acts when accompanying the Armed Forces overseas. This committee was composed of

experts in military and civilian law from all branches of the armed services, the Department of Justice, and the State Department. The advisory committee found that this problem was serious enough that ''legislation is needed to address misconduct by civilians accompanying the forces overseas in peacetime settings.'' These experts believed that the jurisdictional void must be closed to ''maintain order and discipline.''

The American Government must have the authority to discipline people it sends overseas to represent and serve this country. It is inconsistent with the American system of justice that a civilian employee working with service members and dependents of service members not be subject to American criminal laws. This piece of legislation is an important step toward recognizing the changing nature of our Armed Forces and making sure that the Criminal Code is keeping pace with the military's changing dynamic.

As a former U.S. attorney for 12 years myself, and one who has met frequently with victims, nothing can be more frustrating than to see a person or a family victimized by some awful act and have to tell them: There is no law that will vindicate you. Even though under various other circumstances it would be a plain crime, for some technical reason there is not a way to legally right this wrong.

So I believe this is an important bill. It closes a loophole involving more and more Americans each year. We simply do not need to cede away the authority to prosecute criminal acts to nations that may have no interest whatsoever in vindicating the rights of an American service man or woman who has been a victim of a crime.

I believe this is an important act. It has broad support, the support of the military and support of other officials of this Government. We think it is a needed step and I commend it to my fellow Members of the Senate.

I also want to express my appreciation for an Alabama family whose child was a victim of a crime, a sexual act, in a foreign country, who is here in this Capitol today, at the Senate today, and without whose support and encouragement this piece of legislation would not become law and would not have reached this point.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator SESSIONS, to reintroduce legislation that would close the loopholes that permit civilians accompanying the Armed Forces and those serving with the Armed Forces from evading punishment for crimes they committed while abroad. Under current law, many illegal acts committed abroad by dependents, civilian employees, and those servicing with the Armed Forces go substantially unaddressed by either military or civilian courts. Administrative punishments have proven equally inadequate to address this problem.

When civilians accompany the Armed Services outside the United States, they are not subject to prosecution under Federal criminal law or the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This has proven to be a double-edged sword. While foreign nations frequently have no interest in vindicating crimes committed by American civilians against other Americans, despite the extreme seriousness of the offense, there have been instances where the United States has had to turn over American civilians to host countries for potentially harsh punishment because of the absence of appropriate enforcement action. Unfortunately, this problem is likely to worsen as there are a large number of dependents overseas, and the number of civilian employees of the Armed Services overseas is increasing. As for those serving with the Armed Forces, criminal prosecutions by the military court or administrative alternatives sometimes simply discharge the individual and send them home, rather than imposing any serious punishment for a crime.

The case that has united Senator SESSIONS and me behind this legislation is that of an Ohio resident, Amy McGough, who was stationed in Germany, along with her husband who is from Alabama. Mrs. McGough's 8-year-old son and 5-year-old daughter were repeatedly raped and molested by a neighbor boy who was supposed to be baby-sitting them. While the Criminal Investigations Division of the Army found sufficient facts, neither the Army nor Federal prosecutors had jurisdiction to prosecute the case, and the German government would not intervene because of the age of the perpetrator.

In such cases, our bill would guarantee that civilians, or those serving with the Armed Forces in certain circumstances, who commit an illegal act punishable under the Federal law by more than a year's imprisonment, will be subject to the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States for prosecution by a military court or for Federal criminal prosecution. Neither civilians connected with the Armed Forces nor those serving with the Armed Forces abroad accused of rape, child molestation or some other serious felony will simply be allowed to resign or leave the foreign country to avoid punishment. They will be subject to Federal prosecution.

We need to make sure that an appropriate criminal process exists in these circumstances. Letting these individuals back on America's streets does little to hold them accountable, and nothing to protect our communities here at home. I appreciate the efforts of my colleague, Senator SESSIONS, who is also a member of the Armed Services Committee, in working with me to introduce this legislation to address our mutual concern.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 769. A bill to provide a final settlement on certain debt owed by the city of Dickinson, ND, for the construction of the bascule gates on the Dickinson Dam; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE DICKINSON DAM BASCULE GATES SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Dickinson Dam Bascule Gates Settlement Act of 1999 and I am pleased that my colleague from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, is an original cosponsor of the bill. This legislation would permit the Secretary of the Interior to accept a one-time, lump-sum payment for the city of Dickinson, ND, in lieu of the annual payments required under the city's existing repayment contract for construction of the ''bascule gates'' on the Dickinson Dam on the Heart River. This bill would resolve a long-standing issue for the city of Dickinson and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Dickinson Dam Bascule Gates Settlement Act is nearly identical to a bill I introduced last June, and it is my hope that the Senate will quickly consider and pass this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, the history of the bascule gates is long and complex. The Bureau of Reclamation constructed the Dickinson Dam on the Heart River in 1949 and 1950 to supply water to the city of Dickinson, and for flood control, recreation, and other purposes. The reservoir created by this dam was named Patterson Lake in about 1960.

The need for additional water supply for the city was identified in the early 1970's, and the bascule gates were constructed in the early 1980's, to provide additional water storage capacity in Lake Patterson. At the time, the city expressed reservations over the cost of the bascule gates and the viability of the gates, since the city was not aware of any other location in a northern climate in which the gates had been tested or proven. In 1982, shortly after the gates were operational, a large ice block caused excessive pressure on the hydraulic system, causing it to fail. Construction modifications were made to the gate hydraulic system and a deicing system were added in 1982, adding further costs to the project.

In 1991, the city began to receive its municipal water supply from the Southwest Pipeline Project, a project constructed in part with funds provided for North Dakota's statewide water project, the Garrison Diversion project, which is another Bureau of Reclamation project. The Southwest Pipeline brings high-quality water from Lake Sakakawea on the Missouri River to the city of Dickinson and other communities in southwest North Dakota.

The water is of much higher quality that the water from the city's previous supply from Lake Patterson, and has helped spur economic development in the region. While the citizens of the area now benefit from a higher quality water supply, the city no longer benefits from the additional water supply provided by the bascule gates. The result is the city is paying for two Bureau of Reclamation projects, while it is using water from only one of those projects for its municipal water supply. The city has repaid more than $1.2 million to the United States for the bascule gates, despite the fact that the gates now provide almost no direct benefit to the city.

The city has previously investigated alternatives to the current situation. The city has discussed the option of assuming title to the dam and bascule gates, as well as attempting to negotiate a new agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation administratively. However, because the terms of the existing contract are outlined statutorily, new legislation is required to make any changes to the current repayment contract.

The legislation I am introducing today would do three primary things. First, it would permit the Interior Secretary to accept a lump-sum payment of $300,000 from the city and terminate the remaining annual payments required under the existing repayment contract. This is an increase from last year's legislation, which called for a $150,000 final settlement. Enacting this legislation would end the issue of paying for the construction of these gates for both the city and the Federal government.

Second, my bill would require the Secretary to reallocate the costs of operation and maintenance for the bascule gates and the Dickinson Dam. The bill does not prescribe any particular reallocation formula, but does require the Secretary to consider the fact that the current benefits of the dam and bascule gates are primarily for flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife purposes. In my view, operation and maintenance costs should be borne by those who benefit from a particular project.

Finally, my bill would permit the Secretary to enter any appropriate water service contracts in the future if the city or any other entity uses water from Patterson Lake for municipal water supply or for other purposes. It is only fair that if the city benefits in the future from the water stored behind the bascule gates that we preserve an option for recovering additional costs from those beneficiaries.

Mr. President, this legislation represents a win-win situation for the residents of the Dickinson area and for the Federal Government. I hope this Congress will carefully study this issue and quickly pass this important legislation.

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 ''Dickinson Dam Bascule Gates Settlement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1980 and 1981, the Bureau of Reclamation constructed the bascule gates on top of the Dickinson Dam on the Heart River, North Dakota, to provide additional water supply in the reservoir known as Patterson Lake for the city of Dickinson, North Dakota, and for additional flood control and other benefits;

(2) the gates had to be significantly modified in 1982 because of damage resulting from a large ice block causing excessive pressure on the hydraulic system, causing the system to fail;

(3) since 1991, the City has received its water supply from the Southwest Water Authority, which provides much higher quality water from the Southwest Pipeline Project;

(4) the City now receives almost no benefit from the bascule gates because the City does not require the additional water provided by the bascule gates for its municipal water supply;

(5) the City has repaid more than $1,200,000 to the United States for the construction of the bascule gates, and has been working for several years to reach an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation to alter its repayment contract;

(6) the City has a longstanding commitment to improving the water quality and recreation value of the reservoir and has been working with the United States Geological Survey, the North Dakota Department of Game and Fish, and the North Dakota Department of Health to improve water quality; and

(7) it is in the public interest to resolve this issue by providing for a single payment to the United States in lieu of the scheduled annual payments and for the termination of any further repayment obligation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BASCULE GATES.—The term ''bascule gates'' means the structure constructed on the Dam to provide additional water storage capacity in the Lake.

(2) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Dickinson, North Dakota.

(3) DAM.—The term ''Dam'' means Dickinson Dam on the Heart River, North Dakota.

(4) LAKE.—The term ''Lake'' means the reservoir known as ''Patterson Lake'' in the State of North Dakota.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

SEC. 4. FORGIVENESS OF DEBT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept a 1-time payment of $300,000 in lieu of the existing repayment obligations of the City under the Bureau of Reclamation Contract No. 9–07–60W0384, dated December 19, 1988, toward which amount any payments made by the City to the Secretary on or after June 2, 1998, shall be credited.

(b) OWNERSHIP.—Title to the Dam and bascule gates shall remain with the United States.

(c) COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In consultation with the City and the State of North Dakota, the Secretary shall reallocate responsibility for the operation and maintenance costs of the Dam and bascule gates.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF BENEFITS.—The reallocation of costs shall reflect the fact that the benefits of the Dam and bascule gates are mainly for flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife purposes.

(d) WATER SERVICE CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may enter into appropriate water service contracts if the City or any other person or entity seeks to use water from the Lake for municipal water supply or other purposes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, in introducing a bill to provide a final settlement on certain debts owned by the City of Dickinson, North Dakota, to the Bureau of Reclamation. The legislation is virtually identical to that introduced during the last Congress.

The Dickinson Dam Bascule Gates Settlement Act will provide long overdue relief to the citizens of Dickinson. Let me briefly explain why the debt liquidation is needed and appropriate. For one thing, the Bureau of Reclamation built a faulty project. The debt was incurred by the City of Dickinson for construction of a dam with gate structures which never worked properly. In addition, the need for the dam to help provide a reliable local water supply was eclipsed by the construction of the Southwest Pipeline, a project of the same Bureau of Reclamation.

The legislation itself is actually quite simple. It would permit the Secretary of the Interior to accept one final payment from the City of Dickinson in place of a series of payments now required by city's current repayment contract.

My colleague has described in some detail the complicated and frustrating story of the dam and bascule gates project. Let me underscore a couple of major points. In 1949 and 1950, the dam was constructed to provide an adequate water supply for the City of Dickinson, as well as some flood control and recreation. The bascule gates were added to augment storage capacity in the reservoir called Patterson Lake. Despite the city's concerns about the use of a gate structure on the dam, which had not previously been used in a northern climate, the gates actually failed in 1982. The ensuing modifications increased the cost of the project.

Another twist in the story is that by 1991 the city no longer needed the Patterson Lake water supply. As noted, it began to receive its water supply from the Southwest Pipeline. This is a major distribution network of the Garrison Diversion Unit, another Bureau of Reclamation project. This system provides

both higher quality and more reliable water supplies than the city's previous supply from Patterson Lake.

Consequently, it makes no sense for the City of Dickinson to have two water supply systems when it needs only one—especially when the first system was a faulty one. The city has already repaid more than $1.2 million for the bascule gates, even though they now provide virtually no benefit to the city.

Last year, I was able to pass an appropriations amendment to provide partial relief for the city's debt. Unfortunately, this provision stalled in the conference committee. The North Dakota delegation also added an amendment for more complete debt relief to a package of water management projects, which did not pass in the last days of 1998 session.

Thus, we need to provide authority for Dickinson to settle its debt, to reallocate costs for operation and maintenance of the bascule gates and Dickinson Dam, and to permit the Secretary of the Interior to enter into appropriate water service contracts with the city for any beneficial use of the water in Patterson Lake. The proposed legislation will address those three objectives while also providing a fair settlement for the Federal Government and the City of Dickinson.

I want to commend my colleague from North Dakota for his leadership and cooperation in developing a sound solution to this problem. In term, I urge my colleagues to consider and pass this needed legislation.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 770. A bill to provide reimbursement under the medicare program for telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE COMPREHENSIVE TELEHEALTH ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to be joined by Senator DASCHLE, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator INOUYE, Senator HARKIN, and Senator MURKOWSKI to introduce legislation to help improve health care delivery in rural and underserved communities throughout America through the use of telecommunications and telehealth technology.

Telehealth encompasses a wide variety of technologies, ranging from the telephone to high-tech equipment that enables a surgeon to perform surgery from thousands of miles away. It includes interactive video equipment, fax machines and computers along with satellites and fiber optics. These technologies can be used to diagnose patients, deliver care, transfer health data, read X-rays, provide consultation and educate health professionals. Telehealth also includes the electronic storage and transmission of personally identifiable health information, such as medical records, test results, and insurance claims.

The promise of telehealth is becoming increasingly apparent. Throughout the country, providers are experimenting with a variety of telehealth approaches in an effort to improve access to quality medical and other health-related services. Those programs are demonstrating that telecommunications technology can alleviate the constraints of time and distance, as well as the cost and inconvenience of transporting patients to medical providers. Many approaches show promising results in reducing health care costs and bringing adequate care to all Americans. For the first time, technological advances and the development of a national information infrastructure give telehealth the potential to overcome barriers to health care services for rural Americans and afford them the access that most Americans take for granted. But it is clear that our nation must do more to integrate telehealth into our overall health care delivery infrastructure.

Because so many rural and underserved communities lack the ability to attract and support a wide variety of health care professionals and services, it is important to find a way to bring the most important medical services into those communities. Telehealth provides an important part of the answer. It helps bring services to remote areas in a quick, cost-effective manner, and can enable patients to avoid traveling long distances in order to receive health care treatment.

We have made progress. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 includes a provision that provides for some Medicare reimbursement of telehealth services. Unfortunately, however, the Health Care Financing Administration interpreted the legislative language too narrowly and severely limited the services that are covered. This bill clarifies the intent of Congress regarding Medicare reimbursement and thereby increases access to these services in underserved areas.

The first element of my proposal clarifies and expands Medicare reimbursement for telehealth. Medicare reimbursement policy is an essential component of helping to integrate telehealth into the health care infrastructure and is particularly important in rural areas, where many hospitals do as much as 80% of their business with Medicare patients. Because the Secretary defined reimbursable services so narrowly in the BBA, this legislation clarifies that all services that are covered under Medicare Part B if you drive to a doctor's office, are covered via telehealth. In particular, it clarifies that the technology called ''store and forward'', which is a cost-effective method of transferring information, is included in this reimbursement policy. Finally, this bill expands coverage from health professional shortage areas, as enacted in 1997, to cover all rural areas.

The second element of this proposal asks the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit a report to the Congress on the status of efforts to ease licensing burdens on practitioners who cross state lines in the course of supplying telehealth services. Currently, consultation by almost any licensed health professional in this situation requires that the practitioner be licensed in both states.

In talking with telehealth providers in my state, and with experts on the Ad Hoc Committee, I have been told repeatedly that this is one of the most significant barriers to developing broad, integrated telehealth systems. More importantly, they tell me states have actively been using licensure to close their borders to innovative telehealth practice. Many states have taken legislative action to ensure that out-of-state practitioners must be fully licensed in their state in order to provide telehealth services, even if they are fully licensed in their own state. During a discussion with a telehealth practitioner from my home state of North Dakota, I was told about a group of telehealth specialists who, among their small group practice, were licensed in more than thirty different states. That means they pay thirty different fees, are responsible for thirty different continuing education requirements, and are overseen by thirty different regulatory bodies. This is a costly and burdensome procedure for many practitioners, but the burden falls particularly heavily on rural practitioners, who face long travel times to acquire continuing education, and who frequently run on lower profit margins than urban practitioners.

While I am not prepared at this time to propose that the federal government get involved with professional licensure, I have asked the Secretary to study the issue and report to Congress yearly on the status of efforts by states and other interested organizations to address this issue. This will allow us to reach out to the states and work together to find solutions to cross-state licensure concerns. As part of this report, I have asked to the Secretary to make recommendations to Congress, if appropriate, about possible federal action to lower the licensure barrier.

A third element of my proposal involves coordination of the Federal telehealth effort. The Department of Health and Human Services has created an informal interagency task force that is examining our federal agency telehealth efforts. This group reported on Federal activities related to telehealth and provided a thorough examination of many of the important issues in telehealth.

My bill attempts to use that task force to inventory Federal activity on

telehealth and related technology, determine what applications have been found successful, and recommend an overall Federal policy approach to telehealth. Many departments and agencies of the Federal government are engaged in telehealth activity, including the Veterans Administration, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Office for the Advancement of Telehealth, and many others. The more these agencies work together to coordinate the Federal effort and consolidate Federal resources, the more effective the Federal government will be in contributing to telehealth in a positive way. I believe this is especially important in light of the GAO report calling for an expanded role for this group and more coordination of telehealth issues across the Federal agencies. The efforts of this group, along with the ongoing activities of the Congressional Ad Hoc Steering Committee, will provide a renewed focus for telehealth across the Federal government. Such coordination will also help protect the American taxpayer from unnecessary duplication of effort.

The fourth part of my proposal helps communities build home-grown telehealth networks. It attempts both to build a telehealth infrastructure and foster rural economic development and incorporates many of the most important lessons learned from other grant projects and studies on telehealth from across the Federal government.

Clearly, the scarcity of resources in many rural communities requires that the coordination and use of those resources be maximized. My bill encourages cooperation by various local entities in an effort to help build sustainable telehealth programs in rural communities. It plants seed money to encourage health care providers to join with other segments of the community to jointly use telecommunications resources. Using a unique loan forgiveness program, it rewards telehealth systems that supply appropriate, high-quality care while reducing overall health care costs.

Most importantly, it does not create a system where various technological approaches are imposed upon communities. Rather it enables potential grantees to determine user-friendly approaches that work best for them. This home-grown approach to developing user-friendly telehealth systems, as well as the preference for coordinating resources within communities, will help ensure the long-term viability of such programs after the grant expires.

Mr. President, my proposal continues our national efforts to integrate telecommunications technology into the rapidly evolving health care delivery system. I am very encouraged by the positive feedback I have received from telehealth networks across the country. I have continued to work with telehealth networks and representatives to strengthen this proposal. As a result, I have made several changes in the bill that I believe will make this a stronger proposal. But, as with any complex issue, I understand that some may prefer different approaches. I would like to continue to encourage all interested parties to come forward with creative solutions to these important issues. It is my hope that telehealth legislation can be included in the comprehensive rural health care legislation in this Congress so we can continue to improve access to needed health care services for rural and underserved populations.

By Mr. ROBB:

S. 771. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the memorialization at the columbarium at Arlington National Cemetery of veterans who have donated their remains to science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, late last summer, a Virginian contacted my office to request my intervention in a matter which had brought considerable anguish and frustration to her family.

She informed me that her father, a decorated veteran of World War II and a career civil servant, had recently passed away. Before his death, however, he made two simple requests: one, that his body be donated to science, and two, that his ashes be placed in the Arlington National Cemetery. His widow, now 72, honored the first of those wishes. But in honoring the first request, she found out that the second was precluded.

The family learned that, due to various legal concerns, ashes of organ donors who donate their bodies to science are not returned to the families of the donors. Unfortunately, due to the regulations governing Arlington National Cemetery, veterans cannot be memorialized in the Columbarium unless their remains are actually inurned there. Oddly, it so happens that if his spouse had predeceased him, her remains would already have been inurned in a niche at Arlington, awaiting his remains.

While I can appreciate that limited space at Arlington has necessitated adherence to strict guidelines for burial and memorialization, I cannot see the virtue in denying appropriate recognition for an entitled veteran simply because he has donated his remains to science. In fact, I would like to encourage more veterans to do just that.

All of us recognize the great need for viable remains for both transplantation and for medical study. Veterans who make this courageous commitment should be suitably recognized and their loved ones should know that a grateful nation has made a place for them at one of our country's most sacred memorials.

With that said, I submit this bill which seeks to modify current regulations to allow otherwise qualified veterans, who have donated their remains to science, to be memorialized at the Columbarium in Arlington National Cemetery, notwithstanding the absence of their cremated remains.

Mr. President, I salute these veterans and their devoted families, and 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. 771

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

SECTION 1. MEMORIALIZATION AT COLUMBARIUM AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY OF VETERANS WHO HAVE DONATED THEIR REMAINS TO SCIENCE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MEMORIALIZE.—(1) Chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2412. Arlington National Cemetery: memorialization at columbarium of veterans who have donated their remains to science

"The Secretary of the Army may honor, by marker or other appropriate means at the columbarium at Arlington National Cemetery, the memory of any veteran eligible for inurnment in the columbarium whose cremated remains cannot be inurned in the columbarium as a result of the donation of the veteran's organs or remains for medical or scientific purposes.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of that chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

"2412. Arlington National Cemetery: memorialization at columbarium of veterans who have donated their remains to science.".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2412 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to veterans who die on or after January 1, 1996.

By Mr. ROBB:

S. 772. A bill to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the computations of certain civil service retirement system annuities based on part-time service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM ANNUITIES CLARIFICATION

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will correct current calculations of federal retirement annuities that unfairly penalizes federal civil servants who switch to part-time service at the end of their careers.

The Congress included provisions in the 1986 Civil Service amendments contained in the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act that reformed the part-time service calculations for retirement, so that part-time workers would not receive the same annuities as full-time workers. I believe that was a fair and equitable reform. However, after receiving a letter from

one of my fellow Virginians, L. David Jones, it is clear that there have been errors in the interpretation of the provision.

Mr. Jones worked for the Naval Research Lab until his retirement in February, 1995. He worked there full-time for 30 years and part-time for five years after his 30 years of full-time service. He elected part-time service at the end of his career to not only to ease into retirement, but to help his colleagues better manage an increased workload. But because of the misinterpretation of the provision, he would have been better off retiring at the end of his 30 years. Instead of being praised for his additional service, his situation now serves as a cautionary tale for others who wish to transition into retirement and help their colleagues: if you switch to part-time service after a long career as a full-time worker, your annuities will be reduced. Clearly, that is not the intent of the provision.

Mr. Jones and his wife sought judicial remedies to no avail. He and his family simply want his annuity calculated accurately. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

Mr. President, by passing this legislation we will ensure that federal retirees like Mr. Jones and others are not unjustly penalized for working part-time at the end of their careers. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Government Affairs Committee to ensure its consideration and favorable recommendation as quickly as possible.

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. 772

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

SECTION 1. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM ANNUITY COMPUTATIONS BASED ON PART-TIME SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) In the administration of paragraph (1)—

''(A) subparagraph (A) of such paragraph shall apply to any service performed on a part-time basis before, on, or after April 7, 1986;

''(B) subparagraph (B) of such paragraph shall apply to all service performed on a part-time or full-time basis on or after April 7, 1986; 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.''.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amendment made under subsection (a) shall apply to the computation of any annuity with a date of commencement on or after April 7, 1986.

(2) ANNUITY PAYMENTS.—The computation of an annuity based on the amendment made under subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to annuity payments made on or after the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the active business definition relating to distributions of stock and securities of controlled corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE SECTION 355(B)(2)

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise today to again introduce a bill that would make a technical change in the Internal Revenue Code. We often talk about the need to simplify the Tax Code. The change I propose today would do that.

This change is small but very important. It would not alter the substance of current law in any way. It would, however, greatly simplify a common corporate transaction. This small technical change will alone save corporations millions of dollars in unnecessary expenses and economic costs that are incurred when they divide their businesses.

The Treasury Department agrees that there is a technical problem with the drafting of the Tax Code and has agreed to work with me on this proposal. In fact, the President included a similar provision to correct this problem in his budget. I am introducing today the same bill I introduced during the last session of Congress, but expect to work with Treasury to perfect the language and make sure that corporations are not further hampered by this problem.

Corporations, and affiliated groups of corporations, often find it advantageous, or even necessary, to separate two or more businesses. The division of AT&T from its local telephone companies is an example of such a transaction. The reasons for these corporate divisions are many, but probably chief among them is the ability of management to focus on one core business.

At the end of the day, when a corporation divides, the stockholders simply have the stock of two corporations, instead of one. The Tax Code recognizes this is not an event that should trigger tax, as it includes corporate divisions among the tax-free reorganization provisions.

One requirement the Tax Code imposes on corporate divisions is very awkwardly drafted, however. As a result, an affiliated group of corporations that wishes to divide must often engage in complex and burdensome preliminary reorganizations in order to accomplish what, for a single corporate entity, would be a rather simple and straightforward spinoff of a business to its shareholders. The small technical change I propose today would eliminate the need for these unnecessary transactions, while keeping the statute true to Congress's original purpose.

More specifically, section 355 (and related provisions of the Code) permits a corporation or an affiliated group of corporations to divide on a tax-free basis into two or more separate entities with separate businesses. There are numerous requirements for tax-free treatment of a corporate division, or ''spinoff,'' including continuity of historical shareholder interest, continuity of the business enterprises, business purpose, and absence of any device to distribute earnings and profits. In addition, section 355 requires that each of the divided corporate entities be engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business. The proposed change would alter none of these substantive requirements of the Code.

Section 355(b)(2)(A) currently provides an attribution or ''lookthrough'' rule for groups of corporations that operate active businesses under a holding company, which is necessary because a holding company, by definition, is not itself engaged in an active business. This lookthrough rule inexplicably requires, however, that ''substantially all'' of the assets of the holding company consist of stock of active controlled subsidiaries. The practical effect of this language is to prevent holding companies from engaging in spinoffs if they own almost any other assets. This is in sharp contrast to corporations that operate businesses directly, which can own substantial assets unrelated to the business and still engage in tax-free spinoff transactions.

In the real world, of course, holding companies may, for many sound business reasons, hold other assets, such as non-controlling (less than 80 percent) interests in subsidiaries, controlled subsidiaries that have been owned for less than five years (which are not considered ''active businesses'' under section 355), or a host of nonbusiness assets. Such holding companies routinely undertake spinoff transactions, but because of the awkward language used in section 355(b)(2)(A), they must first undertake one or more (often a series of) preliminary reorganizations solely for the purpose of complying with this inexplicable language of the Code.

Such preliminary reorganizations are at best costly, burdensome, and without any business purpose, and at worst, they seriously interfere with business operations. In a few cases, they may be so costly as to be prohibitive, and cause the company to abandon an otherwise sound business transaction that is clearly in the best interest of the corporation and the businesses it operates.

There is no tax policy reason, tax advisors agree, to require the reorganization of a consolidated group that is clearly engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business, as a condition to a spinoff. Nor is there any reason to treat affiliated groups differently than single operating companies. Indeed, no

one has ever suggested one. The legislative history indicates Congress was concerned about non-controlled subsidiaries, which is elsewhere adequately addressed, not consolidated groups.

For many purposes, the Tax Code treats affiliated groups as a single corporation. Therefore, the simple remedy I am proposing today for the problem created by the awkward language of section 355(b)(2)(A) is to apply the active business test to an affiliated group as if it were a single entity.

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. 773

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

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF ACTIVE BUSINESS DEFINITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 355(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining active conduct of a trade or business) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of subparagraph (A), all corporations that are members of the same affiliated group (as defined in section 1504(a)) shall be treated as a single corporation.''

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions or transfer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 774. 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 Finance.

BUSINESS MEAL DEDUCTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a very important bill for small businesses in Louisiana and throughout our country that I also introduced during the 105th Congress. My bill would restore the 80 percent deduction for business meals and entertainment expenses, thus eliminating a tax burden that has seriously hampered many small businesses in our country.

Small business is a powerful economic engine, both nationwide and in Louisiana. Small businesses have helped to create the prosperity that we have all enjoyed in the last few years. They are leaders in the innovation and technology development that will sustain our economy in the 21st century. Nationwide, small business employs 53 percent of the private work force, contributes 47 percent of all sales in the country, and is responsible for 50 percent of the private gross domestic product.

For these reasons, I believe the tax code should encourage, not discourage, small business development and growth. For the more than 225,000 self-employed and for the thousands of small businesses in Louisiana, business meals and entertainment take the place of advertising, marketing, and conference meetings. These expenses are a core business development cost. As such, a large percentage of these costs should be deductible.

For many years, businesses were allowed to deduct 100 percent of business meals and entertainment expenses. In 1987, this deduction was reduced to 80 percent. The deduction was further reduced in 1994 to 50 percent because of the misconception that these meals were ''three martini lunches.''

Contrary to this perception, studies show that the primary beneficiary of the business meal deduction is not the wealthy business person. Studies indicate that over two-thirds of the business meal spenders have incomes of less than $60,000 and 37 percent have incomes below $40,000. Low to moderately priced restaurants are the most popular types for business meals, with the average check equaling less than $20. In addition, 50 percent of most business meals occur in small towns and rural areas.

In 1995, just one year after the deduction was reduced to 50 percent, the White House Conference on Small Business established the restoration of the deduction as one of its top priorities for boosting small business. In Louisiana alone, it is expected that the positive economic impact of this proposal could exceed $67 million in industries, such as the travel and restaurant industry, that employ over 120,000 people. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

S. 775. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a feasibility study for applying airport bubbles as a method of identifying, assessing, and reducing the adverse environmental impacts of airport ground and flight operations and improving the overall quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT AIRPORT POLLUTION ACT

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Right To Know About Airport Pollution Act, and ask that my remarks be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place. This important legislation will allow the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in conjunction with the FAA, to conduct a nationwide study of air, water, solid waste and noise pollution generated by airports across the U.S. every day. In addition, the bill will direct the EPA to determine whether current air emission standards are sufficient to protect the environment, and will require airports to be listed under Community Right To Know laws governing the use of hazardous materials.

Many of my colleagues and I hear everyday from constituents who are concerned by the pollution, including noise pollution, created by airports in our states. In 1996, a Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) report confirmed that US airports rival smokestack industries in the amount of pollution they release into the environment. This growing problem affects every state in our nation and millions of our constituents. You do not have to be from a state with a large airport to understand that pollution associated with these facilities severely affects the health and impacts the quality of life of our constituents.

While we must recognize that airport expansion is an inevitable by-product of a vibrant economy, and that the government has a responsibility to foster economic growth and jobs, we also have an equal responsibility to mitigate the hazardous affects of pollution and noise on our constituents. The studies produced as a result of this legislation will give us a better idea as to the magnitude of the pollution problem caused by airports, and will allow us to prepare a commensurate response.

Again, I would like to thank my colleagues who have demonstrated interest in this issue and look forward to the passage of this important legislation.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

S. 777. A bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to streamline the process our farmers follow when filing paper work with the Department of Agriculture (USDA). Currently, when farmers are required to fill out USDA paper work, they are required to travel to their local USDA county offices, complete the paper work, wait in long lines and file these documents in paper form. This process is very inefficient and time consuming.

The bill that I introduce today simply requires USDA to develop a system for farmers to access and file this paper work over the internet. This legislation entitled the ''Freedom to E-file Act'' simply makes good common sense. As our society has become more technologically advanced so have our farmers. In fact, a 1998 Novartis survey found that over 72 percent of all farmers with 500 acres or more had personal computers. Overall, over fifty percent of all farmers surveyed had computers.

Our agriculturalists use computers not only for financial management and

market information but for sophisticated precision agriculture management systems. These sophisticated small business owners could easily file necessary farm program paperwork from their homes and offices if only this option was available.

Farmers are often frustrated with the long lines at county USDA offices, especially during their most hectic times such as harvest season. Our nation's farmers are clearly overburdened by government-required paperwork. This bill is the first step in the right direction toward regulatory reform for our U.S. food producers.

This legislation is budget neutral and USDA would implement the bill using existing funds. I want to recognize and commend my colleague, Congressman RAY LAHOOD, for championing the companion to this bill in the House of Representatives. This bill should enjoy bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this bill important to our nation's farmers.

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. 777

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 ''Freedom to E-File Act''.

SEC. 2. ELECTRONIC FILING AND RETRIEVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department of Agriculture and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information.

(b) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to Congress on the progress made toward implementing subsection (a).

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 779. A bill to provide that no Federal income tax shall be imposed on amounts received by Holocaust victims or their heirs; to the Committee on Finance.

HOLOCAUST ERA ASSETS TAX EXCLUSION ACT OF 1999

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Holocaust Era Assets Tax Exclusion Act of 1999, along with my colleagues Senators MOYNIHAN and SCHUMER. Mr. President, survivors of the Holocaust who had assets withheld from them by Swiss banks or others have finally received justice in the form of a settlement between the banks and the survivor's attorneys in August 1998. The settlement was for $1.25 billion for survivors worldwide. This settlement will finally return the assets to survivors more than fifty years after they first entrusted them to the banks.

In addition to these recipients, there are survivors who are needy and have received one-time payments from the Swiss Humanitarian Fund established by the Swiss government. In both cases, any payment from the Swiss banks or other similar sources like this, should be excluded from taxation because they are receiving back what was rightfully theirs to begin with. The sum total of payments coming to the needy Holocaust survivors in the United States from this fund is $31.4 million.

Moreover, funds are being established by banks and corporations in France, Austria, Italy, and Germany to compensate claimants for wrongfully held bank deposits, insurance policies, slave labor, and other losses.

Survivors who have sued banks, insurance companies, and manufacturers which profited from slave labor during the Holocaust, did so because there was no other way for them to seek justice. Deprived of their assets, or those of their families for over fifty years, survivors fought unsuccessfully until now to receive what belonged to them.

With the average age of Holocaust survivors at 80, there is little time for debate over these payments which will ease life for the survivors in their final years. To tax them for the long overdue receipt of assets would be wrong and immoral. What these survivors will receive from the various funds will be money that is rightfully theirs in the first place.

The survivors of man's greatest inhumanity to man deserve justice. After escaping death at the hands of the Nazis, they were again victimized by European bankers and insurers. Those who endured the tortures of slave labor have never been compensated for their servitude to the Nazis. Now that they have received some measure of justice, let us not make them wait any longer for what is rightfully theirs.

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. 779

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

SECTION 1. NO FEDERAL INCOME TAX ON AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY HOLOCAUST VICTIMS OR THEIR HEIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, gross income shall not include any amount received by an individual (or any heir of the individual)—

(1) from the Swiss Humanitarian Fund established by the Government of Switzerland or from any similar fund established by any foreign country, or

(2) as a result of the settlement of the action entitled ''In re Holocaust Victims' Asset Litigation'', (E.D. NY), C.A. No. 96–4849, or as a result of any similar action.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to any amount received before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators FITZGERALD, MOYNIHAN, and SCHUMER in introducing this important legislation, which would prevent the federal government from taxing away any monies obtained by Holocaust survivors or their families in a settlement related to thefts by the Nazis or their sympathizers.

The horrors of the Nazi regime and its atrocities remain very much with us. Many people in America and around the world, particularly Jews, must live every day with memories of atrocities suffered or witnessed, either by themselves or by those they love, during the Nazi terror. Ghettoes, death camps and simple murder were the stuff of daily life for millions of innocent people during this terrible time of Nazi power.

Only recently has public attention been properly directed toward another great crime of the Nazi regime and those who cooperated with it: A 1998 study by the Institute of the World Jewish Congress estimates that between $90 billion and $140 billion in today's dollars was stolen from the Jewish populations of countries occupied by the Nazis. In addition to committing outright theft and looting, the Nazis seized liquid assets that could be converted easily into cash, such as insurance policy proceeds and bank accounts. Documents discovered by Risk International Services, Inc., an insurance archaeology firm, show that the Nazis specifically targeted insurance policies held by Jews as a source of funding for their expansionist, totalitarian regime.

Some insurance companies also specifically (and illegally) targeted Jewish families. Knowing that Jewish policy holders soon would be taken to concentration camps, these firms sold specifically tailored policies, taking as much cash as possible up front, with no intention of honoring their obligations.

After the war, Holocaust survivors attempted to collect on their policies, access their bank accounts and/or reclaim assets that had been illegally seized. Unfortunately, governments, banks and insurance companies failed to fulfill their duty to treat Holocaust victims with justice and dignity. Instead, Mr. President, they refused to honor policies or return stolen assets. In this way they compounded crime with crime and denied people who already had suffered more than most of us could bear the rightful means by which to rebuild their lives.

Finally, after over 50 years of injustice, Holocaust survivors and their families are reclaiming what is rightfully theirs. But, even as we support these efforts to reclaim stolen property, I believe we must do our part in

protecting the proceeds. Under current law, any money received by Holocaust survivors in their settlements with banks and other organizations that once cooperated with the Nazis would be treated as gross income for federal tax purposes.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that victims of the Holocaust have suffered far too much for any such taxation to be just. These settlements represent but a fraction of what is owed to those who suffered under Nazi tyranny. To treat them as income subject to taxation would be wrong.

This is why this legislation is so important. It will prevent the federal government from taxing away any monies obtained by Holocaust survivors or their families in a settlement related to thefts by the Nazis or their sympathizers. It will prevent yet another injustice from being done to those who survived the brutal Nazi regime. It will also keep our nation firmly on the side of justice.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 781. A bill to amend section 2511 of title 18, United States Code, to revise the consent exception to the prohibition on the interception of oral, wire, or electronic communications that is applicable to telephone communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY ACT OF 1999

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today the ''Telephone Privacy Act of 1999.'' This legislation would prohibit the recording of a telephone call unless all the parties on the call have given their consent.

I am introducing this bill because our nation's telephone privacy laws are confused and in conflict. We need a national law governing telephone privacy so that telephone users have a uniform standard to rely on.

Currently, thirty-seven states require only the consent of one party to record a phone call. Fifteen states require the consent of all parties to be taped. This jumbled collection of telephone privacy laws leaves most consumers confused about their rights to protect their phone calls from surreptitious taping.

Today, consumers who seek to block surreptitious taping of their phone calls face an incredible burden. The problem is especially acute during interstate calls because the legality of surreptitiously recording a phone call depends on the state where the call is recorded. Thus, when a party makes an interstate call, one's rights may depend on the laws governing taping in other states.

The recent well-publicized taping of Monica Lewinsky's phone conversations by Linda Tripp illustrates this problem. Maryland, where Linda Tripp recorded the conversations, is a state that requires the consent of all parties. However, Washington D.C., where Monica Lewinsky lived at the time, requires only one-party consent. Two people living within a half-hours drive from each other should have the same laws apply to them.

In practice, any person who wants to protect herself against surreptitious recording must know the telephone privacy laws of other states. Our laws cannot reasonably expect a consumer to have this knowledge. People who make lots of interstate calls might be forced into the position of knowing the telephone privacy laws of all 50 states.

Not only will the Telephone Privacy Act of 1999 promote uniformity of laws, it will also create a standard that better protects privacy. The Telephone Privacy Act would require an all-party consent standard for taping phone calls no matter where one lived in the United States. It would end the practice of one-party consent that exists under Federal law and in a number of states.

While surreptitious taping has legitimate uses, such as lawful surveillance by the police, our laws should not reward the practice of surreptitious taping. This practice violates individual privacy and offends common decency.

Phone calls remain one of the few avenues of communication where people still feel safe enough to have intimate conversations. We should protect this expectation of privacy. If a telephone user intends to tape a phone call, the other party on the line ought to be informed.

Moreover, the one-party consent standard is an anachronism. It is inconsistent with other more privacy-respecting provisions of our communication laws. Federal law makes it a felony, for example, for a third party to tap or record a telephone conversation between others. It is also a felony to surreptitiously tape a cellular telephone call.

The bill has been carefully drafted so that it does not affect the rights of law enforcement officials to tape or monitor conversations as they are carrying out their duties.

Nor does it affect the practice of businesses taping customer calls, as long as the customer is notified at the outset that the call is being taped. It also does not affect the right of people to surreptitiously tape threatening or harassing phone calls.

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. 781

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 ''Telephone Privacy Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF CONSENT EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON INTERCEPTION OF ORAL, WIRE, OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS APPLICABLE TO TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS.

Paragraph (d) of section 2511(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''unless such communication'' and all that follows and inserting ''unless—

''(i) such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortious act in violation of the Constutition or laws of the United States or of any State; or

''(ii) in the case of a telephone communication, any other party to such communication has not given prior consent to such interception.''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 782. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the exception to the prohibition on the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications to require a health insurance issuer, health plan, or health care provider obtain an enrollee's or patient's consent to their interception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATIENTS' TELEPHONE PRIVACY ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill to protect the medical privacy rights of patients when they talk to their health care insurers or providers. The bill requires health care insurers and providers to obtain patients' ''express consent'' before tape-recording or monitoring conversations.

Today, the health insurance industry routinely tape-records and monitors incoming telephone calls of patients with questions about their health insurance coverage. This bill halts that common practice with two simple rules.

First, health insurance companies and health care providers must obtain the patient's ''express consent'' before tape-recording or monitoring a conversation. Second, health insurance companies and health care providers must give patients the option not to be tape-recorded or monitored.

The bill puts control of medical privacy back where it belongs—in the hands of patients who have no choice but to share personal information with their health insurance and health care providers.

The bill protects all patients—

Whether covered by private or public health plans,

Whether covered by group, individual, or self-insured health plans,

Whether covered by Medicare or Medicaid,

Whether covered by Federal health plans, or

Whether covered by the Children's Health Insurance Plan.

Let me emphasize again who would be subject to the bill—the health insurance and health care industry—a huge industry that necessarily affects all of us. First, the bill would cover communications between patients and health

insurers. Second, the bill would cover communications between patients and ''health care providers,'' which includes physicians and other health care professionals.

Federal law now requires that only one party must consent to the tape-recording or monitoring of a telephone conversation. In California, state law provides that all parties must consent before a telephone conversation may be tape-recorded. Nearly a dozen other states have adopted similar two-party consent laws. They include Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

Even two-party consent laws, however, do not adequately address this problem. Health insurance companies tape-record or monitor patients' calls based on the patient's implied consent. Implied consent arises from the patient talking after hearing the health insurer's recording that the call may be tape-recorded or monitored. In this case, courts have held that consent is given implicitly.

Consequently, merely changing federal law to a two-party consent rule would not solve the problem. The key requirement must be that the health insurer or health care provider obtains the patient's express consent. Only this change will protect individuals when they call their health insurance provider with questions about their health care coverage. When my office contacted the top 100 health insurance providers in this country, we learned from nearly all who responded that they routinely monitor or tape-record calls received from patients.

Let me share with my colleagues some responses that we received. Kaiser Permanente operates in nineteen states and the District of Columbia, and provides care to more than nine million members. Their practice varies from state to state, depending on applicable state laws.

Kaiser Permanente may: Monitor randomly selected calls, in which case it may, or may not, notify patients in advance; or tape-record all or randomly selected calls, in which case it may, or may not, notify patients in advance.

United HealthCare wrote to me that they did not believe that tape-recording or monitoring calls even presents a privacy issue. Their rationale was that they only randomly tape-record calls and only after advising the caller that they may record the call.

Great-West responded that a patient has the option of communicating in writing if the patient does not want a telephone call to be tape-recorded. Let me say simply—that is not good enough for me. Imagine the undue burden the task of writing a letter may place on elderly or seriously ill patients.

Despite the two-party consent rule in California, New York Life Care Health Plans, Inc., asserted that no violation of California law occurs without a ''confidential communication.'' Under California state law, the definition of a ''confidential communication'' does not include communications where the parties may expect that the may be recorded. New York Life asserted that, since they told patients that their calls could be monitored, their calls were not confidential calls.

New York Life's display of legal bootstrapping shows little, if any, regard for medical privacy rights. Their interpretation of the word ''confidential'' turns its commonly understood meaning on its head! In the minds of most people, what could be more confidential than matters about one's personal health problems? Surely little, if anything. How many of my colleagues in the Senate would say that communications about their health problems with health insurance or health care providers are not confidential?

Blue Cross Blue Shield of the National Capital Area does not give patients any notice that their calls may be monitored. Their Associate General Counsel responded that, in both Maryland and the District of Columbia, telephone communications in the normal course of business do not meet the definition of an ''interception.'' Thus, consent is not required. Although Virginia law considers a telephone to be an ''intercepting device,'' Virginia follows the one-party consent rule.

Finger Lakes Blue Cross Blue Shield randomly tape-records calls from patients and only now is setting up a front-end recording to inform patients of that practice. New York requires only one party to consent.

None of the health insurance providers who responded to my office gave me a valid reason for tape-recording or monitoring patients' calls. The standard response from health insurers was that they tape-record or monitor patients' calls for so-called ''quality control,'' an ambiguous term at best. Indeed, no one explained what that term means, how tape-recording calls benefits patients, or why tape-recording calls was necessary.

Of course, health insurance providers are not the only business entities that tape-record telephone conversations. How many of us realize that when we call for airline tickets, bank account information, mutual fund transfers, or any myriad of other daily concerns, the other party on the telephone line will be tape-recording the conversation? Yet, personal health information is far more personal in nature and, accordingly, entitled to greater protection. It stands alone as uniquely different from other commercial transactions.

This bill does not attempt to change the consent rule for other business entities. It would apply only to health insurance and health care providers. Most patients today have almost no choice about their health insurer provider or, increasingly, about their health care provider. In turn, the health insurer may give the patient no option except to submit to tape-recording the conversation. An elderly, or seriously ill patient, is simply not going to object.

Admittedly, much disclosure of medical information occurs both with patient consent and for valid medical reasons. For instance, insurance companies receive information from physicians based upon a written consent form signed by the patient at the physician's request. Yet, increasingly, threats to medical health privacy have become less visible and, in that sense, more alarming. Many individuals are left with a false sense of privacy. The potential for misuse of personal health information is real and growing.

A fundamental right to medical privacy is embedded in American society. Most Americans presume that telephone conversations about their health problems are confidential. Sadly, they are wrong.

Conversations with our health insurance and health care providers often contain deeply personal information, including prescription drugs, psychiatric care, alcohol dependency—the list goes on and on. Surely they deserve protection. Traditionally, Americans have relied upon a confidential relationship with their doctors.

Let's restore at least some measure of protection to telephone conversations about our personal health problems. This bill allows health insurance and health care providers to continue their routine practice of tape-recording or monitoring patients' calls—but only with the patient's express consent.

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. 782

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 ''Patients' Telephone Privacy Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF EXCEPTION TO PROHIBITION ON INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) MODIFICATION.—Section 2511(2)(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''It shall not be unlawful'' and inserting ''(i) Subject to clause (ii), it shall not be unlawful''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii)(I) With respect to a wire, oral, or electronic communication between a health insurance issuer or health plan and an enrollee of such health insurance issuer or health plan, or between a health care provider and a patient, it shall not be unlawful under this chapter for a health insurance issuer, health plan, or health care provider to intercept such communication only if the patient has given prior express consent to such interception.

''(II) In this paragraph—

''(A) the term 'health insurance issuer' has the meaning given that term in section 733 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b);

''(B) the term 'health plan' means a group health plan, as defined in section 733 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b), an individual or self-insured health plan, the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), the medicaid program under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), the State children's health insurance program under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.), the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services under chapter 55 of title 10, and a health plan offered under chapter 89 of title 5; and

''(C) the term 'health care provider' means a physician or other health care professional.''.

(b) RECORDING AND MONITORING OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH HEALTH INSURERS.—

(1) COMMUNICATION WITHOUT RECORDING OR MONITORING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a health insurance issuer, health plan, or health care provider that notifies any customer of its intent to record or monitor any communication with such customer shall provide the customer the option to conduct the communication without being recorded or monitored by the health insurance issuer, health plan, or health care provider.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means a physician or other health care professional.

(B) HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER.—The term ''health insurance issuer'' has the meaning given that term in section 733 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b).

(C) HEALTH PLAN.—The term ''health plan'' means—

(i) a group health plan, as defined in section 733 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b);

(ii) an individual or self-insured health plan;

(iii) the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(iv) the medicaid program under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.);

(v) the State children's health insurance program under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.);

(vi) the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code; and

(vii) a health plan offered under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 783. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JAMES GUELFF BODY ARMOR ACT OF 1999

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999.

Currently, Federal law does not limit access to body armor for individuals with even the grimmest history of criminal violence. However, it is unquestionable that criminals with violent intentions are more dangerous when they are wearing body armor.

Many will recall the violent and horrific shootout in North Hollywood, California, just two years ago. In that incident, two suspects wearing body armor and armed to the teeth, terrorized a community. Police officers on the scene had to borrow rifles from a nearby gunshop to counteract the firepower and protective equipment of these suspects.

Another tragic incident involves San Francisco Police Officer James Guelff, for whom this act is named. On November 13, Officer Guelff responded to a distress call. Upon reaching the crime scene, he was fired upon by a heavily armed suspect who was shielded by a kevlar vest and bulletproof helmet. Officer Guelff died in the ensuing gunfight.

Lee Guelff, James Gueff's brother, recently wrote a letter to me about the need to revise the laws relating to body armor. He wrote:

> It's bad enough when officers have to face gunmen in possession of superior firepower . . . But to have to confront suspects shielded by equal or better defensive protection as well goes beyond the bounds of acceptable risk for officers and citizens alike. No officer should have to face the same set of deadly circumstances again.

I couldn't agree with Lee more. Our laws need to recognize that body armor in the possession of a criminal is an offensive weapon. We need to make sure that our police officers on the streets are adequately supplied with body armor, and that hardened-criminals are deterred from using body armor.

The James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999 has three key provisions to achieve these goals. First, it increases the penalties criminals receive if they commit a crime wearing body armor. Specifically, a violation will lead to an increase of two levels under the Federal sentencing guidelines. Second, it makes it unlawful for violent felons to purchase, use, or possess body armor. Third, this bill enables Federal law enforcement agencies to directly donate surplus body armor to local police.

I will address each of these three provisions.

Enhancing criminal penalties for individuals who wear body armor during the commission of a crime: Criminals who wear body armor during the commission of a crime should face enhanced penalties because they pose an enhanced threat to police and civilians alike. Assailants shielded by body armor can shoot at the police and civilians with less fear than individuals not so well protected.

In the North Hollywood shoot-out, for example, the gunmen were able to hold dozens of officers at bay because of their body armor. This provision will deter the criminal use of body armor, and thus deter the escalation of violence in our communities

Making it unlawful for violent felons to wear body armor: This bill makes it a crime for individuals with a violent criminal record to wear body armor. It is unconscionable that criminals can obtain and wear body armor without restriction when so many of our police lack comparable protection.

The bill recognizes that there may be exceptional circumstances where an individual with a brutal history legitimately needs body armor to protect himself or herself. Therefore, it provides a mechanism for violent felons to obtain specific permission from the Secretary of the Treasury to wear body armor.

This provision has already been codified into law in California. Several other states are also actively considering legislation to restrict violent felons access to body armor.

California police applied the law for the first time earlier this year. Police arrested an individual for wearing body armor who had a violent criminal record. Besides a conviction for second-degree assault in 1993, the suspect is independently facing charges for threatening to kill his ex-girlfriend. He also is facing trial for issuing death threats against security guards at a West Hollywood Nightclub.

Direct donation of body armor: The James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999 speeds up the procedures by which Federal agencies can donate surplus body armor to local police.

It is disturbing that so many of our local police officers do not have access to bullet-proof vests. The United States Department of Justice estimates that 25% of State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers, approximately 150,000 officers, are not issued body armor.

Getting our officers more body armor will save lives. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, greater than 30% of the 1,182 officers killed by guns in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved by body armor, and the risk of dying from gunfire is 14 times higher for an officer without a bulletproof vest.

Last year, Congress made some inroads into this shortage of body armor by enacting the ''Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998.'' This act established a $25 million annual fund to help local and State police purchase body armor. The James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999 will provide a further boost to the body armor resources of local and State police departments.

This legislation has attracted the support of a broad cross-section of the law enforcement community. The Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Troopers Coalition, the International Association of Police Chiefs,

the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Brother of Police Officers, and the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives, have all endorsed the legislation.

Richard J. Gallo, President of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association notes:

In the past, FLEOA members have confronted individuals, with prior criminal convictions, wearing body armor and violently resisting arrest. Federal, state and local law enforcement officers, and the public, deserve protection from this, and at the very least, will now know theses felons will receive enhanced sentences for using body armor during the commission of a criminal act.

Robert Stewart, Executive Director of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, writes:

There is a societal obligation to assure the men and women in blue are afforded all the protection they need to maintain public order. Very real fiscal constraints can, however, compromise the ability of local governments to accomplish that critical goal. Hence, NOBLE heartily endorses the James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999.

I look forward to working with my fellow Senators from both sides of the aisle in turning this bill into law.

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. 783

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 ''James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) nationally, police officers and ordinary citizens are facing increased danger as criminals use more deadly weaponry, body armor, and other sophisticated assault gear;

(2) crime at the local level is exacerbated by the interstate movement of body armor and other assault gear;

(3) there is a traffic in body armor moving in or otherwise affecting interstate commerce, and existing Federal controls over such traffic do not adequately enable the States to control this traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power;

(4) recent incidents, such as the murder of San Francisco Police Officer James Guelff by an assailant wearing 2 layers of body armor and a 1997 bank shoot out in north Hollywood, California, between police and 2 heavily armed suspects outfitted in body armor, demonstrate the serious threat to community safety posed by criminals who wear body armor during the commission of a violent crime;

(5) of the approximately 1,200 officers killed in the line of duty since 1980, more than 30 percent could have been saved by body armor, and the risk of dying from gunfire is 14 times higher for an officer without a bulletproof vest;

(6) the Department of Justice has estimated that 25 percent of State and local police are not issued body armor;

(7) the Federal Government is well-equipped to grant local police departments access to body armor that is no longer needed by Federal agencies; and

(8) Congress has the power, under the interstate commerce clause and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to enact legislation to regulate interstate commerce that affects the integrity and safety of our communities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BODY ARMOR.—The term ''body armor'' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES WITH RESPECT TO BODY ARMOR.

(a) SENTENCING ENHANCEMENT.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide an appropriate sentencing enhancement, increasing the offense level not less than 2 levels, for any offense in which the defendant used body armor.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—No amendment made to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines pursuant to this section shall apply if the Federal offense in which the body armor is used constitutes a violation of, attempted violation of, or conspiracy to violate the civil rights of any person by a law enforcement officer acting under color of the authority of such law enforcement officer.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION OF PURCHASE, USE, OR POSSESSION OF BODY ARMOR BY VIOLENT FELONS.

(a) DEFINITION OF BODY ARMOR.—Section 921 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(35) The term 'body armor' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall be unlawful for a person to purchase, own, or possess body armor, if that person has been convicted of a felony that is—

''(1) a crime of violence (as defined in section 16); or

''(2) an offense under State law that would constitute a crime of violence if it occurred within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—

''(1) APPLICATION.—A person who is subject to the prohibition of subsection (a) whose employment, livelihood, or safety is dependent on the ability to possess and use body armor, may file a petition with the Secretary for an exception to the prohibition of subsection (a).

''(2) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—Upon receipt of a petition under paragraph (1), the Secretary may reduce or eliminate the prohibition of subsection (a), impose conditions on reduction or elimination of the prohibition, or otherwise grant relief from the prohibition, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, based on a determination that the petitioner—

''(A) is likely to use body armor in a safe and lawful manner; and

''(B) has a reasonable need for such protection under the circumstances.

''(3) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (2) with respect to a petitioner, the Secretary shall consider—

''(A) any continued employment of the petitioner;

''(B) the interests of justice;

''(C) any relevant evidence; and

''(D) the totality of the circumstances.

''(4) CERTIFIED COPY OF PERMISSION.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of granting any exception to a petitioner under this subsection, that the petitioner agree to maintain on his or her person a certified copy of the Secretary's permission to possess and use body armor, including any conditions or limitations.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to—

''(A) require the Secretary to grant relief to any particular petitioner; or

''(B) imply that any relief granted by the Secretary under this subsection relieves any other person from any liability that may otherwise be imposed.

''(c) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of a law enforcement agency who enforces the prohibition specified in subsection (a) against a person who has been granted relief pursuant to subsection (b), shall be immune from any liability for false arrest arising from the enforcement of this section unless the person has in his or her possession a certified copy of the permission granting the person relief from the prohibition, as required by subsection (b)(4).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The immunity from liability described in paragraph (1) shall not relieve any person or entity from any other liability that may otherwise be imposed.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons.''.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) Whoever knowingly violates section 931 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.''.

SEC. 6. DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS BODY ARMOR TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''Federal agency'' and ''surplus property'' have the meanings given such terms under section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472).

(b) DONATION OF BODY ARMOR.—Notwithstanding section 203 of the Federal Property

and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484), the head of a Federal agency may donate body armor directly to any State or local law enforcement agency, if such body armor is—

(1) in serviceable condition; and

(2) surplus property.

(c) NOTICE TO ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of a Federal agency who donates body armor under this section shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a written notice identifying the amount of body armor donated and each State or local law enforcement agency that received the body armor.

(d) DONATION BY CERTAIN OFFICERS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of Justice, in addition to any other officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(B) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(C) The Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(D) The Director of the United States Marshals Service.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of the Treasury, in addition to any other officer of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

(B) The Commissioner of Customs.

(C) The Director of the United States Secret Service.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. FRIST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KERRY, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 784 A bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE CANCER CLINICAL TRIALS COVERAGE ACT

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be introducing the ''Medicare Cancer Clinical Trials Coverage Act of 1999'' with my colleague from Florida, Senator MACK. This legislation would establish a demonstration project to assure Medicare beneficiaries with cancer that Medicare will cover their routine patient costs when part of a clinical trial.

I would like to thank Senator MACK for his leadership and dedication on this issue. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator MACK, a tireless champion for cancer patients throughout his years of service in the Senate.

With 1,500 deaths due to cancer each day and 1.3 million new cancer diagnoses this year, there is a clear and urgent need for this legislation. Our senior population is especially at risk—Medicare beneficiaries make up half of all cancer diagnoses and 60% of all cancer deaths. Yet, Medicare's policy toward covering quality cancer care is ambiguous and its enforcement practices are unpredictable.

Our legislation represents a significant step forward in the fight to prevent, detect and treat cancer quickly and effectively. It is based on a very simple premise: given the disproportionate impact that cancer has on older Americans, Medicare should be responsible for the routine patient care costs associated with approved clinical trials.

Cancer clinical trials often represent a cancer patient's best hope for survival, especially when their cancer fails to respond to traditional therapies. Yet, under current law, Medicare beneficiaries can be denied coverage for the routine patient care costs associated with clinical trials. However, if the same care is provided outside of a clinical trial setting, it is covered by Medicare.

It is a tragedy that the costs of participating in a clinical trial are discouraging patients from using what might be their best weapon in a battle with cancer. Medicare beneficiaries who are cancer patients are left with only two choices: pay the costs out of their own pocket, or forgo treatment all together. It is unfair, and unconscionable, that we force cancer patient to make this decision.

There are other compelling reasons to cover these costs. By paying for these routine costs, we provide incentives for researchers to include more Medicare beneficiaries in cancer clinical trials. Researchers know that patients who are at different stages physically, mentally, and emotionally will react very differently to treatments—even if they are fighting the same cancer. But what they don't know is how age and health interact with the safety and effectiveness of new drugs and treatments. Our bill helps them find the answers to those critical questions.

Our bill saves money in the long-run by ensuring the Medicare program pays for treatments that work. Clinical studies can determine which interventions work the best, and when they are the most effective.

Finally, in establishing a demonstration project, this bill will also provide valuable information about the costs and benefits of providing coverage for clinical trials for other life-threatening diseases. We started with cancer first because cancer is a major affliction of Medicare beneficiaries. In addition there is a well-established national clinical cancer trial system to deliver this patient care.

Mr. President, our legislation does not create a new benefit. It merely ensures that patients enrolled in clinical studies receive Medicare coverage for the same type of routine patient care costs, such as hospital and physician fees, that would be covered outside of a trial setting. We are not asking Medicare to pay for the cost of research. These expenses will still be covered by trial sponsors, including pharmaceutical companies.

The ''Medicare Cancer Clinical Trials Coverage Act'' is a modest proposal, but it has the potential to become a new weapon in the fight against cancer. But we must act now. We have fought for this proposal in previous sessions of Congress, and I believe the momentum is building to get the legislation passed this year. I look forward to working with Senator MACK and others to take an important step forward for cancer patients.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 784

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 ''Medicare Cancer Clinical Trial Coverage Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE CANCER PATIENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall establish a demonstration project that provides for payment under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) of routine patient care costs—

(1) that are provided to an individual diagnosed with cancer and enrolled in the medicare program under such title as part of the individual's participation in an approved clinical trial program; and

(2) that are not otherwise eligible for payment under such title for individuals who are entitled to benefits under such title.

(b) APPLICATION.—The beneficiary cost-sharing provisions under the medicare program, such as deductibles, coinsurance, and copayment amounts, shall apply to any individual participating in a demonstration project conducted under this Act.

(c) APPROVED CLINICAL TRIAL PROGRAM.—For purposes of this Act, the term ''approved clinical trial program'' means a clinical trial program that is approved by—

(1) the National Institutes of Health;

(2) a National Institutes of Health cooperative group or a National Institutes of Health center;

(3) the Food and Drug Administration (in the form of an investigational new drug or device exemption);

(4) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(5) the Department of Defense; or

(6) a qualified nongovernmental research entity identified in the guidelines issued by the National Institutes of Health for center support grants.

(d) ROUTINE PATIENT CARE COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this Act, ''routine patient care costs'' shall include the costs associated with the provision of items and services that—

(A) would otherwise be covered under the medicare program if such items and services were not provided in connection with an approved clinical trial program; and

(B) are furnished according to the design of an approved clinical trial program.

(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this Act, ''routine patient care costs'' shall not include the costs associated with the provision of—

(A) an investigational drug or device, unless the Secretary has authorized the manufacturer of such drug or device to charge for such drug or device; or

(B) any item or service supplied without charge by the sponsor of the approved clinical trial program.

SEC. 3. STUDY, REPORT, AND TERMINATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall study the impact on the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act of covering routine patient care costs for individuals with a diagnosis of cancer and other diagnoses, who are entitled to benefits under such title and who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than January 1, 2004, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that contains a statement regarding—

(1) any incremental cost to the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act resulting from the provisions of this Act; and

(2) a projection of expenditures under the medicare program if coverage of routine patient care costs in an approved clinical trial program were extended to individuals entitled to benefits under the medicare program who have a diagnosis other than cancer.

(c) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this Act shall not apply after December 31, 2004.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with my colleagues, Senators ROCKEFELLER and MACK to introduce legislation that will provide Medicare patients who are battling cancer with coverage of their health care costs when they participate in approved clinical trials. For patients suffering from life-threatening illness such as cancer, the opportunity to participate in clinical trials often offers them their best hope for access to the latest and most advanced treatment modalities.

Medicare currently does not pay the costs of patient care associated with clinical trials because they are experimental therapies. Our bill proposes that we begin a demonstration project through Medicare—the nation's largest third party payor—to provide coverage of routine patient costs associated with approved cancer clinical trials. It is a demonstration program because there has been much debate over the costs associated with clinical trials and a clear need exists to gather better cost data. Unfortunately, dispute still exists over how to distinguish between routine patient costs and those associated with the trial. The full impact on health care costs is not yet known.

Thus our bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct this demonstration project to study the feasibility of covering patient costs for beneficiaries diagnosed with cancer and enrolled in clinical trials approved by the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Defense, and the Department of Veteran Affairs. The Secretary is required to report to Congress concerning the incremental costs attributed to the trial and the advisability of covering other diseases. Once Congress has these data in hand, we will be able to make the determination to enact legislation to make the coverage of routine care costs in clinical trials a permanent part of the Medicare program.

We have spent many years debating this bill and urging the Administration to begin this demonstration project. As a research investigator involved in clinical trials, as a thoracic cancer surgeon, and as co-director of the Thoracic Oncology Clinic at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, I know first-hand the critical importance of clinical trials in determining the very best therapies in our battles against cancer. Only through participation in clinical trials can we advance quality care for patients with cancer.

Since I have come to the United States Senate, I have urged my colleagues to make federal funding for both basic and clinical research a national priority by doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health over the next five years. Last year we witnessed an historic increase of $2 billion that brought us closer to this goal. But we cannot stop there. If we do not capitalize on this investment by further supporting our clinical research infrastructure and the conduct of clinical trials, we will not reap the full benefits of our investment.

Clinical trials are scientific studies that allow us to investigate how new medicines and clinical treatments work in patients. Patients should recognize that clinical trials are by their nature investigational and therefore are not a magic bullet or without risk. Patients should be fully informed of the potential benefits and, equally important, the potential risks of participating in a clinical investigation. With this in mind, patients should be given the opportunity to participate in clinical investigations which may allow them to receive cutting-edge treatments that may improve their chances of survival. Clinical investigations advance our scientific knowledge and help bring about medical innovations to find better treatments for patients.

We must continue to foster both public and private efforts to support clinical trials. I believe our foremost federal responsibility is to address access to clinical trials in our publicly-financed programs such as Medicare. We must first determine the criteria the Medicare program will use to evaluate which clinical trials are eligible for coverage and which costs will be covered. This has not been an easy task.

We have also been reviewing the proposal to require private health plans and insurers to cover routine costs associated with standard patient care while participating in a clinical trial. The Senate Health and Education Committee, on which I serve, had an informative debate last month on the issue of clinical trials coverage during our consideration of S. 326, ''The Patients' Bill of Rights.'' The amendment we were considering went beyond the Medicare demonstration project by requiring private sector health plans to cover costs associated with clinical trials for patients with any life-threatening or serious illness. Several members of our committee, including myself, expressed concern that before mandating such broad requirements on the private sector, we should first determine what costs would be incurred. In a time of rising health care costs, we must be cautious in our efforts to provide patient protections that do not drive up costs further or we will not be serving patients well.

Therefore, I offered an amendment to have a comprehensive study conducted by the Institute of Medicine to assess patient access to clinical trials and the coverage of routine patient care costs by private health plans and insurers. Our efforts should not end there. That is just the beginning. I am encouraged by recent collaborative efforts between the National Institutes of Health and the American Association of Health Plans to increase participation of patients in clinical trials and to encourage health plans to cover routine patient costs. We need to monitor this effort closely and explore other ways to promote public-private collaboration and to gather the necessary data that will reveal the true impact on health care costs. I will continue to pursue this effort in a systematic way with my colleagues.

We must not wait any longer to launch the Medicare demonstration project that our bill today addresses. The longer we wait, the longer patients are denied access to potentially life-saving therapies and the longer it will take for new therapies to become standard therapy. And we must continue to address the issue of clinical trial coverage by the private sector to bring about patients' access to new clinical therapies while being mindful of the costs we are imposing. Patients and their families deserve that we give thoughtful consideration to both of these legislative proposals this year.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. LOTT):

S. 786. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies, subject to a reduction of 50 percent if the recipient dies

during the first 15 days of such month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to me, very important to my constituents in Maryland and very important to the people of the United States of America.

For the third Congress in a row, I am joining in a bipartisan effort with my friend and colleague, Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, to end an unfair policy of the Social Security System.

Senator SNOWE and I are introducing the Social Security Family Protection Act. This bill addresses retirement security and family security. We want the middle class of this Nation to know that we are going to give help to those who practice self-help.

What is it I am talking about? We have found that Social Security does not pay benefits for the last month of life. If a Social Security retiree dies on the 18th of the month or even on the 30th of the month, the surviving spouse or family members must send back the Social Security check for that month.

I think that is a harsh and heartless rule. That individual worked for Social Security benefits, earned those benefits, and paid into the Social Security trust fund. The system should allow the surviving spouse or the estate of the family to use that Social Security check for the last month of life.

This legislation has an urgency, Mr. President. When a loved one dies, there are expenses that the family must take care of. People have called my office in tears. Very often it is a son or a daughter that is grieving the death of a parent. They are clearing up the paperwork for their mom or dad, and there is the Social Security check. And they say, ''Senator, the check says for the month of May. Mom died on May 28. Why do we have to send the Social Security check back? We have bills to pay. We have utility coverage that we need to wrap up, mom's rent, or her mortgage, or health expenses. Why is Social Security telling me, 'Send the check back or we're going to come and get you'?''

With all the problems in our country today, we ought to be going after drug dealers and tax dodgers, not honest people who have paid into Social Security, and not the surviving spouse or the family who have been left with the bills for the last month of their loved one's life. They are absolutely right when they call me and say that Social Security was supposed to be there for them.

That is what our bill is going to do. That is why Senator SNOWE and I are introducing the Family Social Security Protection Act. When we talk about retirement security, the most important part of that is income security. And the safety net for most Americans is Social Security.

We know that as Senators we have to make sure that Social Security remains solvent, and we are working to do that. We also don't want to create an undue administrative burden at the Social Security Administration—a burden that might affect today's retirees. But it is absolutely crucial that we provide a Social Security check for the last month of life.

How do we propose to do that? We have a very simple, straightforward way of dealing with this problem. Our legislation says that if you die before the 15th of the month, you will get a check for half the month. If you die after the 15th of the month, your surviving spouse or the family estate would get a check for the full month.

We think this bill is fundamentally fair. Senator SNOWE and I are old-fashioned in our belief in family values. We believe you honor your father and your mother. We believe that it is not only a good religious and moral principle, but it is good public policy as well.

The way to honor your father and mother is to have a strong Social Security System and to make sure the system is fair in every way. That means fair for the retiree and fair for the spouse and family. That is why we support making sure that the surviving spouse or family can keep the Social Security check for the last month of life.

Mr. President, we urge our colleagues to join us in this effort and support the Social Security Family Protection Act.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. ENZI and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 788. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide that a quality grade label issued by the Secretary of Agriculture may not be used for imported meat and meat food products; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

USDA GRADE RESCISSION ACT OF 1999

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to sponsor a bill on an issue of great importance to my state and the agricultural industry. The issue is that of rescinding the USDA Grade Stamp on foreign meat products coming into America from other countries and unfairly receiving the USDA Grade Stamp.

This language offered today will insure that all meat products imported from a foreign country will not be graded USDA. For years other countries have used the USDA Grade Stamp to their advantage. Particularly, Canada and Mexico ship livestock into the United States and reap the benefits of the premium given for USDA Prime, USDA Choice or USDA Select.

USDA Prime and USDA Choice grades are given a premium price. Competition from foreign countries effectively prevents that same number of American livestock producers from receiving a premium. USDA should mean just that the meat was raised and slaughtered in the United States, and given the stamp by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Currently, boxed beef is not eligible to receive the USDA Grade Stamp. However, agricultural producers across the border ship livestock to the United States and feed them for a short period of time in order to bypass that restriction. The animals are then slaughtered here as United States product. This is not only unfair, it is a betrayal of trust. It is one that we will no longer tolerate. My bill provides for a 90 day feeding period to prevent this from happening, yet maintain the profits light-weight cattle from foreign countries bring to American feeders.

The huge influx of imports from both Canada and Mexico that American agricultural producers are currently faced with has provided an added hardship to the agricultural economy. Additionally, when consumers see the USDA Grade Stamp on a meat product they are under the assumption they are buying U.S. made product. In fact, this is usually not the case. Even though carcasses are required to have a ''foreign origin marking'', it is trimmed off for marketing purposes.

Essentially, this bill will protect both the American producer and the American consumer. The USDA Grade Stamp on foreign product is a detriment to both. It is a detriment to the producer because foreign countries get the benefit of the grade stamp, without having to pay for it. America's producers need the assurance that the USDA label really means just that—produced in the U.S. It is a detriment to the consumer because they deserve to know that they are buying American. I've said it before and I'll say it again. U.S. consumers deserve to know that they are buying absolutely the safest food supply in the world, which is grown by American farmers and ranchers. With this in mind we then should be informing the American consumer that they really are purchasing American product.

I am proud and very pleased to serve as sponsor of this bill and I look forward to moving it through the legislative process so we may give our consumers and producers the information and advantage of knowing their meat was produced in the USA.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 789. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of special compensation to certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE SPECIAL PAY FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIRED VETERANS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to authorize special compensation for severely

disabled military retirees who suffer under an existing law regarding ''concurrent receipt.'' As many of my colleagues know, current law requires military retirees who are rated as disabled to offset their military retired pay by the amount they receive in veterans' disability compensation. This requirement is discriminatory and wrong.

Today, America's disabled military retirees—those individuals who dedicated their careers to military service, and who suffered disabling injuries in the course of that service—cannot receive concurrently their military retirement pay, which they have earned through at least 20 years of service in the Armed Forces, and their veterans' disability compensation, which they are owed due to pain and suffering incurred from military service. In other words, the law penalizes the very men and women who have sacrificed their physical or psychological well-being in uniformed service to their country.

The legislation I am introducing today does not provide for full payment to eligible veterans of both the disability compensation and the retired pay they have earned. I regret that such a proposal, which I support in principle, would be far more expensive than many of my colleagues could accept. I learned that lesson the hard way in the course of sponsoring more ambitious concurrent receipt proposals in previous Congresses.

My current legislation would instead authorize special compensation for the most severely disabled retired veterans—those who have served for at least 20 years, and who have disability ratings of between 70 and 100 percent. More specifically, it would authorize monthly payments of $300 for totally disabled retired veterans; $200 for retirees rated as 90 percent disabled; and $100 for retirees with disability ratings of 70–80 percent.

These men and women suffer from disabilities that have kept them from pursuing second careers. If we cannot muster the votes to provide them with their disability pay and retired pay concurrently, the least we can do is authorize a modest special compensation package to demonstrate that we have not forgotten their sacrifices. At $42 million per year, this legislation comes nowhere near approaching the price tag of more expansive concurrent receipt proposals. Moreover, it involves only discretionary, not mandatory, spending.

In short, it is affordable. And it is the right thing to do. But don't take my word for it. The Military Coalition, an organization of 30 prominent veterans' and retirees' advocacy groups, supports my legislation, as do many other veterans' service organizations, including the American Legion and Disabled American Veterans. These highly respected organizations recognize, as I do, that severely disabled military retirees deserve, at a minimum, special compensation for the honorable service they have rendered the United States.

My interest in actively resolving the concurrent receipt issue dates to 1993, when I included a provision in the Fiscal Year 1994 Defense Authorization bill directing the Department of Defense (DoD) to submit a concurrent receipt legislative proposal to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. When that deadline was not met, I took the opportunity at a Senate Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee hearing to ask the then-Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Manpower and Personnel Policy about the status of the concurrent receipt report. Although he replied that Congress would receive it in June 1993, the report arrived seven months late. Clearly, the concurrent receipt issue was not then a DoD priority, nor is it today.

I also worked with the Armed Services Committee to include legislation in the FY 1994 Defense Authorization bill to exempt military retirees who are rated as 100 percent disabled from the requirement to offset their military pay by the amount they receive in veterans' disability pay. Although I had assumed that no one could deny a military retiree with 100 percent disability from receiving both his retirement and his disability pay, my legislation was never enacted into law.

Undeterred, in 1994 I introduced legislation, which was included in the Senate version of the Defense Appropriations bill for FY 1995, directing the Secretary of Defense to authorize the concurrent payment of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation. Although my amendment had 16 cosponsors and received bipartisan support in the Senate, it was regrettably reduced to just a study by the House of Representatives during conference negotiations on the bill.

This amendment was heralded by more than 30 separate veterans' associations as a means of redressing the unjust offset of retirement pay with disability compensation. It provided for concurrent payment of retirement and disability compensation if the following criteria were met:

(1) the veteran had completed 20 years of military service;

(2) the disability was incurred or aggravated in the performance of duty in military service; and

(3) the disability was rated as 100 percent at the time of retirement or within four years of the veteran's retirement date.

I introduced these concurrent receipt amendments because the existing requirement that military retired pay be offset dollar-for-dollar by veterans' disability compensation is inequitable. I firmly believe that non-disability military retired pay is post-service compensation for services rendered in the United States military. Veterans' disability pay, on the other hand, is compensation for a physical or mental disability incurred from the performance of such service. In my view, the two pays are for very different purposes: one for service rendered and the other for physical or mental ''pain and suffering.'' This is an important distinction evident to any military retiree currently forced to offset his retirement pay with disability compensation.

Concurrent receipt is, at its core, a fairness issue, and present law simply discriminates against career military people. Retired veterans are the only group of federal retirees who are required to waive their retirement pay in order to receive VA disability. This inequity needs to be corrected.

In the 105th Congress, I was proud to have co-sponsored S. 657, a bill sponsored by Senator DASCHLE that would eliminate the offset on a graduated scale based on the inverse of the retiree's disability rating. For instance, a veteran who is 90 percent disabled would have to offset his retirement pay by an amount equal to 10 percent of his total VA disability. This compromise would establish the right of a disabled military retiree to receive at least a portion of his earned military retirement. Unfortunately, the full Congress did not act on this legislation before adjourning in October 1998.

In the past, Congressional attempts to rectify discrimination against disabled career service members have been accompanied by staggering cost estimates, dooming to failure again and again proposed remedies to the concurrent receipt dilemma. The concurrent receipt legislation I supported in the 105th Congress reflected an attempt to ease the offset burden on retired disabled service members while avoiding significant deficit expansion. My current legislation in the 106th Congress is even more conscious of the costs associated with properly compensating disabled military retirees.

Unfortunately, cost concerns must remain a consideration as we seek to promote a system of concurrent receipt that is both equitable and consistent with our balanced budget objective. While I would prefer to implement a system aimed first and foremost at severely disabled veterans, as my earlier legislation proposed, I believe S. 657 represented a step in the right direction and was worthy of Congress' support. Similarly, I believe the special compensation authorized by my current legislation makes progress by targeting the most severely disabled veterans, even if it does not revoke the discriminatory concurrent receipt restrictions that remain in place today.

I continue to hope that the Pentagon, once it finally understands our

message that it cannot continue to unfairly penalize disabled military retirees, will provide Congress with a fair and equitable plan to properly compensate retired service members with disabilities. It is hard to disagree with the simple logic that disabled veterans both need and deserve our full support after the untold sacrifices they made in defense of this country.

I look forward to the day when our disabled retirees are no longer unduly penalized by existing limitations on concurrent receipt of the benefits they deserve. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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. 789

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED UNIFORMED SERVICES RETIREES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—(1) Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1413. Special compensation for certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary concerned shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, pay to each eligible disabled uniformed services retiree a monthly amount determined under subsection (b).

''(b) AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid to an eligible disabled uniformed services retiree in accordance with subsection (a) is the following:

''(1) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as total, $300.

''(2) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as 90 percent, $200.

''(3) For any month for which the retiree has a qualifying service-connected disability rated as 80 percent or 70 percent, $100.

''(c) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—An eligible disabled uniformed services retiree referred to in subsection (a) is a member of the uniformed services in a retired status (other than a member who is retired under chapter 61 of this title) who—

''(1) completed at least 20 years of service in the uniformed services that are creditable for purposes of computing the amount of retired pay to which the member is entitled; and

''(2) has a qualifying service-connected disability.

''(d) QUALIFYING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'qualifying service-connected disability' means a service-connected disability that—

''(1) was incurred or aggravated in the performance of duty as a member of a uniformed service, as determined by the Secretary concerned; and

''(2) is rated as not less than 70 percent disabling—

''(A) by the Secretary concerned as of the date on which the member is retired from the uniformed services; or

''(B) by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs within four years following the date on which the member is retired from the uniformed services.

''(e) STATUS OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under this section are not retired pay.

''(f) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Payments under this section for any fiscal year shall be paid out of funds appropriated for pay and allowances payable by the Secretary concerned for that fiscal year.

''(g) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'service-connected' has the meaning give that term in section 101 of title 38.

''(2) The term 'disability rated as total' means—

''(A) a disability that is rated as total under the standard schedule of rating disabilities in use by the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

''(B) a disability for which the scheduled rating is less than total but for which a rating of total is assigned by reason of inability of the disabled person concerned to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation as a result of service-connected disabilities.

''(3) The term 'retired pay' includes retainer pay, emergency officers' retirement pay, and naval pension.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1413. Special compensation for certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1413 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1999, and shall apply to months that begin on or after that date. No benefit may be paid to any person by reason of that section for any period before that date.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 790. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of bottled water to submit annual reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE BOTTLED WATER SAFETY AND RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am introducing today the Bottled Water Safety and Right-to-Know Act of 1999. This legislation is designed to ensure that bottled water safety standards protect public health, and to give consumers the right to know about contaminants in their bottled water.

Mr. President, I have been interested in bottled water for several years. Bottled water consumption has doubled in the U.S. since 1987, largely due to the public perception that bottled water is cleaner and safer than tap water. This is especially true in my state, where we hear so often about contamination of tap water. Unfortunately, bottled water today does not have to meet all the same safety standards met by tap water. Nor do consumers have the right to know about the contaminats found in bottled water. Let me discuss each of these issues in more detail.

There is an important disparity between contaminant standards for bottled water and those for tap water. Bottled water is regulated as a food by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, while tap water is regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Unfortunately, several contaminants are regulated less stringently in bottled water by the FDA than in tap water by the EPA. In particular, the FDA has no standard for phthalate, a probable human carcinogen which leaches out of some plastic bottles, no ban on fecal coliform of E. Coli, and weaker standards for several other contaminants. In addition, the infrastructure guaranteeing the safety of bottled water is far weaker than the regulatory programs the EPA and its state and local partners have established for tap water.

There is, in addition, a disparity in the transparency of information about the two types of water. Public water systems have long been required to monitor contaminant levels and allow no more than a maximum amount of contamination in their water. Facing only these regulatory requirements, however, water companies had little incentive to provide more than the minimum-required level of drinking water protection. The Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 changed that by adding consumer Right-to-Know requirements to the existing regulatory programs. The purpose of the Right to Know requirements is to increase public understanding of drinking water threats, foster public demand for prevention of those threats, and thereby lead water companies and state and local agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements in preventing the threats.

Unfortunately, no equivalent Right to Know exists for bottled water. Customers have no way to know whether the bottled product—hundreds of times more expensive than what comes out of the tap—is the safer, cleaner product. In other words, Mr. President, bottled water is the snake oil of the 1990's—it is sold as a cleaner product purely on the basis of claims and perception, not facts.

The Bottled Water Safety and Right-to-Know Act of 1999 would correct these deficiencies, establishing contaminant standards and Right-to-Know requirements for bottled water at least as stringent as those placed on tap water.

First, the bill would give the FDA two years to make all standards for contaminants in bottled water as protective of public health as the tap water standards established by the EPA, the State of California, the World Health Organization, and the European Union. If the FDA failed to implement this requirement, the bill would transfer regulatory authority over bottled water to the EPA.

Second, the bill would require that bottled water companies list, on their products' labels, the concentration of any regulated contaminant found at levels high enough to cause adverse

health effects, and of any other contaminants whose presence in tap water would be disclosed to the public under federal law. Bottled water without contamination would require no such contaminant labelling. In addition, labels would name the source of the water, the type of treatment applied, and whether the treatment meets the EPA's criteria of full protection of immuno-compromised individuals from Cryptosporidium and other microbial pathogens.

Finally, the bill would require bottled water companies to send the FDA information on the contaminants in the water, the source of the water, and type of treatment applied. The FDA would then make the reported information, information on the recent inspection and enforcement history of the relevant bottled water facilities, and other background information available to the public through the Internet and in paper form through a 1–800 number, both of which would be printed on bottle labels.

Mr. President, bottled water consumers have the right to bottled water that is as safe as tap water, and they have the right to know about the contaminants in their bottled water.

I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor this legislation, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 790

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 ''Bottled Water Safety and Right to Know Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORTS.

Section 410 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 349) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) The Secretary shall—

''(A) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph identify contaminants for which—

''(i) the Administrator has established a national primary drinking water regulation under section 1412 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g–1) and the Secretary has not established a standard of quality regulation for such contaminant or has established a standard of quality regulation or monitoring requirement that may be less protective of public health than the national primary drinking water regulation; or

''(ii) the Secretary has established a standard of quality regulation for such contaminant that may be less protective of public health than the standard for such a contaminant issued by the World Health Organization, the European Union, or the State of California; and

''(B) not later than 12 months after that date of enactment, propose an interim standard of quality regulation, for each contaminant identified under subparagraph (A), that contains a standard or monitoring requirement that is at least as protective of public health as the more protective of—

''(i) the national primary drinking water regulation described in subparagraph (A); or

''(ii) a standard issued by the World Health Organization, European Union, or the State of California; and

''(C) not later than 24 months after that date of enactment, issue a final regulation of the standard described in subparagraph (B), for each identified contaminant.

''(6) The Secretary is authorized to award grants to the States for the enforcement of the regulations described in paragraph (5).

''(7)(A) Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall publish final regulations as described in paragraph (5) in the Federal Register.

''(B) If the Secretary fails to publish the regulations described in subparagraph (A), then—

''(i) all functions that the Secretary of Health and Human Services exercised before the effective date of this subparagraph (including all related functions of any officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services) relating to inspections and enforcement concerning bottled water shall be transferred to the Environmental Protection Agency;

''(ii) all references to the Secretary in paragraph (5), notwithstanding the references in clause (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), and all references in paragraph (6) and subsections (c), (d), and (e) shall instead be to the Administrator;

''(iii) except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, the assets, liabilities, grants, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, used, held, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with the functions transferred under clause (i), subject to section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, shall be transferred to the Environmental Protection Agency, and unexpended funds transferred pursuant to this subparagraph shall be used only for the purposes for which the funds were originally authorized and appropriated;

''(iv) all orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, licenses, registrations, privileges, and other administrative actions—

''(I) that have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective by the President, any Federal agency or official of a Federal agency, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in the performance of functions that are transferred under this subparagraph; and

''(II) that were in effect before the effective date of this subparagraph, or were final before the effective date of this subparagraph and are to become effective on or after the effective date of this subparagraph;

shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by the President, the Administrator or other authorized official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law;

''(v) this subparagraph shall not affect any proceedings, including notices of proposed rulemaking, or any application for any license, permit, certificate, or financial assistance pending before the Secretary on the effective date of this subparagraph, with respect to functions transferred by this subparagraph;

''(vi) such proceedings and applications described in clause (v) shall be continued and orders shall be issued in such proceedings and appeals taken from the orders, and payments shall be made pursuant to the orders, as if this subparagraph had not been enacted, and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or revoked by a duly authorized official, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law;

''(vii) nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prohibit the discontinuance or modification of any such proceeding described in clause (v) under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such proceeding could have been discontinued or modified if this subparagraph had not been enacted;

''(viii) this subparagraph shall not affect suits commenced before the effective date of this subparagraph, and in all such suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this subparagraph had not been enacted;

''(ix) no suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against the Secretary, or by or against any individual in the official capacity of such individual as an officer of the Secretary, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this subparagraph;

''(x) any administrative action relating to the preparation or promulgation of a regulation by the Secretary relating to a function transferred under this subparagraph may be continued by the Administrator with the same effect as if this subparagraph had not been enacted; and

''(xi) a reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to—

''(I) the Secretary with regard to functions transferred under this subparagraph, shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator; and

''(II) the Department of Health and Human Services with regard to functions transferred under this subparagraph, shall be deemed to refer to the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(C) As used in subparagraph (B), the term 'Federal agency' has the meaning given the term 'agency' by section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue regulations that require each manufacturer of bottled water to submit reports and display information as required under paragraph (2).

''(2) The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall require that each manufacturer of bottled water shall—

''(A) not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, prepare and submit in electronic form, on a form provided by the Secretary, an annual report to the Secretary that describes, at a minimum—

''(i) the source of the water purveyed;

''(ii) the type of treatment to which the water has been subjected and whether such treatment meets the Secretary's criteria for full protection of immuno-compromised individuals from cryptosporidium and other microbial pathogens;

''(iii) the amount and range of any regulated contaminant detected in the water during the reporting year, the maximum contaminant level goal for the contaminant, if any, and whether the goal was exceeded during the reporting year; and

''(iv) the amount and range of any unregulated contaminant detected in the water during the reporting year that is subject to unregulated contaminant monitoring or notification requirements under sections 1445 or 1414, respectively, of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-4; 300g-3), or that the Secretary determines may present a threat to public health; and

''(B) for the second and each subsequent reporting year, display on the labels of the bottled water—

''(i) if the maximum contaminant level goal or lowest health advisory level under the Safe Drinking Water Act (whichever is lower) for a regulated contaminant is exceeded during the preceding reporting year—

''(I) the amount and range of the regulated contaminant in the bottled water;

''(II) the maximum contaminant level goal for the contaminant; and

''(III) a plain definition of 'maximum contaminant level goal' as determined by the Administrator;

''(ii) the amount and range of any unregulated contaminant detected in the water during the preceding reporting year that is subject to unregulated contaminant monitoring or notification requirements under sections 1445 or 1414, respectively, of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-4; 300g-3) or that the Secretary has determined may present a threat to public health;

''(iii) the source of the water;

''(iv) the type of treatment, if any, to which the water has been subjected and whether such treatment meets the Secretary's criteria for full protection of immuno-compromised individuals for cryptosporidium and other mircobial pathogens;

''(v) the address for the Internet website described in paragraph (3)(A); and

''(vi) the toll-free telephone number described in paragraph (3)(B).

''(3) Not later than 6 months after the date on which an annual report referred to in paragraph (2) is submitted to the Secretary, the Secretary shall make the report available to the public—

''(A) on an Internet website maintained by the Secretary; and

''(B) in paper form, in English, Spanish, and in any other language determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, upon request made through use of a toll-free telephone number maintained by the Secretary.

''(4) In addition to submitting an annual report under paragraph (2), the manufacturer may also submit a supplement to the Secretary that contains additional information that the manufacturer determines to be appropriate for public education. The Secretary may make the supplement available to the public in the same manner as the annual report is made available to the public under paragraph (3).

''(5) In the same manner as the annual report is made available to the public under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall make the following information available to the public:

''(A) The definitions of the terms 'maximum contaminant level goal' and 'maximum contaminant level'.

''(B) For any regulated contaminant described in paragraph (2)(A), a statement setting forth—

''(i) the maximum contaminant level goal;

''(ii) the maximum contaminant level; and

''(iii) if a violation of the maximum contaminant level has occurred during the reporting year, the potential health concerns associated with such a violation.

''(C) For any unregulated contaminant described in paragraph (2)(A), a statement describing the health advisory or explaining the reasons for determination by the Secretary that the contaminant may present a threat to public health.

''(D) A statement explaining that the presence of contaminants in bottled drinking water does not necessarily create a health risk.

''(E) The date of the last Federal and State inspections of the bottled water facilities relating to the safety of the water.

''(F) A statement describing any violations discovered at the facilities during the inspections described in subparagraph (E) and any enforcement actions that were taken as a consequence of the violations.

''(G) The date of recall of any bottled water and the reasons for the recall.

''(d) Every manufacturer of bottled water who is subject to any requirement of this section shall maintain such records, make such reports, conduct such monitoring, and provide such information as the Secretary may reasonably require by regulation in order to assist the Secretary in establishing regulations under this section, in determining whether the manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this section, in evaluating the health risks of unregulated contaminants, or in advising the public of such risks.

''(e) Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall make available to the public, in the same manner as the annual report is made available under subsection (c)(3), information regarding violations of bottled water regulations relating to inspections, and any enforcement actions taken in regards to such violations. The Secretary shall establish and administer a grant program to fund the gathering of such information.

''(f) In this section:

''(1) The term 'bottled water' means all water sold in the United States that—

''(A) is intended for human consumption;

''(B) is sealed in bottles or other containers; and

''(C) may be still or carbonated, but has no sweeteners or juices added to the water, except for trace levels of flavorings.

''(2) The term 'contaminant' means any physical, chemical, biological, or radiological substance or matter in water.

''(3) The term 'maximum contaminant level' has the meaning given the term in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f).

''(4) The term 'maximum contaminant level goal' means a goal established by the Administrator under section 1412 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1).

''(5) The term 'regulated contaminant' means a contaminant that is regulated under section 1412 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1).

''(6) The term 'unregulated contaminant' means a contaminant that is not regulated under section 1412 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1).''.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITED ACTS.

Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(aa) The failure by a manufacturer of bottled water to submit an annual report or display the required information on labels of bottled water in accordance with section 410(c).''.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution honoring World War II crewmembers of the USS *Alabama* on the occasion of the 1999 annual reunion of the USS *Alabama* Crewmen's Association; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE SAILORS OF THE BATTLESHIP USS ALABAMA

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a number of American heroes. During World War Two, over 6,300 sailors and Marines were members of the crew of the Battleship USS *Alabama*. The ship and crew were instrumental in the defeat of both Germany and Japan. The crew was credited with the downing of 22 enemy aircraft and was awarded numerous citations and medals including the European-African-Middle Eastern Medal and the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with nine battle stars.

This week, the USS *Alabama* Crewman's Association is holding its annual reunion at Battleship Memorial Park in Mobile, Alabama. I ask the Senate to pass this Joint Resolution which commends and recognizes the gallant crewmen of the USS *Alabama*. To those men I say congratulations and thank you for a job well done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution 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. 18

Whereas the members of the crew of the battleship U.S.S. Alabama (BB–60) during World War II were a courageous group who braved both Arctic chill and Pacific heat to help defend our great country against enemy oppression;

Whereas the U.S.S. Alabama crewed by those men was awarded nine battle stars and shot down 22 enemy aircraft; and

Whereas the U.S.S. Alabama Crewmen's Association is holding its annual reunion on April 15 to 18, 1999: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMMENDATION AND RECOGNITION OF CREWMEN OF THE U.S.S. ALABAMA.

The United States honors the 6,300 persons who were members of the U.S.S. Alabama's crew during World War II, commends and thanks them for their sacrifice and service in the defense of the United States, and recognizes those among them who are assembling April 15 to 18, 1999, as the U.S.S. Alabama Crewmen's Association on the occasion of the association's 1999 annual reunion.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 51

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 51, a bill to reauthorize the Federal programs to

prevent violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 97

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 97, a bill to require the installation and use by schools and libraries of a technology for filtering or blocking material on the Internet on computers with Internet access to be eligible to receive or retain universal service assistance.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 353

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 353, a bill to provide for class action reform, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 414, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension of the credit for producing electricity from wind, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. 472, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide certain medicare beneficiaries with an exemption to the financial limitations imposed on physical, speech-language pathology, and occupational therapy services under part B of the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to amend the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act to ensure the equal right of individuals with disabilities to vote, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 512, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to research on autism.

S. 531

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 531, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

S. 537

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust the exemption amounts used to calculate the individual alternative minimum tax for inflation since 1993.

S. 581

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 581, a bill to protect the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to authorize a Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to expand and clarify the requirements regarding advance directives in order to ensure that an individual's health care decisions are complied with, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the time limitation on benefits for immunosuppressive drugs under the medicare program, to provide continued entitlement for such drugs for certain individuals after medicare benefits end, and to extend certain medicare secondary payer requirements.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

INOUYE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. 706

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 706, a bill to create a National Museum of Women's History Advisory Committee.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 712, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for highway-rail grade crossing safety through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to ensure that Congress and the public have the right to participate in the declaration of national monuments on federal land.

S. 757

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 757, a bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions in order to ensure coordination of United States policy with respect to trade, security, and human rights.

S. 761

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 761, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes.

S. 767

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 767, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 2-month extension for the due date for filing a tax return for any member of a uniformed service on a tour of duty outside the United States for a period which includes the normal due date for such filing.

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 767, supra.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 22, a resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the men and women who have lost their lives serving as law enforcement officers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 29

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 29, a resolution to designate the week of May 2, 1999, as ''National Correctional Officers and Employees Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 33

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 33, a resolution designating May 1999 as ''National Military Appreciation Month.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 34, a resolution designating the week beginning April 30, 1999, as ''National Youth Fitness Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 72

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 72, a resolution designating the month of May in 1999 and 2000 as ''National ALS Awareness Month.''

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—URGING THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO FULLY FUND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION UNDER THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. COVERDELL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 25

Whereas all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

Whereas Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1247 (E. Dist. Pa. 1971), and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (Dist. D. C. 1972), found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the Congress responded to these court decisions by passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (enacted as Public Law 94–142), now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), to ensure a free, appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Federal Government has provided only 9, 11, and 12 percent of the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the last 3 years, respectively;

Whereas the national average cost of educating a special education student ($13,323) is more than twice the national average per pupil cost ($6,140);

Whereas research indicates that children who are effectively taught, including effective instruction aimed at acquiring literacy

skills, and who receive positive early interventions demonstrate academic progress, and are significantly less likely to be referred to special education;

Whereas the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act drain school budgets, jeopardize the quality of education provided by local schools, and place a significant burden on State and local taxpayers;

Whereas if the appropriation for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) exceeds $4,924,672,200 for a fiscal year, the State funding formula will shift from one based solely on the number of children with disabilities in the State to one based on 85 percent of the children ages 3 to 21 living in the State and 15 percent based on children living in poverty in the State, enabling States to undertake good practices for addressing the learning needs of more children in the regular education classroom and reduce over identification of children who may not need to be referred to special education;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has been successful in achieving significant increases in the number of children with disabilities who receive a free, appropriate public education;

Whereas the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education; and

Whereas the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) should, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative; and

(2) should meet the commitment described in paragraph (1) while retaining the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs that increase student achievement.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today, joined by many of my colleagues, I am submitting a Senate concurrent resolution calling for a delay in authorizing or appropriating of funds for new educational initiatives until we fully fund IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. My colleague, Representative GOODLING, is introducing a companion resolution in the House today as well.

In 1975 Congress made a commitment to contribute up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) for each child with a disability being educated by our Nation's schools. We are nowhere close to that target of 40 percent. We are committed to achieving that target, and until we do reach the target, we should refrain from undertaking major new education commitments.

According to the latest estimates from the Department of Education, this school year there are 6.1 million children with disabilities being served by our Nation's schools. States and local communities are spending $72.9 billion of non-federal dollars to educate these children. The federal contribution available to use in this school year is $3.8 billion. That level of funding represents 10.8 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for each child with a disability. That represents a mere $635.83 per child. It's time to deliver on the missing 29.2 percent.

In a letter of March 24, 1999, the National School Boards Association urges us to increase funding for IDEA by $2.1 billion a year for the next ten years. It reports that 38 cents of every new tax dollar is being spent on special education. Local school districts desperately need our help. If IDEA had been fully funded in fiscal year 1999, my State, Vermont, would have received $20 million more than the $5.7 million it will receive this July 1.

By putting our urge to create and fund new initiatives on hold and by focusing on increased funding for IDEA as our first priority, we will be giving relief to school districts, resources to teachers, hope to parents, and opportunities to children with disabilities.

Please join us in cosponsoring this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 252

Mr. DOMENICI proposed an amendment to the motion to instruct conferees proposed by Mr. KENNEDY to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009; as follows:

At the end add the following in the conference report;

(1) amendment #176, offered in the Senate by Senator Roth and Breaux, regarding Medicare reform; and

(2) Section 209 of the Senate-passed resolution, offered in the Budget Committee by Senator Snowe and Wyden, regarding the use of on-budget surpluses for a prescription drug benefit.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a closed hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This hearing is titled: ''Damage to the National Security from Chinese Espionage at DOE Nuclear Weapons Laboratories.''

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in room 219 of the Hart Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

Those who wish further information may write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 1:45 p.m. to conduct an oversight hearing on welfare reform implementation in Indian country. The hearing will be held in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing previously announced has been rescheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing scheduled for Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 2 in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C. has been canceled.

Alternatively, the hearing will take place on Wednesday, April 28, 1999, at 2 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 415, a bill to amend the Arizona Statehood and Enabling Act in order to protect the permanent trust funds of the State of Arizona from erosion due to inflation and modify the basis on which distributions are made from the funds, and S. 607, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Amie Brown or Mike Menge (202) 224–6170.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, in open session, to receive testimony from the unified commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements in review of the fiscal year 2000 Defense Authorization Request and Future Years Defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, at 2:30 p.m., in closed/open session, to review submarine warfare in the 21st century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. on Telco/Broadband.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, April 13, 1999 beginning at 10 a.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 13, 1999 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing on the reductions in force in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, at 2:30 p.m., in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, BUSINESS RIGHTS, AND COMPETITION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 13, 1999 at 10 a.m. in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building, on: ''S. 467, the Antitrust Merger Review Act: Accelerating FCC Review of Mergers.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, in open session, to receive testimony on Department of Defense land withdrawals and environmental programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2000 and the Future Years Defense Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, FEDERALISM AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism and Property Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to hold an executive business meeting during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 13, 1999, at 2 p.m., in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CAL RIPKEN, SR.

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, on March 25, the game of baseball experienced a tremendous loss when former Baltimore Orioles' manager, coach and minor-league player Cal Ripken, Sr., passed away at the age of 63.

Cal Ripken, Sr. was a monumental figure in Baltimore's baseball heritage. For nearly four decades, Cal Sr. was the heart of the Baltimore Orioles' organization. He exemplified everything that is good about baseball and about America—hard work, dedication and integrity. He taught his sons, Cal Ripken, Jr. and Bill Ripken, to play baseball when they were young and inspired in them his own legendary love of our national pastime.

In 1987, Cal Sr. was named manager of the Orioles, and became the first father to manage two sons simultaneously at the major league level. Ripken Sr. retired in 1992, having spent 36 years with the Orioles' organization.

I will never forget going to the ball park, year after year, and seeing the competitive fire Cal Ripken, Sr. brought to the Orioles. He knew how to bring out the best in the players he coached and managed.

Cal Ripken, Sr. will be remembered for what he instilled in his family, in Baltimore and in all of us: work hard, show up every day, and always give it everything you've got. His spirit will live forever in the hearts of every Baltimore Oriole and every Oriole fan.•

RECOGNIZING INNOVATIVE EDUCATION AT OAK HARBOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize a school in Oak Harbor, Washington for their wonderful success in becoming a 'school of choice.' Oak Harbor Elementary is another shining example for why I began my ''Innovation in Education Award'' program—to highlight to my colleagues in the good things that are happening in education at the local level.

When Oak Harbor Elementary underwent a massive remodel of its north annex, originally built in 1934, it had the opportunity to add 200 more students to its student body. Rather than change attendance boundary areas, the school board and superintendent saw it as an opportunity to make it a magnet school to draw students from the most crowded schools in the district.

Over the course of a year, Principal Glenda Merwine met with parents and staff to determine what the ideal elementary school could look like. After many meetings, surveys, and discussions, the school chose to make a series of reforms including: requiring uniforms for all students in grades K–5; including curriculum in every classroom about various positive character traits like honesty, generosity and integrity; requiring parent compacts for participation in their children's education; and eventually implementing strong fine arts programs.

With this innovative new structure, Oak Harbor Elementary attracted over 200 student transfers from other schools including private schools and home-schooled children in the area.

The Oak Harbor ''school of choice'' is now in its second semester under the new plan. Staff and parents are highly enthusiastic over the improved discipline, motivation and achievements of the entire student body. Ms. Merwine said she has seen a dramatic change in the students' attitudes. The student body at Oak Harbor Elementary has increased by 230, yet Ms. Merwine said suspensions and disciplinary incidents decreased dramatically.

She gave one example of how the uniforms have brought down artificial barriers between students. Last year, a kindergartener frequently asked Ms. Merwine or a teacher to play with her, claiming the other children wouldn't. Ms. Merwine eventually observed another student telling the girl she wouldn't play with her because she wasn't wearing the ''right brand of jeans.'' This year, on the first day of school, Ms. Merwine said she saw the same two girls—now in 1st grade and wearing nearly identical uniforms—happily playing in the school yard.

I hope my colleagues will recognize the importance educators like Glenda Merwine, and the exciting things happening in our local schools when they are given the freedom to innovate. I for one, want to do all I can to increase their flexibility and resources so local educators—our parents, teachers, principals, school board members and superintendents—can continue to make the best decisions about the education of our children.•

MICHAEL ''MICK'' BIRD AND THE TRANS-OCEANIC ROWING EXPEDITION

• Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to bring my colleagues' attention to a very exciting expedition. In September 1998, Mr. Michael ''Mick'' Bird completed the second leg of an unprecedented 24,000 mile voyage around the world. On August 19, 1997, Mick Bird started rowing out to sea from Fort Bragg, California in his vessel Reach. After 66 days of rowing, on October 23, 1997, Mick arrived in Hilo Bay on the Big Island of Hawaii.

After putting the Reach in drydock in Hawaii, Mick returned to his home base in California to raise support and prepare for the next leg of his historic journey. Mick returned to Hawaii last summer and put to sea in Reach on July 18, 1998 rowing for the Gilbert Islands, about 2,500 miles southwest of Hawaii and halfway point between Hawaii and Australia. On September 22, 1998, 66 days and more than 2,200 miles from Hawaii, Mick made landfall on Majuro in the Marshall Islands, a bit north of his intended destination in the Gilberts. Mick is now happily home in California with his family preparing for his next leg to the north central coast of Australia; another 2,500 mile row.

Mick Bird, a former U.S. Air Force officer, is of Pacific Island descent and has family ties to the State of Hawaii. His voyage is more formally known as Trans-Oceanic, which is the name of the non-profit organization sponsoring this attempt at the world's first solo circumnavigation of the globe by a rowing vessel. The goals of this expedition are, among others, to explore the limits of the human spirit, to raise awareness about ocean ecosystems, to be an example of individual achievement as well as teamwork, and to generate support for the National Tuberous Sclerosis Association. The expedition is also using its World Wide Web sites (www.naau.com and www.goals.com/transrow) to create a direct link between Mick's vessel Reach and educators and students to share experiences and practical applications of math, science and geography.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Bird on his very impressive accomplishments to this point, and to express my good wishes for the safety and success of the rest of this voyage around the world. I also wish to commend him and Trans-Oceanic for enhancing public awareness and education. I encourage my colleagues to have a look at Trans-Oceanic's web sites and share them with educators at home to follow along with this amazing journey.•

TRIBUTE TO EDITH SCHMIDTCHEN ON HER RETIREMENT

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Edith (''Edie'') Schmidtchen on her retirement as the Town Clerk for Bedford, New Hampshire after thirty-five years of service. She has had an exceptionally distinguished career with the Town of Bedford.

Edie began her career in Bedford as the Assistant to the Town Clerk. She was promoted and served as the Deputy Town Clerk and then served as the Town Clerk for twenty-one years. Her dedication to the Town and the State of New Hampshire is truly admirable.

Edie has also been very active in the community during her time in the Town Clerk's office. She has been a volunteer teacher for the Bedford Mother's Club, an active member of the Bedford Presbyterian Church, and Secretary of the Town of Bedford Planning Board. She has also participated in many other activities that have bettered her community.

My thoughts and best wishes are with Edie, her children and her grandchildren for success in their future endeavors. Once again, I congratulate her on her retirement and thank her for her thirty-five years of continual service to the Town of Bedford. It is an honor to represent her in the United States Senate.•

TRIBUTE TO MR. CARL D. SOMMERS

• Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Carl D. Sommers, a true leader and a dedicated spokesman for New Jersey's labor movement. He has served the many members of organized labor in my home state for over 25 years and at his retirement, he is to be honored for his contributions to the Sheet Metal Workers Union.

Born and raised in Lawrence Township, New Jersey, Carol graduated from the Trenton High Vocational Sheet Metal Program. He began his career by serving a four-year apprenticeship with Sheet Metal Workers Local #27, where he has remained a member until this day. He has served his union as a local Union Shop Steward, Trustee, Executive Board Member, and as a member of the Joint Apprenticeship Training Fund. Carl also served as a Trustee of the Education Fund, monitoring and managing the Financial Training Facility and Teacher programs. As a member of the Supplemental Unemployment Fund Board, Carl has helped his union colleagues during periods of unemployment.

Carl was elected as Business Representative of Local 27 in 1990. In this new position, he adeptly represented the concerns and the welfare of his Union in labor disputes and corrected violations of collective bargaining agreements. He was also responsible for the daily work assignments of all Local members and attended labor seminars in an effort to protect the union rights.

He has proudly served his members by serving on the Contract Negotiating Committee, and attending rallies to garner support for pro-labor legislation. He recently became a Trustee of the New Jersey State Labor Council of Sheet Metal Workers, a member of both the Camden County Building Trades Council and the Warren County Building Trades Council. For over two years, Carl has served as Financial Secretary-Treasurer of the Mercer-Burlington Counties and Vicinities Building Trades Council.

On the eve of his retirement, it brings me great pleasure to recognize the accomplishments of Carl Sommers and his actions and efforts should be commended. The New Jersey labor community should be proud to have had Carl as a member and should be assured that he will continue to monitor and participate in the labor movement.•

TRIBUTE TO BRAVE GEORGIAN RESCUERS

• Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize three Georgians who went above and beyond the call of duty in a daring rescue mission yesterday. We watched with awe as Robert Clines, Larry Rogers and Matt Mosely successfully rescued Ivers Sims, a construction worker who found himself suspended some 180-feet in the air trapped by a raging fire.

Roger Clines, a Georgia Department of Natural Resources pilot, and his navigator Larry Rogers negotiated their helicopter through treacherous wind, smoke and fire, as Atlanta firefighter Matt Mosely dangled on a rope to rescue Mr. Sims—a dramatic and heroic scene.

I want to take a moment to recognize and honor the teamwork, dedication and bravery that resulted in this successful rescue mission. These three men, in the true spirit of heroism, risked their lives for the sake of a fellow human being.

Addtiionally, I would like to take this opportunity to honor and pay tribute to all of Atlanta's firefighters, the Atlanta police officers, Sheriff's deputies, and the Cabbagetown residents themselves, who worked together to fight the massive fire that engulfed the historic cotton mill. Our firefighters, facing shortages of equipment and personnel, heroically fought and contained a fire that could have destroyed an historic neighborhood currently being revitalized. Residents at home during the fire helped by rescuing neighbors' pets, and used garden hoses to extinguished burning debris.

As devastating as it was for residents of Atlanta's Cabbagetown to watch this historic landmark burn, the heroism of the day—like Atlanta's symbol the Phoenix—rose from the ashes. Although we mourn the loss of this historic landmark, it is good to know that

we will remember this day not for the tragedy that could have been, but for the heroism that was.●

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this week from April 11–17 we are celebrating the 41st anniversary of ''National Library Week.'' As a strong and vigorous supporter of Federal initiatives to strengthen and protect libraries, I am pleased to take this opportunity to draw my colleagues' attention to this important occasion and to take a few moments to reflect on the significance of libraries to our nation.

When the free public library came into its own in this country in the 19th century, it was, from the beginning, a unique institution because of its commitment to the same principle of free and open exchange of ideas as the Constitution itself. Libraries have always been an integral part of all that our country embodies: freedom of information, an educated citizenry, and an open and enlightened society. They are the only public agencies in which the services rendered are intended for, and available to, every segment of our society.

It has been my longstanding view that libraries play an indispensable role in our communities. From modest beginnings in the mid-19th century, today's libraries provide well-stocked reference centers and wide-ranging loan services based on a system of branches, often further supplemented by travelling libraries serving outlying districts. Libraries promote the reading of books among adults, adolescents, and children and provide the access and resources to allow citizens to obtain reliable information on a vast array of topics.

Libraries gain even further significance in this age of rapid technological advancement where they are called upon to provide not only books and periodicals, but many other valuable resources as well. In today's society, libraries provide audio-visual materials, computer services, internet access terminals, facilities for community lectures and performances, tapes, records, videocassettes, and works of art for exhibit and loan to the public. In addition, special facilities libraries provide services for older Americans, people with disabilities, and hospitalized citizens.

Of course, libraries are not merely passive repositories of materials. They are engines of learning—the place where a spark is often struck for disadvantaged citizens who for whatever reason have not had exposure to the vast stores of knowledge available. I have the greatest respect for those individuals who are members of the library community and work so hard to ensure that our citizens and communities continue to enjoy the tremendous rewards available through our library system.

My own State of Maryland has 24 public library systems providing a full range of library services to all Maryland citizens and a long tradition of open and unrestricted sharing of resources. This policy has been enhanced by the State Library Network which provides interlibrary loans to the State's public, academic, special libraries and school library media centers. The Network receives strong support from the State Library Resource Center at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, the Regional Library Resource Centers in Western, Southern, and Eastern Shore counties, and a Statewide database of holdings totalling 178 libraries.

The result of this unique joint State-County resource sharing is an extraordinary level of library services available to the citizens of Maryland. Marylanders have responded to this outstanding service by borrowing more public library materials per person than citizens of almost any other State, with 67 percent of the State's population registered as library patrons.

I have had a close working relationship with members of the Maryland Library Association and others involved in the library community throughout the State, and I am very pleased to join with them and citizens throughout the nation in this week's celebration of ''National Library Week.'' I look forward to a continued close association with those who enable libraries to provide the unique and vital services available to all Americans.●

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY J. CHERRY

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Stanley J. Cherry, a World War I veteran and extraordinary citizen of Grand Traverse County, Michigan, who was recently awarded France's highest tribute, the Legion of Honor.

A son of Polish immigrants, Stanley Cherry enlisted in the United States Army in May 1918, after which time he was sent to England with the 330th Second Machine Company Battalion where he was trained to operate English Vickers, French Hodgkiss, and American Browning machine guns. He began his service in France in October of the same year where he remained after the signing of the armistice, assigned to secure provisions.

During his 62 year marriage to his wife Lucille, the couple owned and operated a general store in Elmira, Michigan, for over 30 years. In addition to running the store they raised two daughters, Joanne Hawly and Jeanette Galbraith, who both currently live in Traverse City, Michigan.

In commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the signing of the armistice, the French government chose to honor surviving allied war veterans who fought in France to help defeat the German Army. A representative of the French Consulate General office in Chicago was present at the February 19th ceremony to confer upon Mr. Cherry the rank of Chevalier of the National Order of the Legion of Honor. France's highest honor, the Legion of Honor was founded in 1802 by Napoleon as a way of recognizing citizens for their contributions to France.

In addition to the Legion of Honor award, Mr. Cherry was presented a certificate of merit voted by the Michigan Legislature and signed by Governor Engler.

Mr. President, Stanley Cherry is an outstanding American citizen. In April he will be celebrating his 103rd birthday. I salute him for his many remarkable contributions as a veteran and for his commitment to his community and family. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him on being conferred the rank of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor.●

HONORING CASSADAGA JOB CORPS

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Cassadaga Job Corps in Cassadaga, New York, which was recently rated the nation's top job center. The center's director, Andrew Carpenter, and his staff have earned top billing for overall training and job placement performance. In addition to winning national and county recognition, the Cassadaga Job Corps' achievements have also set state records.

Over the past four years, time and money has been invested in upgrading Cassadaga Job Corps facilities, including construction of an academic and training center which opened in 1997. Upcoming projects include dormitory renovations and construction, development of a waste water plant, and remodeling of the nursing education complex.

I would like to express my congratulations to the Cassadaga Job Corps' 120 staffers and 255 students who have earned the privilege of being named the best job training center in the nation, and my thanks to them for their hard work and dedication.●

LATIN-AMERICANS FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, INC.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Latin-Americans for Social and Economic Development, Inc. (LA SED.) LA SED, a remarkable organization in my home state of Michigan, will celebrate its 30th Anniversary on May 5, 1999.

For thirty years now, LA SED has served Hispanics and the residents of Southwest Detroit through broad-based social programs. While championing the welfare of the Latino community,

it has also addressed the issues that affect the diverse ethnic populations in Southwest Detroit. From education to advocacy and much more, LA SED's far-reaching hand has helped thousands of Detroit's most deserving citizens achieve a higher standard of living.

Over the years, LA SED has grown to become one of Detroit's premier multipurpose social service agencies. As it celebrates this important milestone, I am sure its staff, friends and supporters will have the opportunity to recall its many successes. I am pleased to join with them in thanking LA SED for its efforts while applauding all the hard work and determination that have resulted in its prestigious reputation.

Mr. President, LA SED can take pride in the many important achievements of its first thirty years. I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting the accomplishments of LA SED's first three decades and in wishing it continued success for the future.●

TRIBUTE TO THE RAIMONDO FAMILY

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Raimondo Family as they are honored by the Fort Lee Chamber of Commerce as Family of the Year. The Raimondo name and family are synonymous with the rich history of the Borough of Fort Lee.

Carmelo Raimondo, who emigrated from the Province of Coscenza in Southern Italy, founded Raimondo Construction with his wife Madeline Battaglia in 1923. In 1942, they moved to Fort Lee with their two sons Frank and Charles. Since that time, numerous members of the Raimondo family have helped build Raimondo Construction into the pinnacle of success that it is today. Raimondo Construction has been an integral part of the Fort Lee community, and the Raimondos have helped to make Fort Lee the Borough that it is.

The Raimondo Family is now spread throughout Bergen County and across the country, and every member of the family continues to be active in their community. Whether it is serving the United States in the Navy, caring for the sick as a nurse, or shaping the youth of our nation in the Boy Scouts, the Raimondo Family has contributed a great deal to society. They have worked on behalf of a diverse pool of civic organizations such as Christie Muhaw Scholarship Fund, the New Jersey Symphony, the Church of the Good Shepard, the York Street Project in Jersey City, the Bergen 200 Club, the Police Honor League of New Jersey, the Fort Lee Council of Youth and Community Services, and the Bergen County Catholic Youth Organization. The Raimondo Family has set a standard of community activism that we should all strive to meet.

The story of the Raimondo Family is the story of the American dream. It is the story of Carmelo Raimondo coming to America in search of the opportunity that this great country offers. The success that the Raimondos have experienced is a testament to the fact that America is truly the land of opportunity. My grandparents also came to America in search of opportunity, and it is this common experience that has built a bond between myself and the Raimondo Family.

I am proud to recognize the Raimondos on this occasion.●

THE ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL RAMPAGE

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate a group of young constituents and journalists at Rockville High School's newspaper, The Rampage. This year, the students on the staff of The Rampage and their journalism teacher, Kevin Keegan, won recognition as the best student newspaper in Maryland for the seventh year in a row. I am proud of these students for putting their minds and their hearts into creating a first-rate newspaper for the Rockville community.

More than 200 years ago, when the Framers of the United States Constitution created the First Amendment, they recognized and enshrined the importance of a free press in a democratic society. With its declaration that no law could abridge the freedom of the press, the First Amendment also bestowed on our Nation's journalists a unique and special role. The Nation has given reporters the awesome responsibility to help communicate the needs of the Nation, report on and analyze the functioning of government, and chronicle the day-to-day events that affect our communities. In return, we hope those journalists recognize the importance of their responsibility and carefully tend their role as stewards of public information.

To maintain this profoundly important and delicate relationship, it is essential that journalists have strong training in writing, investigation, and ethics. That is why I am so proud of The Rampage, its staff, and its advisor. Mr. Keegan is teaching the important fundamentals of journalism, instilling in these young people the power and obligation of a free press, and encouraging them to grow personally and professionally in the process. Along the way, their hard work and commitment has earned these young journalists great respect and renown.

I would like to say a special word of thanks to The Rampage advisor, Mr. Keegan. He is well-known in Rockville and across the state for his commitment to teaching and to his students. As a journalism teacher and advisor for 20 years and coach of Team Maryland, a state all-star academic team, Mr. Keegan embodies all that is great and good about education in America. He inspires students personally, challenges them academically, and donates enormous amounts of energy and time to give kids the extra attention and encouragement they need to succeed. In 1997, he was recognized statewide when Hood College in Frederick honored him with its Maryland Distinguished Teacher award.

Mr. President, I have worked with quite a few journalists in my years of public service. I have been proud that many Maryland reporters and news outlets have earned national reputations and honors. But I am uniquely proud of The Rampage today because they represent great hope for maintaining a strong free press and a strong democratic society. In their ranks we may well find some of the next generation's Pulitzer Prize winners. I congratulate them today on their tremendous accomplishments and wish them all the best for their future endeavors. Maryland is very proud of them.●

MS. ROSA PARKS AND MR. OLIVER W. HILL

● Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words today about two civil rights leaders to whom this nation owes an immense debt of gratitude. Ms. Rosa Parks and Mr. Oliver W. Hill, both, in very distinct ways, took action that has helped make our children more free, our society more enlightened, our culture more enriched.

I was pleased to add my name to the list of cosponsors of S. 531, legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Ms. Rosa Parks, who as everyone knows stood up to segregation by sitting down in the front seats of a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama. It is difficult to adequately put in words the courage it took on the part of Ms. Parks to oppose decades of institutionalized racism. It is also hard to describe the pride we feel today in Ms. Parks' action, and in how our nation's conscience grew, although too slowly, in response to the bus boycott that followed.

Ms. Parks' action set off a 382-day bus boycott by 40,000 people, which in turn led to a federal court challenge and the end of Montgomery's segregated buses. The decade of peaceful protests that followed brought us a string of liberating Supreme Court decisions and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today, Ms. Parks, an unassuming seamstress, stands like a giant in the history of the 20th century.

Mr. Oliver W. Hill, an aggressive attorney for the Civil Rights movement, is less well known. But Mr. Hill is no less courageous, and the contributions he made to this country deserve much greater recognition. For that reason, I've asked the President to award him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

I describe Mr. Hill as ''aggressive'' because he trained as a warrior in the cause of justice: he went to law school specifically to overturn Plessy v. Ferguson. His training paid off. He prevailed in Alston v. School Board of City of Norfolk to grant equal pay for African American teachers. And he defended the rights of African American students in Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, which was one of the five cases decided as part of Brown v. The Board of Education. Sadly, all this success was not without cost. Mr. Hill remembers the terrible telephone calls to his home, and the cross that was burned on his yard in Richmond.

The courage and accomplishments of this man and this woman are truly historic and important to our nation. I hope we can pass S. 531 quickly to recognize Ms. Parks, and I hope the President will decide very soon to reward Mr. Hill with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.●

DR. CHARLENE R. NUNLEY, PRESIDENT OF MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the installation of Dr. Charlene R. Nunley as the new President of Montgomery College. After a national search by the College's Board of Trustees, Dr. Nunley becomes the sixth President of Montgomery College, Maryland's largest community college, founded in 1946.

Dr. Nunley has already contributed enormously to this institution in her former position as Executive Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, where she was responsible for a $110 million budget, and provided academic leadership for 40,000 credit and noncredit students each year on three different campuses. Dr. Nunley takes over the helm from Robert E. Parilla, whose two-decade tenure was critical to the vision and growth that enabled Montgomery College to become one of Maryland's premier community colleges. Not only was Dr. Nunley Mr. Parilla's personal choice for President, she also has been with Montgomery College even longer than he, beginning her involvement six months prior to the start of the Parilla Presidency. It is, in fact, Dr. Nunley's longevity that is at the root of her deep and personal dedication to this institution. This extensive institutional knowledge also gives her the wisdom and credibility to formulate a clear vision for the future growth of Montgomery College as we approach the new millennium.

Dr. Parilla and the Board of Directors were certainly not the only ones who felt strongly that Nunley was the right person for this job. Corporate securities advisor Gordon Macklin announced that he and his wife would be making a $1.26 million gift to the school after Nunley became President. This gift, announced on January 27, 1999, constitutes the largest single charitable gift to a Maryland community college and will provide for the establishment of the Gordon and Marilyn Mack in Business Institute. The Macklin Institute, expected to open in the fall of 1999, will offer an honors program for second-year students who will be provided with a scholarship, a laptop computer, a summer internship, and a faculty and corporate mentor. Therefore not only does this Institute offer an increased business curriculum and high-tech training to Montgomery College students, but it will encourage strong business students to enroll at Montgomery College, and will promote economic development in the area.

Additionally, on March 24, 1999, Montgomery College received its second historic gift since Nunley was named President on January 4 of this year. Paul Peek, a computer systems manager from McLean, Virginia donated $1.3 million to the College's Humanities Institute and Art Department. This represents the single largest individual gift ever to a Maryland community college, and will be used to support the ongoing work of both the Humanities Institute and the Department of Art. In appreciation for this gift, Montgomery College has named the Humanities Institute and the Rockville Campus's Art Building in Peck's name.

Dr. Nunley was educated at Pennsylvania State University and received a Ph.D. in Educational Policy Studies from George Washington University. Before joining Montgomery College 26 years ago, Dr. Nunley served as Director of Institutional Research at Howard Community College in Columbia, Maryland, and began her career in education at the Potomac State College of West Virginia University.

Mr. President, Dr. Nunley's creativity, effectiveness and dedication have already contributed enormously to Montgomery College, and have significantly furthered the strength of its links with the local government and business communities. I have the utmost confidence in Dr. Nunley's ability to lead Montgomery College into the next century, and look forward to working with her during another successful 20-year tenure.●

TRIBUTE TO MR. MICHAEL A. FERRARA, JR.

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Michael A. Ferrara, Jr. as he is honored as an Outstanding Italian American by the Sons of Italy organization. Michael has enjoyed a fruitful legal career, multiple philanthropic endeavors, and a beautiful family.

Michael was born in South Philadelphia to the children of Italian immigrants. His father worked hard for the Pennsylvania Railroad and his mother worked for Wanamakers once Michael and his sister, JoAnn, were grown. He was raised in this city and stayed close after graduating high school, attending Villanova University on a NROTC scholarship. Michael graduated from Villanova with a degree in Mathematics and soon after, began his naval service.

In the Navy, Michael served aboard both a submarine and a destroyer, visiting Ireland, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Tunisia. His service was extended to five years due to the Vietnam War, which is where he spent his last year. While in DaNang, Michael taught English to Vietnamese children for the U.S. Information Agency and helped deliver Marines, tanks, and ammunition to river bases along the demilitarized zone. At the age of 23, Michael was in command of a mini-fleet of 25 boats and 250 men. His service in Vietnam was rewarded with several commendations including the Combat Action Ribbon, Navy Unit Commendations, Vietnam Campaign Medal and Vietnam Service Medal with three bronze stars.

After completing his military service, Michael attended law school at the University of San Diego. After graduation, he began his successful legal career. Michael has been elected President of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America, as well as President of the 2500 member New Jersey Trial Lawyer's Association. He has also served as President of the National Civil Justice Foundation. Recently he was selected, along with four other attorneys, to represent the Attorney General of New Jersey in the lawsuit against the tobacco industry.

In addition to his extensive legal career, Michael has served his community through various philanthropic endeavors, including the March of Dimes and the New Jersey State Aquarium's education program. As a fellow Italian American it gives me great pleasure to recognize Michael Ferrara and his achievements, both in his career and his community. He is a man most deserving of this award and his actions should be highly commended.●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on the Executive Calendar: The Foreign Service nominee on the Secretary's desk. I finally ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nomination be printed at the appropriate place

in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Foreign Service nomination of Richard Lewis Baltimore III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 19, 1999

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 81, S. 380.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 380) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 380) was considered read a third time and passed, as follows:

S. 380

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999.

(a) CHANGE OF ANNUAL REPORTING DATE.—Section 3(e) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 802(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''April 1'' and inserting ''June 1''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A) and (D), by striking ''member of the Congressional Award Association'' and inserting ''recipient of the Congressional Award'' ; and

(2) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking ''representative of a local Congressional Award Council'' and inserting ''a local Congressional Award program volunteer''.

(c) EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM; NONCOMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 804(c)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''and 1998'' and inserting ''1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004''.

(d) TERMINATION.—Section 9 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking ''October 1, 1999'' and inserting ''October 1, 2004''.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 79, S. 148.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 148) to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering S. 148, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1999, introduced by Senator ABRAHAM. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation. The bill would establish a program to provide financial assistance for projects to promote the conservation of neotropical migratory birds in the United States, Latin America and the Caribbean.

Each autumn, some 5 billion birds from 500 species migrate between their breeding grounds in North America and tropical habitats in the Caribbean, Central and South America. These neotropical migrants—or New World tropical migrants—are birds that migrate between the biogeographic region stretching across Mexico, Central America, much of the Caribbean, and the northern part of South America.

The natural challenges facing these migratory birds are profound. These challenges have been exacerbated by human-induced impacts, particularly the continuing loss of habitat in the Caribbean and Latin America. As a result, populations of migratory birds have declined generally in recent years.

While there are numerous efforts underway to protect these species and their habitat, they generally focus on specific groups of migratory birds or specific regions in the Americas. One program that stands out for its success is Partners in Flight, administered by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Started in 1990, this program has raised more than $41 million for 480 projects for migratory bird conservation in the United States and Latin America.

The program established by S. 148 is intended to support and bolster these existing efforts. It does so by creating a comprehensive program to address the varied threats facing the numerous species of migratory birds across their range. Frequently there is little, if any, coordination among existing programs, nor is there any one program that serves as a link among them. A broader, more holistic approach would strengthen existing efforts, fill the gaps between these programs, and promote new initiatives.

I do not intend that this program would supplant or supersede existing efforts, nor do I expect that Federal funds for implementing S. 148 be diverted from funds going to these existing efforts. New money should go to this new program to assist neotropical migratory birds in new ways.

S. 148 is identical to a bill that was approved by the Senate last year, S. 1970, but was never passed by the House. The bill is based on bipartisan negotiations with the sponsors of the bill, the House Resources Committee, the administration, and the EPW Committee. Numerous groups, including conservation groups and the forest products industry, have supported this bill.

The bill allows for the Secretary to establish an advisory group, and I urge that the Secretary do so. The success of this initiative will depend on close collaboration with public and private organizations involved in the conservation of migratory birds.

I am very pleased with the legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it, and urge its speedy enactment. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today the Senate again will pass legislation to protect the habitat of the broad range of migratory birds which spend the spring and summer months in the United States. This legislation, which I introduced with my distinguished colleagues, Senator DASCHLE and Senator CHAFEE, is designed to protect over 90 endangered species of bird spending certain seasons in the United States and other seasons in other nations of the West Hemisphere. This is actually the second time this legislation has passed the Senate. Last year, after receiving considerable support from the environmental and conservation communities, this legislation passed the Senate by Unanimous consent. Unfortunately, time ran out for equal consideration in the House. Nevertheless, this year we returned with renewed determination and were able to again move this bill.

Every year, Mr. President, approximately 25 million Americans travel to observe birds, and 60 million American adults watch and feed birds at home. Bird-watching is a source of great pleasure to many Americans, as well as a source of important revenue to states, like my own state of Michigan, which attract tourists to their scenes of natural beauty. Bird watching and feeding generates fully $20 billion every Year in revenue across America.

Birdwatching is a popular activity in Michigan, and its increased popularity is reflected by an increase in tourist dollars being spent in small, rural communities. Healthy bird populations

also prevent hundreds of millions of dollars in economic losses each year to farming and timber interests. They help control insect populations, thereby preventing crop failures and infestations.

Despite the enormous benefits we derive from our bird populations, many of them are struggling to survive. Ninety species are listed as endangered or threatened in the United States. Another 124 species are of high conservation concern. In my own state we are working to bring the Kirtland's Warbler back from the brink of extinction. A few years ago, the population of this distinctive bird has been estimated at approximately 200 nesting pairs. Since then, a great deal of work has been done by Michigan DNR employees to preserve the Kirtland's Warbler habitat in the Bahamas, where they winter. Thanks in large part to this effort, the number of breeding pairs has recently increased to an estimated 800. This is an easily grasped problem. Since the entire species spends half of the year in the Bahamas, the significant efforts made by Michigan's Department of Natural Resources and concerned residents in Michigan will not be enough to save this bird if its winter habitat is degraded or destroyed.

This situation is not unique, among bird watchers' favorites, many neotropical birds are endangered or of high conservation concern. And several of the most popular neotropical species, including bluebirds, robins, goldfinches, and orioles, migrate to and from the Caribbean and Latin America.

Because neotropical migratory birds range across a number of international borders every year, we must work to establish safeguards at both ends of their migration routes, as well as at critical stopover areas along their way. Only in this way can conservation efforts prove successful.

That is why Senator DASCHLE, Senator CHAFEE and I introduced the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. This legislation will protect bird habitats across international boundaries by establishing partnerships between the business community, nongovernmental organizations and foreign nations. By teaming businesses with international organizations concerned to protect the environment we can combine capital with know-how. By partnering these entities with local organizations in countries where bird habitat is endangered we can see to it that local people receive the training they need to preserve this habitat and maintain this critical natural resource.

This act establishes a 4-year demonstration project providing $8 million each year to help establish programs in the United States, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The greater portion of these funds will be focused outside the U.S. Approved programs will manage and conserve neotropical migratory bird populations. Those eligible to participate will include national and international nongovernmental organizations and business interests, as well as U.S. Government entities.

The key to this act is cooperation among nongovernmental organizations. The federal share of each project's cost is never to exceed 33 percent. For grants awarded outside the United States, the non-Federal match can be made with in-kind contributions. This will encourage volunteerism and local interest in communities that lack the financial resources to contribute currency. Since domestic organizations and communities are more financially secure, the matching portion of grants awarded within the United States will be required in cash.

The approach taken by this legislation differs from that of current programs in that it is proactive and, by avoiding a crisis management approach, will prove significantly more cost effective. In addition, this legislation does not call for complicated and expensive bureaucratic structures such as councils, commissions or multi-tiered oversight structures. Further, this legislation will bring needed attention and expertise to areas now receiving relatively little attention in the area of environmental degradation.

This legislation has the support of the National Audubon Society, the Nature Conservancy, the American Bird Conservancy, Defenders of Wildlife, the Ornithological Council, Ducks Unlimited, and the American Forest and Paper Association. These organizations agree with Senator DASCHLE, Senator CHAFEE, and I that, by establishing partnerships between business, government and nongovernmental organizations both here and abroad we can greatly enhance the protection of migratory bird habitat.

I want to take a moment to comment on the contributions of Senator DASCHLE and Senator CHAFEE with respect to this bill. For over a year, my colleagues and their staffs have dedicated a great deal of time and hard work to this legislation. This bill would not have advanced as it has, perhaps would not have moved at all, were it not for their efforts, and I wish to thank them for all they have done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 148) was considered read a third time and passed, as follows:

S. 148

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 ''Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) of the nearly 800 bird species known to occur in the United States, approximately 500 migrate among countries, and the large majority of those species, the neotropical migrants, winter in Latin America and the Caribbean;

(2) neotropical migratory bird species provide invaluable environmental, economic, recreational, and aesthetic benefits to the United States, as well as to the Western Hemisphere;

(3)(A) many neotropical migratory bird populations, once considered common, are in decline, and some have declined to the point that their long-term survival in the wild is in jeopardy; and

(B) the primary reason for the decline in the populations of those species is habitat loss and degradation (including pollution and contamination) across the species' range; and

(4)(A) because neotropical migratory birds range across numerous international borders each year, their conservation requires the commitment and effort of all countries along their migration routes; and

(B) although numerous initiatives exist to conserve migratory birds and their habitat, those initiatives can be significantly strengthened and enhanced by increased coordination.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to perpetuate healthy populations of neotropical migratory birds;

(2) to assist in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds by supporting conservation initiatives in the United States, Latin America, and the Caribbean; and

(3) to provide financial resources and to foster international cooperation for those initiatives.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACCOUNT.—The term ''Account'' means the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Account established by section 9(a).

(2) CONSERVATION.—The term ''conservation'' means the use of methods and procedures necessary to bring a species of neotropical migratory bird to the point at which there are sufficient populations in the wild to ensure the long-term viability of the species, including—

(A) protection and management of neotropical migratory bird populations;

(B) maintenance, management, protection, and restoration of neotropical migratory bird habitat;

(C) research and monitoring;

(D) law enforcement; and

(E) community outreach and education.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide financial assistance for projects to promote the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

(b) PROJECT APPLICANTS.—A project proposal may be submitted by—

(1) an individual, corporation, partnership, trust, association, or other private entity;

(2) an officer, employee, agent, department, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, of any State, municipality, or political subdivision of a State, or of any foreign government;

(3) a State, municipality, or political subdivision of a State;

(4) any other entity subject to the jurisdiction of the United States or of any foreign country; and

(5) an international organization (as defined in section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288)).

(c) PROJECT PROPOSALS.—To be considered for financial assistance for a project under this Act, an applicant shall submit a project proposal that—

(1) includes—

(A) the name of the individual responsible for the project;

(B) a succinct statement of the purposes of the project;

(C) a description of the qualifications of individuals conducting the project; and

(D) an estimate of the funds and time necessary to complete the project, including sources and amounts of matching funds;

(2) demonstrates that the project will enhance the conservation of neotropical migratory bird species in Latin America, the Caribbean, or the United States;

(3) includes mechanisms to ensure adequate local public participation in project development and implementation;

(4) contains assurances that the project will be implemented in consultation with relevant wildlife management authorities and other appropriate government officials with jurisdiction over the resources addressed by the project;

(5) demonstrates sensitivity to local historic and cultural resources and complies with applicable laws;

(6) describes how the project will promote sustainable, effective, long-term programs to conserve neotropical migratory birds; and

(7) provides any other information that the Secretary considers to be necessary for evaluating the proposal.

(d) PROJECT REPORTING.—Each recipient of assistance for a project under this Act shall submit to the Secretary such periodic reports as the Secretary considers to be necessary. Each report shall include all information required by the Secretary for evaluating the progress and outcome of the project.

(e) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of each project shall be not greater than 33 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(A) SOURCE.—The non-Federal share required to be paid for a project shall not be derived from any Federal grant program.

(B) FORM OF PAYMENT.—

(i) PROJECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.—The non-Federal share required to be paid for a project carried out in the United States shall be paid in cash.

(ii) PROJECTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—The non-Federal share required to be paid for a project carried out in a foreign country may be paid in cash or in kind.

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) develop guidelines for the solicitation of proposals for projects eligible for financial assistance under section 5;

(2) encourage submission of proposals for projects eligible for financial assistance under section 5, particularly proposals from relevant wildlife management authorities;

(3) select proposals for financial assistance that satisfy the requirements of section 5, giving preference to proposals that address conservation needs not adequately addressed by existing efforts and that are supported by relevant wildlife management authorities; and

(4) generally implement this Act in accordance with its purposes.

SEC. 7. COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) support and coordinate existing efforts to conserve neotropical migratory bird species, through—

(A) facilitating meetings among persons involved in such efforts;

(B) promoting the exchange of information among such persons;

(C) developing and entering into agreements with other Federal agencies, foreign, State, and local governmental agencies, and nongovernmental organizations; and

(D) conducting such other activities as the Secretary considers to be appropriate; and

(2) coordinate activities and projects under this Act with existing efforts in order to enhance conservation of neotropical migratory bird species.

(b) ADVISORY GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To assist in carrying out this Act, the Secretary may convene an advisory group consisting of individuals representing public and private organizations actively involved in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

(2) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(A) MEETINGS.—The advisory group shall—

(i) ensure that each meeting of the advisory group is open to the public; and

(ii) provide, at each meeting, an opportunity for interested persons to present oral or written statements concerning items on the agenda.

(B) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide to the public timely notice of each meeting of the advisory group.

(C) MINUTES.—Minutes of each meeting of the advisory group shall be kept by the Secretary and shall be made available to the public.

(3) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory group.

SEC. 8. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than October 1, 2002, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results and effectiveness of the program carried out under this Act, including recommendations concerning how the Act might be improved and whether the program should be continued.

SEC. 9. NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Multinational Species Conservation Fund of the Treasury a separate account to be known as the ''Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Account'', which shall consist of amounts deposited into the Account by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

(b) DEPOSITS INTO THE ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit into the Account—

(1) all amounts received by the Secretary in the form of donations under subsection (d); and

(2) other amounts appropriated to the Account.

(c) USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may use amounts in the Account, without further Act of appropriation, to carry out this Act.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of amounts in the Account available for each fiscal year, the Secretary may expend not more than 6 percent to pay the administrative expenses necessary to carry out this Act.

(d) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept and use donations to carry out this Act. Amounts received by the Secretary in the form of donations shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit into the Account.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Account to carry out this Act $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003, to remain available until expended, of which not less than 50 percent of the amounts made available for each fiscal year shall be expended for projects carried out outside the United States.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 12131, the Chair appoint the following Members of the Senate to the President's Export Council: CONRAD BURNS of Montana; JOHN ASHCROFT of Missouri; MIKE ENZI of Wyoming; MAX BAUCUS of Montana; TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following Senators on behalf of the Democratic Leader: Pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105, adopted April 13, 1989, as amended by Public Law 105–275, adopted October 21, 1998, and further amended by S. Res. 75 adopted March 25, 1999, I hereby appoint the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group: ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia (Minority Co-Chairman); CARL LEVIN of Michigan (Minority Co-Chairman); JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr. of Delaware (Minority Co-Chairman); EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts; J. ROBERT KERREY of Nebraska; DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN of New York; PAUL S. SARBANES of Maryland; JOHN F. KERRY of Massachusetts; and RICHARD J. DURBIN of Illinois.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1999

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 14. I further ask that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 1 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, 30 minutes; Senator BROWNBACK, 20 minutes; Senator BAYH, 10 minutes; Senators DOMENICI and

WELLSTONE in control of a total of 15 minutes; Senator LEAHY, 15 minutes; and Senator CLELAND, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it will be the leader's intention following morning business to begin consideration of S. 767, the uniformed services tax filing fairness bill. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will reconvene on Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. and begin a period of morning business until 1 p.m.

Following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of S. 767, a bill introduced by Senator COVERDELL and others regarding tax filing extensions for certain members of the uniformed services. Following passage of that bill, it will be the leader's intention to begin consideration of the budget resolution conference report. There are 10 hours for debate on the conference report, but it is hoped that a significant portion of that time will be yielded back.

Members should, therefore, expect rollcall votes throughout Wednesday's session of the Senate in relation to the Coverdell bill or any other legislative or executive items cleared for action.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the distinguished Senator for his patience and his forbearance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

TRIP TO MACEDONIA AND NATO HEADQUARTERS IN BRUSSELS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the recent spring recess, I took the opportunity to travel to Brussels, Belgium, to meet with NATO officials about the situation in Kosovo. Last week, I traveled to Macedonia in order to make a firsthand assessment of the refugee problem confronting that small nation.

While in Brussels, I received an assessment of the ongoing military campaign against Yugoslav military and security forces and strategic installations from Gen. Wesley Clark, commander of our NATO forces. I also discussed NATO's objectives with respect to Kosovo and the more than 600,000 Kosovars now displaced with NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, NATO ambassadors, and NATO military officials.

I found that NATO ambassadors were unified in their resolve to stand up to Slobodan Milosevic. They expressed a willingness to carry on the air campaign for as long as it might take to degrade Serbian military and security forces.

Let me also say how deeply impressed I was with Gen. Wesley Clark, the supreme allied commander of NATO forces, our ambassador to NATO and their staffs. I urge colleagues who have the opportunity to go to Brussels and meet with these NATO officials to do so. At the end of next week, there will be a gathering of the NATO nations' leaders here in Washington to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the most important strategic alliance of the 20th century. I hope that my colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity created by that historic gathering to speak with as many of these ambassadors and NATO staff and personnel as possible about the situation in Kosovo.

After these meetings in Brussels, I traveled to Macedonia on a military aircraft that was bringing urgently needed supplies to the refugee camps. It was a long flight from Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany to Macedonia, and I was deeply impressed by the young crew and their hard work. Before I left Ramstein Air Force Base, General Brady and his staff gave me an excellent briefing on how they are helping to relieve the suffering of the men, women and children displaced from their homes in Kosovo.

In Macedonia, I met with United States Ambassador Chris Hill and his staff. Let me reiterate to our colleagues here how fortunate we are to have someone of Chris Hill's talents and abilities representing us in Macedonia, particularly at a time such as this. He is a career foreign service officer, has spent time in the Balkans, knows the region well and is handling a very difficult and tense situation with a great deal of energy, vision and creativity.

While I was in Macedonia, I also met with U.S. military personnel who are a part of a unit called Able Sentry. A brigadier general and his staff briefed me on their operations. Before hostilities broke out, Able Sentry was intended as the base facility for a peacekeeping force in Kosovo. Now, these American service men and women are leading NATO's efforts to help the refugees on the ground.

I also spent some time with the enlisted personnel who make up the unit to which three young servicemen, Sergeants Ramirez and Stone and Specialist Steven Gonzales were assigned before their illegal capture by Serbian forces.

I wish all of our colleagues could have joined me in that small room last Saturday to hear these young American servicemen talk with great pride about the work of their colleagues Ramirez, Stone, and Gonzales. Ramirez, Stone and Gonzales were professionals doing a commendable job. When they were captured, they were not close to the Serbian border where they would have placed themselves and their units in any jeopardy. When I spoke with this unit of highly competent individuals just three days ago, they were deeply worried that Members of Congress in Washington would misunderstand the role that they were engaged in and the professionalism with which they were conducting their responsibilities. I assured them that my colleagues here, regardless of party, had a deep respect for the job they were doing and admire them immensely. And, like them, I pray for the safe return of their three comrades.

The service men and women I met with are committed to getting the job done, Mr. President. They know why they are there. They understand the seriousness and importance of this issue and are conducting their jobs with a high degree of professionalism.

I wanted to take a moment here on the floor to express my confidence in them and speak their names on the floor of the Senate, as I assured them I would. I urge my colleagues to do likewise and express their support for the hard and commendable job our men and women in uniform are doing.

Mr. President, the efforts of all of these men and women in Macedonia today are focused on alleviating the suffering of the thousands of people who have been forced from their homes by Slobodan Milosevic's reign of ethnic cleansing. I fear that I am not capable of fully describing the scene at the refugee camps. For a generation of us who were born at the end of World War II, the sites of a concentration camp or of the thousands of homeless people in Europe at the end of World War II rest securely in the domain of documentary films and Hollywood depictions.

Most of us in this Chamber have not had occasion to encounter firsthand the kinds of scenes that our fathers and grandfathers witnessed. Senators THURMOND and HOLLINGS of South Carolina, Senator INOUYE, Senator CHAFEE, Senator LAUTENBERG, and others who were veterans of World War II can also speak of personal recollections of those days.

In the past few days, however, the images from documentary films half a century old became a reality for me. I was profoundly struck by the sight of 45,000 people gathered together in makeshift huts or tents in an area only slightly larger than half of the Mall here in Washington. They were lining up for food, water, medicine and other basic necessities, and using open trenches as latrines. Mr. President, it was a sight to which TV film footage,

television broadcasts, news descriptions—despite their talent and ability—cannot really do justice. It was a truly compelling sight.

I was deeply impressed with the work being done by the British military forces in this particular camp. It was stunning to learn that in less than 36 hours they had constructed and put up 4,000 tents to accommodate the 45,000 refugees that have poured into this particular part of Macedonia. There is another camp nearby in Brazda with some 12,000 people in it. I am told by the distinguished Ambassador from Macedonia that some 16,000 other Kosovars are living in the homes of people in Macedonia. In total, there are some 120,000 Kosovars in that one small country, geographically the size of Vermont, with only 2 million people. To put it into perspective for Americans, this is equivalent to 5 million people arriving on our shores to seek asylum in a 72 hour period. This influx of refugees represents a tremendous disruption in the economic life of Macedonia as it has in Albania.

Mr. President, as I spent 4 hours or so wandering through the refugee camp walking by rows and rows of families huddled in tents or standing in lines to receive food and water, I noticed on every single tent a homemade sign written on cardboard with ballpoint pen or lipstick or whatever else that family could use. These signs would give a person's name and which town they had live in followed by: If you see or run into my mother, my father, my sister, my brother, or my child who is lost and separated, please tell them where I am. People wander by reading the signs, trying to find members of their own families. Teenagers are caring for small children who have been separated from their parents.

As people cross the border they tell the stories of being brutalized by the Serbian military and police forces in Kosovo. These stories of what they had to endure, how they were evicted from their homes, and separated from their families, Mr. President, are haunting and shocking.

I have seen a lot of hardship in my years. I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America during the 1960s. I lived in countries where there is a great deal of poverty and suffering. I have been to Haiti many times. I have traveled throughout Central and Latin America over the years. But never, Mr. President, have I seen anything quite like the scene that I saw in this camp.

At times, however, there are moments amongst the despair of the present which speak to the potential optimism of the future. In the camp I visited is a field hospital operated by the Israeli military. Since the refugees began arriving, the Israeli doctors and nurses have delivered 6 babies. I pray, Mr. President, that these 6 infants will not know the horrors of ethnic-cleansing and hatred their parents have fled. Rather, may they grow up in the spirit of understanding and respect for each other which drives these Jewish doctors to care for mostly Muslim refugees.

If there is any doubt in anyone's mind about whether or not we were trying to do the right thing as a nation and as a group of nations under the alliance of NATO, I promise my colleagues that had they been with me last Saturday, seen what I saw, and talked to the people that I talked to, there would be absolutely no disagreement in this Chamber about whether or not the United States and NATO were taking the right course of action. Our efforts to restore these people to their rightful home, bring an end to this conflict, and thus save the lives of thousands and prevent the spread of this conflict throughout the Balkans area are most assuredly the right thing to do.

I can only hope that Slobodan Milosevic will hear from this Chamber, from this Congress, and from NATO's member nations in the coming days a unanimous voice of determination to rid Kosovo of his brutal forces and stop to worst ethnic cleansing Europe has seen in decades. Furthermore, we must clearly state that we will not second guess the decisions of this administration, including President Clinton, Secretary of Defense Cohen and General Shelton, of our leaders in NATO, and of our colleagues in the diplomatic wing of NATO.

Mr. President, I think it is critically important that we demonstrate at this juncture as much bipartisan support as we can for NATO's military campaign in Yugoslavia. Once President Milosevic understands that the United States and other NATO countries are resolute in their common determination to continue a military campaign against Serbian targets until NATO's conditions have been met, I am convinced he will back down.

We must also be prepared to make clear that President Clinton has available all necessary means to carry out our mission against Serbian military and security forces. The Governments of Macedonia and Albania, together with international private relief organizations, have been confronted with a sea of refugees and are ill equipped to cope with this problem. International relief efforts to provide food, clothing, shelter, and medicines to the still-growing refugee community must continue—and on an expedited basis, I might add.

The United Nations, and specifically the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, must dramatically step up their efforts to respond to the refugee crisis in Albania and Macedonia.

It is also important to say a few words about the Governments of Albania and Macedonia. These are both poor countries that have been confronted with a situation even a wealthy nation like the United States would find difficult to cope with. While there have been some bumps along the road, I would like the Governments and the peoples of Macedonia and Albania to know that we in the United States appreciate deeply what they are trying to do to assist the Kosovar refugees and we recognize that they need substantial economic assistance to help them cope with this situation.

Macedonia and Albania should receive, in my view, bilateral and multilateral economic assistance including IMF assistance, debt relief in the form of debt forgiveness, trade assistance, in order to address war-related economic dislocation in both countries.

The hundred or so refugees with whom I spoke made it clear that they want to return to their home in Kosovo rather than be relocated throughout the globe. They also expressed deep appreciation of the international community, and specifically the United States, in endeavoring to accomplish certain goals on their behalf. It does not go unnoticed by them that the United States, once again, is standing up for those who have been treated as poorly as these people have. It is in our heritage. It is part of our collective ethic in this Nation to try to help, try to do what is right rather than to be silent and stand by while outrages are perpetrated against innocent people.

I believe that what the United States and NATO are doing reversed the Serbian policy of ethnic cleansing and is a just cause that deserves the support of the Congress and the American people.

I pledge to do all I can to support this effort. Particularly, I want to support our President, our military, and NATO as they endeavor to achieve this worthy goal. I hope before this week is out that we might find some common ideas through some collective work here to express some issues on which we can all agree. There are differences of opinion on various aspects of this crisis, but I happen to believe we share a great deal in common on this issue.

I am confident that, under the leadership of the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, and the Democratic leader, TOM DASCHLE, the chairmen and ranking members of the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and other interested Members of this body, we can find some common language and common ideas to send a clear, strong signal this week of how much we appreciate the efforts of our service men and women, of the front-line states, and of the international relief organizations. We must assure them that they do not stand alone and that we are going to do everything we can to ease the pressures

and burdens that these poor refugees are facing. I am confident that we will speak with a common voice when we express our determination not to let Slobodan Milosevic's genocidal behavior stand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senate, under the previous order, will stand adjourned until 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 14, 1999.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:21 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1999:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LESLIE F. KENNE, 0741

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 13, 1999:

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

RICHARD LEWIS BALTIMORE, III, OF NEW YORK

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 13, 1999*

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MICA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 13, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN L. MICA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

WATER VISION 2000

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, since I was elected to Congress I have been focusing on the issue of livable communities and how we create better partnerships between the Federal Government and our citizens.

The livability movement is gaining dramatic momentum nationally as we watch officials from the Vice President, Mr. GORE, to local city and county commissioners champion goals for easing traffic congestion, promoting urban redevelopment and creating more open and green spaces. We have seen fundamental changes in how the Federal Government is approaching transportation once we acknowledged that trying to pave our way out of congestion simply did not work, and just as the ISTEA legislation and the recently-enacted TEA–21 are promoting innovative approaches to transportation problems, I suggest that it is time for us to take a new approach to how we manage water resources. It would begin with a vision and a framework for improving the way the Federal Government approaches water resource problems and management based on the same flexibility that we have seen in transportation.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we have treated our watersheds and rivers as machines, costing taxpayers billions of dollars as our communities continue to face increased risks from flood, decreasing numbers of fish and growing health risks caused by polluted rivers and streams. Forty percent of our Nation's waterways fail to meet drinking, recreation or fish habitat needs, and that number sadly is growing. Some urban streams and creeks and rivers are so degraded, people consider them dead and beyond recovery.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I joined with the America's Rivers program to announce America's most endangered rivers of 1999, a list of 10 such threatened waterways and what we can do about it. Well, Congress can help right now, and I suggest that we approach water issues in this session with what I would term Water Vision 2000.

It would, first of all, suggest that the Federal Government deal fundamentally with watersheds. We must think more broadly and comprehensively about the missions and how they can work with local communities throughout the entire watershed cycle.

Second, we must focus on increased Federal flexibility. We need more coordination and responsiveness from Federal agencies so local communities can be creative in how they meet their water challenges. In this way we can indeed make sure that we are spending each dollar two or three times over in terms of total benefit, and citizen involvement must be part of the solution and not simply an afterthought of the decision-making process.

We have been using such an approach in Oregon. Last November we brought together over 300 people to deal with a summit on the needs of the Johnson Creek watershed, 54 square miles, to consider 45 separate plans that exist to deal with land use and regulatory issues in this area. It was a beginning for our efforts to deal more comprehensively and creatively together from the Federal level down to the local area.

I have suggested in this Congress three additional legislative proposals. I have already discussed on this floor approaches to the Federal flood control program. I hope ultimately we will have municipal watershed management on Federal lands; and I hope that people will join with me this week in dealing with reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program. High-risk properties for flood insurance right now make up only 2 percent of all the national flood properties, but they claim 40 percent of all Federal flood insurance pay-outs. Over the last 18 years, repetitive losses from these properties have cost the taxpayers over $2.5 billion.

My legislation would deny national Federal flood insurance coverage to people who file two or more claims that total more than the value of their property. It would suggest that people who refuse to use Federal money to take the precaution of flood-proofing their homes or relocating out of harm's way would no longer be entitled to continuous Federal payment. Now is the time that we in this Congress ought to dedicate our efforts at every turn to make sure that the numerous local and Federal water agencies are working comprehensively in the watershed, Mr. Speaker.

The next great advance in livability, if my colleagues will pardon the expression, is to be found on the waterfront, and I call on my colleagues to join me in this Congress in a comprehensive approach to a new vision of water resources.

SPECIFICS OF THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would take a few minutes to kind of report on what the last couple weeks were like when I was back home spending time with my constituents during the district work period, conducting 15 town meetings, and I wanted to report today on really the response to the Republican agenda of good schools and low taxes and a secure retirement for all Americans.

I have the privilege of representing a very, very diverse district, the south side of Chicago in the south suburbs of Cook and Will Counties as well as a lot of rural and bedroom communities, and one always listens for the common concerns when they represent a diverse district of cities, suburbs and country.

During the last two weeks I got a pretty good response. People were very supportive of the Republican agenda of strengthening our local schools, of lowering the tax burden for the middle class, of making for a secure retirement for all Americans by strengthening Medicare and Social Security.

I would like to take a few minutes just to talk about some of those specifics of our Republican agenda, and of course let me begin with the Republican efforts to strengthen Social Security and to strengthen Medicare for the next three generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am often asked a common question over the last several years that I have had the privilege of being in the Congress, and that question is: When are you politicians in Washington going to stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund? I was pleased to tell my constituents that this is the year we are going to do that. This is the year we are going to wall off the Social Security Trust fund and say, ''Hands off,'' and my constituents frankly were pretty shocked when they learned that the Clinton-Gore budget actually raids the Social Security trust fund by $351 billion.

I think it is important to note that when we compare Republican efforts to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, which means 100 percent of Social Security according to this chart for Social Security versus the Clinton-Gore proposal for 62 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund going to Social Security and the other 38 percent being spent on other things, that is what this means. The President wants to spend 38 percent of Social Security on new government programs. Republicans, of course, want to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, essentially putting trust back in the trust fund with 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security, and that is a big victory.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to note that the Republican budget sets aside almost $400 billion more than the Clinton-Gore budget for Medicare and Social Security.

Now our second priority in our agenda, of course, is lower taxes for the middle class, and I am one who believes that when the tax burden for the average family in Illinois is about 40 percent of their income going to local, State and Federal Government for taxes, that that tax burden is too high and we need to lower the tax burden, particularly for the middle class. And when we talk about the tax burden, I find that constituents, whether it is at the union hall or the VFW or the local Chamber of Commerce, they tell me that the Tax Code is too complicated, requires too much paperwork, and the majority of people have to hire someone else to fill out the tax forms. And I also point out that the tax burden is really unfair.

As we work this year to lower the tax burden, I believe that our top priority should be to simplify the Tax Code, to address the unfairness in the Tax Code, and of course we need to begin by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Is it right, is it fair that 21 million married working couples on average pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, $1,400 more than an identical couple living together outside a marriage? That is wrong, that our Tax Code punishes marriage.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act has 230 cosponsors. Let us get it done this year. Let us simplify the Tax Code and eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Of course the Republican agenda, a secure retirement and lower taxes also includes strengthening our local schools, and we want to strengthen our local schools by empowering our local school boards and our local teachers and our local parents to run their schools and giving them the flexibility, of course, to meet the needs of local communities, and that is an important shift because previously for 30 to 40 years all the power was moving to Washington. And I talk with local school administrators and school board members. They tell me maybe in Illinois 6 percent of our public schools' budget comes from Washington, but so does two-thirds of the paperwork and almost 100 percent of the mandates, micromanaging how our schools are run.

We want to let local schools run themselves and meet the needs of their local communities, and that is why we want to pass the Ed Flex legislation. My hope, it will be on the President's desk fairly soon.

The other concern that local school board members also share with me is they say, as my colleagues know, ''You've increased funding at the Federal level by 10 percent, even while you've been balancing the budget, increasing funding for education, but if you look at how those dollars have been spent, only 70 cents of every dollar actually reaches the classroom. Thirty cents is lost in the Washington bureaucracy.''

Our goal is to ensure that more dollars get to the classroom, with a goal of 95 cents on the dollar reaching the classroom, and if we compare that to the current cost of delivering those funds to our local schools, that is a 25 percent funding increase above and beyond what they are currently receiving. We are providing $22 billion in Federal funding for our local schools. It is just wrong that 30 cents on the dollar currently is lost in Washington.

Let us help our local schools. Let us lower the tax burden for the middle class. Let us secure retirement by strengthening Medicare and Social Security.

PUERTO RICANS—FIRST CLASS CITIZENS IN TIMES OF WAR, BUT SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN TIMES OF PEACE

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, as we return to our offices from our 2-week Easter recess, many important issues claim our immediate attention, not the least of which is the crisis in Kosovo. The matter is further complicated by our concerns about the three American soldiers being held prisoners by the Serbian government. Our prayers are with them and with their families at this critical period.

Throughout our Nation's history it has been demonstrated that our commitment to democratic values and securing peace and stability throughout the world has in many instances required the mobilization of our armed forces for the common good. During this century, in our dedication to peace and harmony amongst all people, we have opposed the forces of genocide and the inhumanity and cruelty of those who aim to ethnically cleanse a population, and this time it is not any different. The NATO allies stand firmly behind the aim to secure peace in the Yugoslavia region.

And now in this endeavor, just like we have in every other armed conflict throughout the century, the American citizens that reside in Puerto Rico stand shoulder-to-shoulder with their fellow American citizens from every other State, ready and willing to contribute in any way possible to the establishment of justice and freedom. Because we are proud to enjoy the freedoms that our Nation stands for, we have been willing to accept the responsibilities and sacrifices that are demanded. The discharge of this important trust is what patriotism is all about.

Inherent in this quest for freedom is the belief in equality. Only as equals can we join in the common quest.

□ 0945

Our Nation's first elected leader, President George Washington, said it best when he wrote that ''the spirit of freedom beats too high in us to submit to slavery.''

President Washington's message to the Senate and the House of Representatives of January 8, 1790, underscored this guiding belief in equality. He said, and I quote, ''The welfare of our country is the object to which our cares and efforts are to be directed. And I shall derive great satisfaction from a cooperation with you, in the pleasing though arduous task of ensuring to our fellow citizens the blessings which they have a right to expect from a free, efficient and equal government.''

What is difficult to understand is how, despite our Nation's adoption of equality as one of the guiding principles of our democracy, we, the American citizens who reside in the territory of Puerto Rico, are not only denied the right to participate as equals

in the democratic process but also denied participation in the safety net programs that all other Americans enjoy in the 50 States. Despite our common vision throughout the century, despite the 197,000 Americans from Puerto Rico who have heard the call to defend democracy, and despite the thousands who willingly paid the price of patriotism and sacrificed their own lives, 4 million American citizens are denied the benefits that all others in the Nation take for granted.

Senator MOYNIHAN told us a decade ago that when people fight for a country, they get a claim on that country. His words ring as true today as they were then. We have been equals during times of war and death, and we aspire to be equals in time of peace, prosperity and in life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to remember at this critical time that separate and unequal policies that promote unfairness and discrimination have no place in our Nation. By virtue of living in a territory, American citizens are denied equality that is inherent in the American system of government. This denial betrays our democracy and the men and women who valiantly defend it.

What is more, let us remember that even though our troops face danger equally, they are not all equal citizens because not all of them enjoy the same participation in the health and education programs that benefit all other Americans.

Puerto Ricans are first-class citizens in times of war, but second-class citizens in times of peace. That is un-American.

THE SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come before the Chamber this morning to talk about an important item for this country, and that is the solvency of Social Security.

I have been in Congress 6 years. When I first came to Congress in the 103rd Congress, and subsequently in the 104th Congress, 105th Congress, I have introduced legislation that would keep Social Security solvent.

This year, I am chairman of a bipartisan Budget Committee Task Force on Social Security. The problem of solvency justifies a few minutes of review and comment.

Most workers today look forward to some kind of Social Security when we retire based on the fact that most of us now pay 12.4 percent out of every dollar we earn as a Social Security tax. Most workers anticipate that there is going to be some return on that kind of contribution to the Social Security system.

However, we were told back in 1993 by the Congressional Budget Office, and by the President's Office of Management and Budget, that Social Security would be going broke.

Now, in the last several months, we have been hearing from both sides of the aisle, the Democrats and the Republicans, that paying down the public debt with some of the Social Security surplus would somehow save Social Security. Not so. Not so, Mr. Speaker.

It is good and it is historic that for the first time in recent history we will not be using the Social Security surplus for other government spending programs. So when some have bragged about having a balanced budget in the past, they have been misleading. It has been somewhat of a hoodwinking of the American public, because we have depended all these years on the surplus coming in from Social Security to mask the deficit.

The good news is that this year, for the first time in many, many years, we will not be spending that Social Security trust fund surplus. Now we have got to have the intestinal fortitude, we have got to have the willingness, to face the tough problem of saving Social Security and Medicare. That means a restructuring of the program.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, the problem is based on demographics. There are more and more retirees in relation to the number of workers paying in those taxes. Let me just give you a quick example of why depending on current worker taxes to pay current retiree benefits is a problem.

In 1950, there were 17 people working, paying in their Social Security taxes that was immediately sent out to beneficiaries. 17 to 1. This year there are three workers paying in their Social Security tax for every one retiree, and the estimate is that by 2030 there will be only two workers trying to come up with enough to support their families and one retiree. So there has to be some structural changes in the way the Social Security system works.

It is a tough decision, and that is why politicians have not dealt with it. There are only two ways to save Social Security. That is, either reduce benefits or increase the amount of revenue coming in. One way to increase revenue is private investment. However, that by itself will not fix Social Security.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have the gumption, the fortitude, the willingness to step up to the plate to make the hard decisions in order to save Social Security. Let us hope that the American people are willing to learn about the complicated ways Social Security is financed and to encourage their representatives in Congress to move ahead. Let us be clear that even though using the Social Security surplus to pay down the public debt is better public policy than using the money to finance more government spending, it does not save Social Security.

LET US KEEP MEDICARE A SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC PROGRAM

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we received good news 2 weeks ago when the Medicare and Social Security trustees reported that both programs will be solvent significantly longer than projected. For Medicare, the trustees reported that the Medicare trust fund will remain solvent through at least 2015.

Those in Congress, the think tanks and the Washington pundits who want to privatize Medicare are wringing their hands over the trustees' latest report. They believe these new projections will lead Congress to do nothing towards reforming Social Security and Medicare.

Once again, Medicare privatizers are wrong. The real threat to Medicare is not its alleged pending bankruptcy. The real threat to Medicare is a legislative proposal just rejected by the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare which would have privatized Medicare and delivered it to the private insurance market.

Under a proposal soon to be introduced called ''premium support,'' Medicare would no longer pay directly for health care services. Instead, it would provide each senior with a voucher good for part of the premium for private coverage. Medicare beneficiaries could use this voucher to buy into the fee-for-service plan sponsored by the Federal Government or to join a private plan.

To encourage consumer price sensitivity, the voucher would track to the lowest cost private plan; Medicare privatizers tell us that seniors could then shop for the plan that best suits their needs, paying the balance of the premium and extra if they want higher quality care. The proposal would create a new, private system of health coverage but it would abandon Medicare's fundamental principle of egalitarianism.

Today, the Medicare program is income-blind. All seniors have access to the same level of care. The idea that vouchers would empower seniors to choose a health plan that best suits their needs is simply, Mr. Speaker, a myth. The reality is that seniors will be forced to accept whatever plan they can afford.

The goal of the Medicare Commission was to ensure the program's long-term solvency. This proposal will not do

that. Supporters of the voucher plan say it would shave 1 percent per year from the Medicare budget over the next few decades. That is still not enough to prevent insolvency, and it is based frankly on overly optimistic projections of private sector performance. Bruce Vladeck, a former administrator of the Medicare program and a commission member, doubted the commission plan would save the government even a dime.

Efforts to privatize Medicare are, of course, nothing new. Medicare beneficiaries have long been able to enroll in private managed care plans. Their experience, however, does not bode well for a full-fledged privatization effort. These managed care plans are already calling for higher government payments. They are dropping out of unprofitable markets and they are cutting back on benefits to America's elderly.

Managed care plans are profit driven and they do not tough it out when those profits are unrealized. We learned this lesson the hard way last year when 96 Medicare HMOs deserted more than 400,000 Medicare beneficiaries, including in Lorain and Trumbull Counties, Ohio, because the HMOs did not meet their profit objectives.

Before the Medicare program was launched in 1965, more than half the Nation's seniors were uninsured. Private insurance was the only option for the elderly, but insurers did not want seniors to join their plans because they knew that seniors would actually use most of their coverage. The private insurance market has changed considerably since then, but it still avoids high risk enrollees and, whenever possible, dodges the bill for high-cost medical services.

The problem is not necessarily malice or greed. It is the expectation that private insurers can serve two masters, the bottom line and the common good. Logically, always looking to the bottom line, our system of private insurance has left 43 million uninsured individuals in the United States. If the private insurance industry cannot figure out how to cover these people, most of whom are middle-income workers and children, how will they treat high-risk, high-cost seniors?

If we privatize Medicare, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same level of quality health care. We are betting on a private insurance system that puts its own interests ahead of health care quality and a balanced Federal budget.

The Medicare Commission wisely disbanded without delivering a final product. Premium support proponents must realize that they cannot make Medicare privatization look like an equitable, fair alternative to the public program upon which 36 million seniors in this country depend. Premium support backers also have repeatedly tried to scare America's seniors by predicting that Medicare will go bankrupt.

Congress would not let Medicare go bankrupt any more than it would let the Department of Defense run out of money.

The goal is simple. Let us keep Medicare the successful public program it has always been.

TROOPS TO TEACHERS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act of 1999. This legislation will enable retiring military personnel to find rewarding second careers as teachers in our Nation's public schools.

As we all know, our schools and students are in desperate need of more high-quality teachers. This bill, which I am introducing with the support of my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), will help provide those teachers. This bill not only reauthorizes Troops to Teachers, but also strengthens and improves the enormously successful program.

Troops to Teachers was created in 1994 to assist military personnel who were affected by military downsizing find second careers in which they could utilize their knowledge, professional skills and expertise in our Nation's schools. The program offers counseling and assistance to help participants identify teacher certification programs and employment opportunities.

Since its authorization in 1994, Troops to Teachers has helped over 3,000 active duty soldiers enter our Nation's classrooms and make significant contributions to the lives of our students.

□ 1000

These military personnel turned teachers have established a solid reputation as educators who bring unique real-world experiences to the classroom. They are dedicated, mature, and experienced individuals who have proven to be effective teachers, as well as excellent role models. They are also helping fill a void felt in many public school districts. Over three-quarters of the Troops to Teachers participants are male, compared with about 25 percent in the overall public school system, and over 30 percent of these teachers belong to a minority racial ethnic group.

In addition, a large portion of these teachers are trained in math, science, and engineering, and about half elect to teach in inner city or rural schools. Overall, the retention of these teachers is much higher than the national average.

Not surprisingly, Troops to Teachers is winning glowing reviews from educational administrators, teachers and legislators. Education Secretary Richard Riley praised the program as an new model for recruiting high quality teachers.

School principals and superintendents who have employed Troops to Teachers participants are overwhelmingly supportive of the program. In a 1995–1996 survey, over 75 percent of the principals and superintendents rated Troops to Teachers participants as above average or higher.

The authorization of this successful program is set to expire at the end of this year. My colleagues and I have introduced the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act in an effort to reauthorize the program and strengthen some aspects of it so it operates more efficiently and more effectively, and targets the educational needs of our students.

I hope my House colleagues will join me in preserving this education success story by cosponsoring the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act.

INDIA MISSILE TEST SHOULD BE SEEN IN CONTEXT OF CHINESE THREAT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in light of India's test launch of the Agni missile on Sunday, I want to state today or stress today that the U.S. should look at India's action in light of China's threat to the Indian subcontinent. We should view this step by India in the context of the ongoing threat posed by China, and the fact that Pakistan's missile development program has developed so quickly because of Chinese support.

The weekend's developments further demonstrate the need for a U.S. policy with regard to South Asia that turns away from the current stance of confrontation with India and towards recognition of India's legitimate security needs. We should have increased consideration for the prospects of greater Indo-U.S. cooperation in responding to the threats posed by China.

Mr. Speaker, last week's visit by the Chinese premier to Washington also raised important questions about how China, a potential adversary, and India, a potential partner threatened by China, are treated in terms of U.S. policy.

Last week official Washington witnessed the arrival of Premier Zhu with

fanfare and ceremony at the White House, suggesting the visit of an international leader who was a trusted friend and partner. But during the premier's visit, as with other high level meetings between the United States and China, we kept hearing of the need for engagement, despite the fact that China has a terrible human rights record and has actually stepped up the pressure on dissidents; despite the fact that China threatens her neighbors, including Taiwan, and provides missile technology to unstable regimes like Pakistan; and despite, and I stress again, despite the growing evidence of Chinese espionage of American nuclear weapons secrets.

Yet, at the same time, when it comes to our relations with the world's largest democracy, that is India, we keep that country at arm's length, ever wary of their intentions and motives.

If pure economics were the only consideration, our policy double standard with the two Asian giants still would not make any sense, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, because India's population is almost as large as China's, and will surpass China early in the next century. India offers opportunities for American trade and investment at least comparable to China, and India does not threaten fundamental U.S. interests, which is more than we can say about China.

Furthermore, India, a country that holds regular elections at the national and local levels, is seriously committed to improving her human rights situation and the treatment of all minority communities, again, much more than can be said for China.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to shift our focus from simply condemning India for becoming a nuclear power, which whether we like it or not is a reality, to adjusting our thinking to this new reality and working to promote peace, security, confidence-building, and nonproliferation in South Asia.

Within our U.S.-South Asia policy, our narrow India-Pakistan focus overlooks the role of China. I believe that China is the real threat to India, as well as to U.S. interests and to regional security. It is in this context that India's potential role as a partner for peace and stability should be understood. Even if the current climate for partnership is not ideal, at least we should stop seeing India as a threat.

In particular, India has legitimate concerns about China's support for Pakistan's nuclear and missile programs. A Rand study published last year indicated that technical help from China, as well as North Korea, is responsible for the accelerated development of Pakistan's missile program. In addition, China invaded India in 1962, and continues to have designs on Indian territory. Since the U.S. should also view China as a potential adversary, there is a growing convergence of American and Indian objectives for responding to China.

Mr. Speaker, in a previous statement on the Floor of the House of Representatives in February I said that the U.S. should pay attention to the emerging notion of minimum deterrence in the Indian subcontinent, combined with a declared policy of no first use of nuclear weapons.

I have always believed that our goal should be to make India a partner in the American foreign policy goal of minimizing the threat of nuclear war. One way of accomplishing this is to take the long overdue step of accepting India as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. While I recognize there is opposition to this step, we must find ways to make India a partner for peace for purposes of confidence-building, and also avoiding the dangers of isolation.

THE VINDICATION OF SUSAN McDOUGAL AND THE CONFIRMATION OF BILL LANN LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning there are several things on my mind that I would like to share with this body. In particular, let me acknowledge and congratulate the vindication of Susan McDougal. When asked the question, what happened in that case and how did she feel, she clearly acknowledged the fact that all of us knew would come to light: Susan McDougal told the truth, that there was no substance in Whitewater to attribute illegal activities to the President and First Lady of the United States. During her tenure, truth was not enough for the special prosecutor and the special Independent Counsel, but a jury in Arkansas has vindicated her.

The same thing with the contempt charge for the President. A sad day, a sad occurrence. But it was what we argued in the Committee on the Judiciary, which was this was a civil matter that would be handled by the civil courts. Today that has occurred, or yesterday that has occurred.

Unfortunately, the tragedy of impeachment proceeded because others disagreed and felt that matters that could have been handled by the courts were the responsibility of this body to take on the highest act that this body could take in the impeachment of a president.

I am very happy, however, that the people of the United States saw the facts of this situation, and that this individual, the President of the United States, was not impeached, or was not convicted of these particular acts.

With that, let me also bring to the attention of this body the need to move forward with the confirmation of the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Bill Lann Lee. This gentleman has served in this position for almost 2 years as the Acting Attorney General. Yet, it has not been seen fit to confirm him by the other body.

He has worked tirelessly and within the laws of the land. He is an outstanding civil rights attorney. He is a first generation Asian American. He has worked in the civil rights area for some 23 years. He has spent his time with his nose to the grindstone. He has in fact worked very hard, but he has not worked viciously, or with vindictiveness.

I have seen him work in my district, coming to Houston and joining me in a town hall meeting on hate crimes after the death of James Barrett, Junior. He has also worked with cases like the shooting death of Pedro Oregon, so he is concerned about law enforcement, but he is also concerned about justice, as well.

Mr. Lann Lee is someone who brings the kind of practical experience and leadership to the Justice Department that is needed. He has maintained a sense of dignity, and realizes that, although when we talk about civil rights there are those who will raise their voices and say, well, we have already crossed that hurdle, America is beyond that, there is no need to address those issues, and of course people will speak without facts, but I can assure them, with the devastating opinions like that in Texas, which has denied access of Hispanics and African-Americans to institutions of higher learning, with job discrimination against women in the work force, with the lack of equal pay for equal work, I can assure Americans that although they may want to turn their heads and may not want to hear about civil rights, it is important for those of us who uphold the law to not turn our heads, to not be afraid of the truth, but go forward and take the higher ground, and work with those of good will and good faith and ensure that this is truly a land of equal opportunity.

Bill Lann Lee does nothing but follow the law. He is not in any way changing the law. He is not interpreting the law, making the law in his own form. He is following the law of the land, which is affirmative action; not quotas, but the outreach to individuals to give them an opportunity, to give them a helping hand, not a handout.

He is following the law on fighting against discrimination of women in the workplace. He is following the law on being against the hate crimes like those perpetrated against James Byrd, Junior. He is following the law when he is investigating the allegations of police brutality that are not a respecter

of color, creed, or religion, but happen across the Nation. He is following the law when he protects good law enforcement, as well.

As indicated by Sandy Bernard, who was president or is president of the 150,000 member American Association of University Women, in an editorial in the Houston Chronicle on Monday, April 12, 1999, ''For more than a year Lee has done an outstanding job as the Acting Assistant Attorney General, enforcing our Nation's civil rights laws effectively, fairly, and vigorously. His work on behalf of women is impressive, and he is moving forward.''

We cannot ask Bill Lann Lee, Mr. Speaker, to change the laws that he has to enforce. What we can simply do is say, do your job. He should be confirmed and confirmed now.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the article in the Houston Chronicle of Monday, April 12, 1999.

The article referred to is as follows:

GET PAST POLITICS, APPROVE BILL LANN LEE NOMINATION

Civil rights laws are designed to protect equal opportunity, but these laws are meaningless without a strong leader to enforce them. That leader is Bill Lann Lee. The Senate must confirm Lee as assistant attorney general for civil rights if we are going to guarantee equal protection for all.

For more than a year, Lee has done an outstanding job as the acting assistant attorney general enforcing our nation's civil rights laws effectively, fairly and vigorously.

His work on behalf of women is impressive. He has challenged public-sector employment practices that have excluded women from many traditionally male jobs. He has enforced Title IX—the law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education—in many federal training and educational programs.

As chair of the National Task Force on Violence Against Health Care Providers, created after the murder of Dr. Barnett Slepian, he has vigorously protected reproductive health care providers. He has made prevention and prosecution of hate crimes a top priority of the division under his leadership.

Prior to his current position, Lee worked for two decades as a civil rights attorney and a champion of equal opportunity. He negotiated settlements in cases that successfully broke down workplace barriers, especially those that kept women from advancing. Lee made a name for himself by bringing about positive change through the law and building consensus and partnerships—something we need more of in Washington.

So what is the problem? I comes down to politics. In 1997 the Senate, Judiciary Committee held up Lee's nomination though he was clearly qualified for the job. Some senators thought that Lee would support ''unconstitutional'' affirmative action policies. Yet these policies are the law of the land. In fact, Lee has strictly adhered to recent Supreme Court rulings on affirmative action.

If our elected officials have an issue with the law, they should not take it out on those appointed to uphold the law. Interestingly, recent votes in the House and Senate have been supportive of affirmative action. It seems the Senate Judiciary Committee would rather hold the nation to its own agenda than allow a vote where the outcome may be disagreeable to them.

The American Association of University Women was sure of Lee's ability when he was first nominated a year ago, and we are only more convinced today. Lee's 23-year history of fighting discrimination and working for justice speaks for itself. His excellent work over the past year should be rewarded with a confirmation so he can continue his job.

By confirming Bill Lann Lee, the Senate will demonstrate that it can rise above political pettiness and prove its commitment to advancing civil rights for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the nation of a continuing injustice. I rise to tell the nation of an attorney with impeccable credentials and qualifications to be the next Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at the United States Department of Justice. I rise today to remind you of the story of Bill Lann Lee.

It is now more than two years since his appointment to fill the position of Assistant Attorney General. Yet, his appointment to be the next Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division has been frozen for more than two years in the Senate. The Senate has refused to complete the confirmation process.

Mr. Lee is one of the country's leading civil rights attorneys, with a long and distinguished history of defending the rights of all Americans. Mr. Lee's distinguished legal career has spanned more than 23 years. He has tirelessly spent his career seeking equal opportunity for all people and working diligently against discrimination in all forms, including employment, housing, voting and education. Mr. Lee has extensive experience in civil rights law.

Yet despite all these accomplishments, his confirmation remains unfinished. A man whose experience in civil rights law includes extensive work in employment discrimination, health care, prevention of lead poisoning in poor children, access to public transportation, and equal access to education.

I know first hand Mr. Lee brings a reasoned approach to his post. He has served the interests of his client, the American people without hesitation. During the last two years, he has served the nation as the Acting Assistant Attorney General. He has won my respect with his straightforward approach and on many occasions he has responded to the needs of the 18th Congressional District. Mr. Lee came to Houston to participate in a Town Hall Meeting on Hate Crimes.

During his two years as Acting Assistant Attorney General the Civil Rights Division has enforced the laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and other factors. Known as a skilled consensus builder, he has tirelessly worked to improve civil rights for all Americans.

Bill Lann Lee brings the kind of practical experience and leadership to the Justice Department that is needed. His leadership of the Civil Rights Division has included many issues including the monitoring of elections and investigating the police as well as protecting citizens with disabilities. One needs to look no further than events in Jasper, TX and New York City to see the leadership of Bill Lann Lee.

I praised President Clinton in 1997 when he made this appointment and I continue my support today. It is long past the time that the Senate should have taken action to confirm Bill Lann Lee as the nation's Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to complete this process. Congress needs to reaffirm its commitment to civil rights and we can send no greater sign than to confirm Bill Lann Lee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded not to refer to the personal conduct of the President of the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are thankful, gracious God, that with all our differences of tradition and experience, and with the contrasts between us that mark our individuality, we are still bound together by Your creative spirit. We are grateful, O God, this spirit can unite us and make us whole, that this spirit can show us the way to live in harmony and concord, that this spirit can show us the power of faith and hope and love. Breathe into our hearts and souls, O God, this spirit of unity and peace, and may we so learn to live our lives that we testify to the wonder of Your grace. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COSTELLO 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. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urging the President to assert clearly United States opposition to such a unilateral declaration of statehood.

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

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution concerning the 20th Anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act.

SUPPORT H.J. RES. 37, REQUIRING TWO-THIRDS VOTE IN CONGRESS FOR PASSAGE OF TAX INCREASES

(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, on Thursday, the Federal Government will reach out its big hands and its sticky fingers and stick them into the pockets of every hard-working man and woman in this country.

Two days from today, April 15, Mr. Speaker, the tax man comes into every working family's home to collect his dues. Well, enough is enough.

That is why I am supporting H.J. Res. 37, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution and requires the House and the Senate to garner a two-thirds majority vote for passage of any legislation that will result in a tax increase.

At a time when the Republican Party is trying to whittle down the tax bite of the Federal Government, to ease the tax burdens on American families, the least we can do is enact common sense legislation to make it harder to raise taxes.

Taxes are currently too high, and now this country is starting to run a budget surplus. The last thing Congress should do is dig deeper into the pockets of hard-working taxpayers.

We should all support tax cuts, support a constitutional amendment that makes it more difficult to raise taxes, and by doing this we will be supporting America and its future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any small change that may be left in our pockets.

CHINA SHOULD NOT BE ADMITTED TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

(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, last year Members vowed that China would not violate any African trade program we passed. Well, guess what, reports quote Chinese leaders as saying China will set up assembly plants in Africa with Chinese equipment, Chinese technology and, guess what, Chinese workers as well.

To further quote this madness, they said China is determined to circumvent any U.S. quotas on Chinese products.

Disgusting. And after all this, certain Members and certain individuals at the White House still want to admit China to the World Trade Organization. Beam me up. What is next here, a monument to Mao Tse-tung right in Washington?

I yield back a $200 billion trade deficit that threatens every man, woman and child in America, as well as our national security.

VOLUNTEER MIAMI FAIR A SUCCESSFUL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, April 17, South Florida will once again become the center of opportunity as the second annual Volunteer Miami fair commences.

At Miami-Dade Community College's Wolfson Campus, hundreds of South Floridians will gather to demonstrate their commitment to their communities and their willingness to serve. At Volunteer Miami we will learn ways in which to utilize our talents and skills and focus our energy on promoting positive, effective change for South Florida.

Martin Luther King stated, ''Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. You don't have to have a college degree to serve. You don't have to make your subject and verb agree to serve. You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.''

In my district, the rewards reaped by volunteerism has been immeasurable.

I thank Dr. Eduardo Padron, David Lawrence and Valerie Taylor for making this service extravaganza possible, and I thank the hundreds of dedicated volunteers who know that, by sharing a little of their time, they can truly make a difference.

I hope that my congressional colleagues will be inspired to organize similar volunteer fairs in their districts to unleash the power behind volunteerism.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that April is Child Abuse Prevention Month.

The most recent data compiled by the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse shows now that more than 3 million cases of child abuse and neglect are reported annually. That number is shocking considering that child abuse is preventable.

Research shows substance abuse and the lack of parenting skills to be the main causes. We can respond by ensuring that alcohol and drug treatment programs and parenting classes are funded and accessible.

Of course, our strongest weapons are knowledge, awareness and compassion. Every responsible adult can help by learning more about the problem, by supporting parents and children at risk in their communities, and by reporting incidents of abuse.

A group of my constituents in Grand Island, Nebraska, has again this year made blue ribbons available to us to acknowledge Child Abuse Prevention Month. It is a small symbol of our commitment to fighting and ending the problem, and I hope all of my colleagues will wear theirs proudly.

AIR WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA NOT SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN PEOPLE, JUST LIBERAL MEDIA

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the Fox Network reported costs of $3 billion for the air war against Yugoslavia, and that was before it was reported that General Clark has now asked for several hundred more U.S. aircraft.

Yesterday, in The Washington Post, Columnist Robert Novak reported that we had bought Russia's neutrality with another $4.6 billion IMF loan. We will spend many billions in addition more on ground troops and reconstruction costs after Milosevic comes down. All of this against a tiny country that was no threat whatsoever to us, and where we made things many times worse by our bombings.

Last week the largest talk radio program in Knoxville asked if we should send ground troops into Kosovo. Only one caller was in favor. Everyone else was strongly opposed.

Our very liberal national media is doing everything it possibly can to escalate this war, so the true story will probably never be adequately reported, and that is that this war is a great miscalculation being carried out at almost obscene expense to the American people.

TORNADO IN SOUTHWEST OHIO

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday a terrible tornado ripped through the heart of the district I represent in Southwest Ohio. Eight hundred homes were destroyed or damaged. The Cities of Blue Ash, Montgomery, and Loveland, Symmes, Sycamore and Deerfield Townships were the hardest hit. Dozens of businesses were damaged and destroyed, four people killed, 34 injured, and hundreds of southwest Ohioans are tonight without a home. Our hearts go out to these families who are now trying to put their lives back together.

The good news is that they are getting help. There has been a remarkable outpouring of support from their neighbors to help people pull their lives back together. I spent the last few days working along with State and local officials, the Red Cross, other volunteers, police and fire fighters, and Federal officials from SBA and FEMA.

People from every neighborhood in our region have come to help. Folks in our area have really rallied behind these hard-hit communities. Our prayers go out to the families, and our thanks and appreciation go out to all the hard-working volunteers, emergency management personnel and local officials who, I believe, have done an outstanding job at a very difficult time.

But we need more help. I urge President Clinton to take prompt action on Ohio Governor Bob Taft's request that Southwest Ohio be declared a Federal disaster area.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, 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.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

MADRID PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 769) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 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 ''Madrid Protocol Implementation Act''.

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE MADRID AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION OF MARKS.

The Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1051 and following) (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'') is amended by adding after section 51 the following new title:

''TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

''SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this title:

''(1) MADRID PROTOCOL.—The term 'Madrid Protocol' means the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, adopted at Madrid, Spain, on June 27, 1989.

''(2) BASIC APPLICATION.—The term 'basic application' means the application for the registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

''(3) BASIC REGISTRATION.—The term 'basic registration' means the registration of a mark that has been granted by an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

''(4) CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term 'Contracting Party' means any country or intergovernmental organization that is a party to the Madrid Protocol.

''(5) DATE OF RECORDAL.—The term 'date of recordal' means the date on which a request for extension of protection that is filed after an international registration is granted is recorded on the International Register.

''(6) DECLARATION OF BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE THE MARK IN COMMERCE.—The term 'declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce' means a declaration that is signed by the applicant for, or holder of, an international registration who is seeking extension of protection of a mark to the United States and that contains a statement that—

''(A) the applicant or holder has a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce,

''(B) the person making the declaration believes himself or herself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he or she makes the declaration, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce, and

''(C) no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form of the mark or in such near resemblance to the mark as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, firm, corporation, or association, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

''(7) EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—The term 'extension of protection' means the protection resulting from an international registration that extends to a Contracting Party at the request of the holder of the international registration, in accordance with the Madrid Protocol.

''(8) HOLDER OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—A 'holder' of an international registration is the natural or juristic person in whose name the international registration is recorded on the International Register.

''(9) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.—The term 'international application' means an application for international registration that is filed under the Madrid Protocol.

''(10) INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—The term 'International Bureau' means the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

''(11) INTERNATIONAL REGISTER.—The term 'International Register' means the official collection of such data concerning international registrations maintained by the International Bureau that the Madrid Protocol or its implementing regulations require or permit to be recorded, regardless of the medium which contains such data.

''(12) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—The term 'international registration' means the registration of a mark granted under the Madrid Protocol.

''(13) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DATE.—The term 'international registration date' means the date assigned to the international registration by the International Bureau.

''(14) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—The term 'notification of refusal' means the notice sent by an Office of a Contracting Party to the International Bureau declaring that an extension of protection cannot be granted.

''(15) OFFICE OF A CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term 'Office of a Contracting Party' means—

''(A) the office, or governmental entity, of a Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks, or

''(B) the common office, or governmental entity, of more than 1 Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks and is so recognized by the International Bureau.

''(16) OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—The term 'office of origin' means the Office of a Contracting Party with which a basic application was filed or by which a basic registration was granted.

''(17) OPPOSITION PERIOD.—The term 'opposition period' means the time allowed for filing an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, including any extension of time granted under section 13.

''SEC. 61. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS BASED ON UNITED STATES APPLICATIONS OR REGISTRATIONS.

''The owner of a basic application pending before the Patent and Trademark Office, or the owner of a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office, who—

''(1) is a national of the United States,

''(2) is domiciled in the United States, or

''(3) has a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the United States,

may file an international application by submitting to the Patent and Trademark Office a written application in such form, together with such fees, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

''Upon the filing of an application for international registration and payment of the prescribed fees, the Commissioner shall examine the international application for the purpose of certifying that the information contained in the international application corresponds to the information contained in the basic application or basic registration at the time of the certification. Upon examination and certification of the international application, the Commissioner shall transmit the international application to the International Bureau.

''SEC. 63. RESTRICTION, ABANDONMENT, CANCELLATION, OR EXPIRATION OF A BASIC APPLICATION OR BASIC REGISTRATION.

''With respect to an international application transmitted to the International Bureau

under section 62, the Commissioner shall notify the International Bureau whenever the basic application or basic registration which is the basis for the international application has been restricted, abandoned, or canceled, or has expired, with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration—

''(1) within 5 years after the international registration date; or

''(2) more than 5 years after the international registration date if the restriction, abandonment, or cancellation of the basic application or basic registration resulted from an action that began before the end of that 5-year period.

''SEC. 64. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION SUBSEQUENT TO INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

''The holder of an international registration that is based upon a basic application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office or a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office may request an extension of protection of its international registration by filing such a request—

''(1) directly with the International Bureau, or

''(2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau, if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''SEC. 65. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MADRID PROTOCOL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of section 68, the holder of an international registration shall be entitled to the benefits of extension of protection of that international registration to the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Madrid Protocol.

''(b) IF UNITED STATES IS OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—An extension of protection resulting from an international registration of a mark shall not apply to the United States if the Patent and Trademark Office is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

''SEC. 66. EFFECT OF FILING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—A request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States that the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office shall be deemed to be properly filed in the United States if such request, when received by the International Bureau, has attached to it a declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce that is verified by the applicant for, or holder of, the international registration.

''(b) EFFECT OF PROPER FILING.—Unless extension of protection is refused under section 68, the proper filing of the request for extension of protection under subsection (a) shall constitute constructive use of the mark, conferring the same rights as those specified in section 7(c), as of the earliest of the following:

''(1) The international registration date, if the request for extension of protection was filed in the international application.

''(2) The date of recordal of the request for extension of protection, if the request for extension of protection was made after the international registration date.

''(3) The date of priority claimed pursuant to section 67.

''SEC. 67. RIGHT OF PRIORITY FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES.

''The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States shall be entitled to claim a date of priority based on the right of priority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property if—

''(1) the international registration contained a claim of such priority; and

''(2)(A) the international application contained a request for extension of protection to the United States, or

''(B) the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection to the United States is not later than 6 months after the date of the first regular national filing (within the meaning of Article 4(A)(3) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) or a subsequent application (within the meaning of Article 4(C)(4) of the Paris Convention).

''SEC. 68. EXAMINATION OF AND OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION; NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.

''(a) EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this title, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

''(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), a request for extension of protection under this title shall be subject to opposition under section 13. Unless successfully opposed, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused.

''(3) Extension of protection shall not be refused under this section on the ground that the mark has not been used in commerce.

''(4) Extension of protection shall be refused under this section to any mark not registrable on the Principal Register.

''(b) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—If, a request for extension of protection is refused under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall declare in a notification of refusal (as provided in subsection (c)) that the extension of protection cannot be granted, together with a statement of all grounds on which the refusal was based.

''(c) NOTICE TO INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—(1) Within 18 months after the date on which the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office a notification of a request for extension of protection, the Commissioner shall transmit to the International Bureau any of the following that applies to such request:

''(A) A notification of refusal based on an examination of the request for extension of protection.

''(B) A notification of refusal based on the filing of an opposition to the request.

''(C) A notification of the possibility that an opposition to the request may be filed after the end of that 18-month period.

''(2) If the Commissioner has sent a notification of the possibility of opposition under paragraph (1)(C), the Commissioner shall, if applicable, transmit to the International Bureau a notification of refusal on the basis of the opposition, together with a statement of all the grounds for the opposition, within 7 months after the beginning of the opposition period or within 1 month after the end of the opposition period, whichever is earlier.

''(3) If a notification of refusal of a request for extension of protection is transmitted under paragraph (1) or (2), no grounds for refusal of such request other than those set forth in such notification may be transmitted to the International Bureau by the Commissioner after the expiration of the time periods set forth in paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

''(4) If a notification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) is not sent to the International Bureau within the time period set forth in such paragraph, with respect to a request for extension of protection, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused and the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request.

''(d) DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In responding to a notification of refusal with respect to a mark, the holder of the international registration of the mark shall designate, by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, the name and address of a person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person, or mailing to that person, a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

''SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''(a) ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—Unless a request for extension of protection is refused under section 68, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

''(b) EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—From the date on which a certificate of extension of protection is issued under subsection (a)—

''(1) such extension of protection shall have the same effect and validity as a registration on the Principal Register, and

''(2) the holder of the international registration shall have the same rights and remedies as the owner of a registration on the Principal Register.

''SEC. 70. DEPENDENCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNDERLYING INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

''(a) EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau notifies the Patent and Trademark Office of the cancellation of an international registration with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Commissioner shall cancel any extension of protection to the United States with respect to such goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled.

''(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RENEW INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection to the United States shall cease to be valid as of the date of the expiration of the international registration.

''(c) TRANSFORMATION OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION INTO A UNITED STATES APPLICATION.—The holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau at the request of the office of origin, under Article 6(4) of the Madrid Protocol, may file an application, under

section 1 or 44 of this Act, for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration. Such an application shall be treated as if it had been filed on the international registration date or the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection with the International Bureau, whichever date applies, and, if the extension of protection enjoyed priority under section 67 of this title, shall enjoy the same priority. Such an application shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by this subsection only if the application is filed not later than 3 months after the date on which the international registration was canceled, in whole or in part, and only if the application complies with all the requirements of this Act which apply to any application filed pursuant to section 1 or 44.

"SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

''(a) REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.—An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner—

''(1) at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, unless within the 1-year period preceding the expiration of that 6-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; and

''(2) at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, and at the end of each 10-year period thereafter, unless—

''(A) within the 6-month period preceding the expiration of such 10-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; or

''(B) within 3 months after the expiration of such 10-year period, the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with the fee described in subparagraph (A) and an additional fee prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(b) CONTENTS OF AFFIDAVIT.—The affidavit referred to in subsection (a) shall set forth those goods or services recited in the extension of protection on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and the holder of the international registration shall attach to the affidavit a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or shall set forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of extension of protection.

"SEC. 72. ASSIGNMENT OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''An extension of protection may be assigned, together with the goodwill associated with the mark, only to a person who is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment either in a country that is a Contracting Party or in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party.

"SEC. 73. INCONTESTABILITY.

''The period of continuous use prescribed under section 15 for a mark covered by an extension of protection issued under this title may begin no earlier than the date on which the Commissioner issues the certificate of the extension of protection under section 69, except as provided in section 74.

"SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''An extension of protection shall convey the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark, if—

''(1) the extension of protection and the existing registration are owned by the same person;

''(2) the goods and services listed in the existing registration are also listed in the extension of protection; and

''(3) the certificate of extension of protection is issued after the date of the existing registration.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date on which the Madrid Protocol (as defined in section 60(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946) enters into force with respect to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. 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. 769, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 769, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

House Resolution 769 is the implementing legislation for the Protocol Related to the Madrid Agreement on the Registration of Marks, commonly known as the Madrid Protocol. The bill is identical to legislation introduced in the preceding three Congresses, and will send a signal to the international business community, United States businesses, and trademark owners that the 106th Congress is determined to help our Nation, and particularly our small businesses, become part of an inexpensive, efficient system that allows the international registration of marks.

As a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, ratification of the Protocol and the enactment of H.R. 769 will enable American trademark owners to pay a nominal fee to the United States Patent and Trademark Office which will then register the marks in the individual countries that comprise the European Union, or more commonly known as the EU. Currently, American trademark attorneys must hire attorneys or agents in each individual country to acquire protection. This process is both laborious and expensive, and discourages small businesses and individuals from registering their marks in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 769 is an important and noncontroversial bill that will greatly help those American businesses and other individuals who need to register their trademarks overseas in a prompt and cost-effective manner. I implore my colleagues to pass the bill today, and want to express my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the entire subcommittee membership and staff for that matter, who have worked very cooperatively in getting the bill to this point.

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

□ 1115

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

I rise in support of H.R. 769, a bill to implement the Madrid Protocol Agreement providing for an international registration system for trademarks.

I am strongly of the belief that the one-stop shop provided for in the Madrid Protocol whereby trademark applicants can file one application in their own country and in their own language and, in so doing, achieve worldwide protection for their trademarks is in the interest of American businesses.

But while the Protocol took effect 2 years ago, it may never achieve its purpose unless and until the U.S. elects to participate. However, the State Department has not forwarded the treaty to the Senate for ratification because of continuing concerns on the part of the United States regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol.

In particular, under the Protocol, the European Union receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member states. The State Department is concerned that it is a violation of the concept of one vote per country and could set an unfortunate precedent in future international agreements.

While the State Department pursues its concerns with European Commission officials, I believe it is important that we in this body signal our support for the substantive provisions of the Protocol. I know of no opposition to these provisions, nor to this bill. I urge its support.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House

suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 769.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1189) to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1189

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCES AND DISPLAYS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.—Section 110(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) a direct charge'' and inserting ''(i) a direct charge''; and

(2) by striking ''(B) the transmission'' and inserting ''(ii) the transmission''.

(b) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.—Section 112(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(1)'';

(3) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(B) by striking ''(4)'' and inserting ''(3)'';

(C) by striking ''(6)'' and inserting ''(5)''; and

(D) by striking ''(3) and (4)'' and inserting ''(2) and (3)''; and

(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(4)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(3)''; and

(B) by striking ''(5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(4)''.

(c) DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE LICENSE FEES FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORS.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the section 512 entitled ''**Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors**'' as section 513 and placing such section after the section 512 entitled ''**Limitations on liability relating to material online**''; and

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of that chapter by striking

''512. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and inserting

''513. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and placing that item after the item entitled

''512. Limitations on liability relating to material online.''.

(d) ONLINE COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY.—Section 512 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''INJUNCTIONS.—''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (j), by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(3) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—''.

(e) INTEGRITY OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''category or works'' and inserting ''category of works''.

(f) PROTECTION OF DESIGNS.—(1) Section 1302(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''1 year'' and inserting ''2 years''.

(2) Section 1320(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the subsection caption by striking ''ACKNOWLEDGEMENT'' and inserting ''ACKNOWLEDGMENT''.

SEC. 2. OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C.—The section heading for section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1400. Patents and copyrights, mask works, and designs''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF CONFLICTING PROVISION.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.''.

(c) CLERICAL CORRECTION TO TITLE 35, U.S.C.—Section 3(d) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking '', United States Code''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. 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. 1189.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1189, to make technical corrections to title 17 of the United States Code and other laws. An amended version of this bill is presented for passage under suspension of the rules.

The amendment to the reported bill makes further technical corrections to title 17 and other laws. As a result of two major copyright bills which were signed in law late in the 105th Congress, several technical errors need to be corrected in order to prevent confusion. H.R. 1189 corrects these errors by making purely technical amendments to the Copyright Act and other laws. H.R. 1189, Mr. Speaker, does not make any substantive changes in the law.

I am unaware of any opposition to this amendment, and I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 1189.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support also of H.R. 1189, a bill making technical corrections in title 17, the Copyright Act.

If ever a bill were truly technical, this is it. Our committee labored long, hard, and successfully last Congress to produce landmark legislation in the copyright area. The brevity of the bill before us today is testimony to a job well done by all concerned in that effort, and I commend those people.

I commend this technical corrections bill to my colleagues.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1189, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 1999

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 46) to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 46

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 ''Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MEDAL.

The President may award, and present in the name of Congress, a Medal of Valor of appropriate design, with ribbons and appurtenances, to a public safety officer who is cited by the Attorney General, on the advice of the Medal of Valor Review Board, for extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

SEC. 3. BOARD.

(a) BOARD.—There is established a permanent Medal of Valor Review Board (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Board''). The Board shall—

(1) be composed of 11 members appointed in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) conduct its business in accordance with this Act.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(A) Two shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(B) Two shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Two shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(D) Two shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(E) Three shall be appointed by the President, one of whom shall have substantial experience in firefighting, one of whom shall have substantial experience in law enforcement, and one of whom shall have substantial experience in emergency services.

(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—The members of the Board shall be individuals who have knowledge or expertise, whether by experience or training, in the field of public safety.

(3) TERM.—The term of a Board member is 4 years.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not affect the powers of the Board and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(5) OPERATION OF THE BOARD.—

(A) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman and not less than twice each year. The initial meeting of the Board shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the appointment of the last member of the Board.

(B) QUORUM; VOTING; RULES.—A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but the Board may establish a lesser quorum for conducting hearings scheduled by the Board. The Board may establish by majority vote any other rules for the conduct of the Board's business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this Act or other applicable law.

(c) DUTIES.—The Board shall select candidates as recipients of the Medal of Valor from among those applications received by the National Medal Office. Not more often than once each year, the Board shall present to the Attorney General the name or names of those it recommends as Medal of Valor recipients. In a given year, the Board is not required to choose any names, but is limited to a maximum number of 6 recipients. The Board shall set an annual timetable for fulfilling its duties under this Act.

(d) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board considers advisable to carry out its duties.

(2) WITNESS EXPENSES.—Witnesses requested to appear before the Board may be paid the same fees as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code. The per diem and mileage allowances for witnesses shall be paid from funds appropriated to the Board.

(e) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Board may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Board considers necessary to carry out its duties. Upon the request of the Board, the head of such department or agency may furnish such information to the Board.

(f) INFORMATION TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.—The Board shall not disclose any information which may compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or is otherwise required by law to be kept confidential.

SEC. 4. BOARD PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each member of the Board shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board.

(2) All members of the Board who serve as officers or employees of the United States, a State, or a local government, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for those services.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members 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 service for the Board.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.—The term ''Public Safety Officer'' has the same meaning given that term in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

SEC. 7. OFFICE.

There is established within the Department of Justice a national medal office. The office shall staff the Medal of Valor Review Board and establish criteria and procedures for the submission of recommendations of nominees for the Medal of Valor.

SEC. 8. CONFORMING REPEAL.

Section 15 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 is repealed.

SEC. 9. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.

The Attorney General shall consult with the Institute of Heraldry within the Department of Defense regarding the design and artistry of the Medal of Valor. The Attorney General shall also consider suggestions received by the Department of Justice regarding the design of the medal, including those made by persons not employed by the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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. 46.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 46 is called the Public Safety Officer Medal Act of Valor. It creates a national medal for public safety officers who exhibit extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty. While law enforcement agencies at all levels present their own award and medals to those who demonstrate bravery, the United States Government has no medal in recognition of acts of courage and valor committed by public safety officers. This legislation is an attempt to rectify the failure of the United States to award a prestigious medal for public safety officer heroism.

Every now and then, a police officer or a fire fighter confronts a critical choice that could make the difference between life and death. Such moments are not about duty, they are about acting beyond what duty requires. They are about taking major risks of serious injury or even loss of life for the sole reason of saving another person's life. When our men and women in blue make this heroic choice, they distinguish themselves from the vast majority of the public who will probably never be tested in this way. A national medal is the least we can do to express our appreciation for such devotion.

Mr. Speaker, legislation identical to H.R. 46 passed the House by voice vote in the last Congress, but unfortunately, the Senate failed to act before adjournment. I am hopeful that the Senate will see its way clear to pass this act before National Police Week in May. What better way to express our thanks to our men and women in blue than to pass this legislation creating a national medal, given by the President, in the name of the Congress, honoring extraordinary acts of valor?

I might add, of course, and I said this earlier, this not only would apply to police officers but also fire fighters.

Significantly, this award is not limited only to State and local police officers. Federal agents could certainly be nominated for a medal. State and local fire fighters and emergency personnel will also be eligible. Thus, the bill will encompass all public safety officers at all levels of government.

The selection process established by H.R. 46 is simple and inexpensive. The bill creates a permanent Medal of Valor Review Board, comprised of 11 members serving 4-year terms, who shall review and select recipients of the award each year. The board members must be individuals who have knowledge or expertise in the field of public safety. The board is not required to chose any names in a given year but may select up to six recipients annually.

The legislation also establishes a National Medal Office within the Department of Justice, which will establish criteria and procedures for the submission of names of nominees from the law enforcement community and the public. The National Medal Office will staff the Medal of Honor Review Board.

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 46 and estimates that full implementation of the legislation would cost only about $250,000 annually. I believe this is a very small price for the Federal Government to pay to express its gratitude for our Nation's most heroic public safety officers and to set the example nationally that we need to set to encourage those who perform such acts.

I also want to note that this legislation will not displace the Medal of Honor as our country's most significant award. America's entire system of

medals and awards, which has become known as the Pyramid of Honor, was established by an act of Congress in 1918. That act was passed to protect the integrity of the national Medal of Honor, but it had the far-reaching effect of establishing degrees of distinguished service and clearly delineating the type of deed necessary for the awarding of a medal.

H.R. 46 is patterned after the Medal of Honor, but it will not disrupt its place at the top of the pyramid.

Finally, H.R. 46 requires the Attorney General to consult with the Institute of Heraldry, an office housed within the Department of Defense which designs and creates medals and ribbons. The staff at the Institute of Heraldry puts great thought into every aspect of a medal, and every color and detail is significant. To avoid overlapping with a previously established medal, the Attorney General is required to consult with the Institute.

Mr. Speaker, we can never fully know what inspires a person to commit an act of bravery, even to risk his or her own life to save the life of a stranger. Congress must, however, find significant and positive ways to express our thanks and to encourage such acts. I believe that creation of this medal is one way to recognize the frequent and too often unsung acts of valor committed by public safety officers.

This legislation is supported by nearly every national law enforcement association, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the National Troopers Coalition, and the Law Enforcement Alliance of America.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for his support in this legislation and his cooperation in quickly moving the bill to the floor. I look forward to working with my friend from Virginia this Congress to find common ground in the battle against crime.

I also want to thank Nicole Nason on the subcommittee staff for her hard work on this bill. Nicole is leaving the subcommittee, and we will certainly miss her service. We wish to thank her for everything she has done in the past and wish her the best in the future.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) in support of H.R. 46. This bill would establish a Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor to be awarded periodically to a selected public safety officer for extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty. It provides for the Department of Justice to solicit, review, and screen nominations from the law enforcement community for the award. Final decisions on the award would be made by a board appointed by the President and congressional leadership from both parties.

I am a cosponsor of the bill, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Committee on the Judiciary by a unanimous vote. It will not only allow members of the law enforcement community to recognize extraordinary heroism within that profession, but will establish a mechanism for calling that extraordinary valor to the attention of the world.

I urge Members to vote for the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this important legislation to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary courage. By passing this legislation, we continue the tradition of honoring those who exhibit great courage and bravery in the line of duty.

I am a proud co-sponsor of this legislation to honor our nation's public safety officers—police officers, firefighters and emergency medical personnel. Each year, the President would award this medal to a worthy public safety officer.

Already in our small towns, counties and cities, local heroes are honored for their acts of bravery. For example in Texas, we honor peace officers and public servants who are injured in the line of duty through the Fleetwood Memorial Foundation.

Here in Congress, we honor the extraordinary heroism and bravery of our citizens through the Congressional Medal of Honor. Members of the armed services are honored with the prestigious Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal.

It is important to recognize the public servants of our communities because so often their work is overlooked. We witness the acts of heroism performed by our police officers, firefighters and emergency medical personnel every day.

These Officers make a choice to serve their communities. While feelings toward Law Enforcement vary with each individual, all citizens must realize that the role of a peace officer is an important and necessary one.

By supporting this bill, we salute the choices and sacrifices made by peace officers. This legislation will positively influence the way we view law enforcement and it will remind us of the everyday heroic acts that take place in our communities.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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 Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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.

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF FREE AND DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 110) congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections on March 7, 1999.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 110

Whereas on March 7, 1999, the Republic of El Salvador successfully completed its second democratic multiparty elections for President and Vice President since the signing of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and a legitimate nonviolent expression of the will of the people of the Republic of El Salvador;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the efforts of the people of El Salvador to consolidate their democracy and to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections demonstrate the strength and diversity of El Salvador's democratic expression and promote confidence that all political parties can work cooperatively at every level of government; and

Whereas these open, fair, and democratic elections of the new President and Vice President should be broadly commended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the House—

(1) congratulates the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador for the successful completion of democratic multiparty elections held on March 7, 1999, for President and Vice President;

(2) congratulates President-elect Francisco Guillermo Flores Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintanilla Schmidt on their recent victory and their continued strong commitment to democracy, national reconciliation, and reconstruction;

(3) congratulates El Salvadoran President Armando Calderón Sol for his personal commitment to democracy, which has helped in the building of national unity in the Republic of El Salvador;

(4) commends all Salvadoran citizens and political parties for their efforts to work together to take risks for democracy and to willfully pursue national reconciliation in order to cement a lasting peace and to strengthen democratic traditions in El Salvador;

(5) supports Salvadoran attempts to continue their cooperation in order to ensure democracy, national reconciliation, and economic prosperity; and

(6) reaffirms that the United States is unequivocally committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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. 110.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1130

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the statement of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations regarding this bill.

''The chairman of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), introduced this resolution congratulating the Salvadoran people on their most recent free elections. I am pleased to see such a positive, bipartisan expression of support for El Salvador. On March 23, the Senate agreed to a similar measure, Senate Resolution 73, which enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

''It is fitting that we should congratulate the president-elect of this country, Guillermo Flores, and vice president-elect Carlos Quintanilla on their electoral victory. The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front and its candidates, who secured 29 percent of the vote, were also present. The transformation of the FMLN into a political party competing for power in open democratic elections is one of El Salvador's key achievements.

''It is equally fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should recognize outgoing President Armando Calderon Sol. President Calderon Sol's quiet leadership has continued El Salvador's successful implementation of the 1992 peace agreement. Faced with the trials of Hurricane Mitch and an economic downturn, he has ably led El Salvador in binding the wounds of more than a decade of civil conflict. Moreover, President Calderon Sol will certainly be remembered for his achievements in privatizing state-owned enterprises, including the historic privatization of El Salvador's pension system.

''I urge my colleagues,'' the gentleman from New York says, ''to unanimously support H. Res. 110.''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 110 which congratulates the government and the people of El Salvador on the successful completion of its second free and democratic election since the signing of the 1992 peace accords. I strongly commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) for bringing it forward.

It is appropriate to call attention to the democratic process in El Salvador. Just a decade ago, the situation in El Salvador and all throughout Central America was much different than what we see today. Groups on all sides have dropped arms, formed political parties and given the people a fair and just voice. We are right to pause today and commend El Salvador for the stunning transition in the past decade and their successful completion of transparent free and fair elections in which everyone can participate.

Now, this is not to say that all of the problems that led to the violence of the 1980s are resolved. There is still much need for improvement in El Salvador. Turnout was much lower at this election than in the last several in the country, less than 50 percent, because people had a difficult time getting to the polls or actually voting once they arrived at the polls due to disorganization. Many low-income and poor Salvadorans are also questioning whether democracy works for them because inequality and poverty still dominate. It is the role, then, of President-Elect Flores to lead the way in generating more opportunity for Salvadorans so that the benefits of democracy and the motivation to go to the polls is felt by all citizens. We, the United States, need to maintain our commitment to the people of El Salvador.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of El Salvador on their recent election. Since the signing of the peace accords ended their brutal civil war in 1992, Salvadorans have made great strides toward true democracy, reaching lasting peace, and creating a better life for all Salvadorans.

I am very glad to stand here today and talk about elections and democracy in El Salvador—instead of civil war and death squads. When I first visited El Salvador in the 1980s, political parties only knew how to resolve their problems through war.

Now, instead of firing bullets at one another, political parties argue their differences in the National Assembly, build coalitions with one another, and work together in their common interests.

This election is yet another tremendous accomplishment. I would like to congratulate new President Francisco Flores on his election victory, and congratulate the Salvadoran people for holding a free and fair election. Each election, since the signing of their Peace Accords, has been more open and free—and the recent Presidential election continued in that pattern.

Of course I don't want to paint too rosy a picture here. Many serious problems in El Salvador continue to exist. Crime is at record levels, the tremendous poverty that existed before the war remains alarmingly high, and the judicial system continues to stumble.

Even as we talk about a successful election in El Salvador today, a great deal can be accomplished in that area as well. Better organization, a method of precinct voting, and the establishment of a new election registry are necessary election reforms that must be accomplished.

I challenge the Salvadoran people and their government to work hard to achieve these reforms, erase the poverty and inequality that exists, and continue to work together for the better of the country.

And I believe we should be there to help. I know President Flores has many difficult challenges ahead, and I look forward to working with him to do what I can to help Salvadorans continue to move forward. With that in mind, I also challenge this country—the United States—to temember our role in El Salvador.

As we congratulate Salvadorans on yet another step toward democracy, I believe it is also time we acknowledge some of our errors in the past, and make a stronger commitment to assisting all Salvadoran people in their effort to reach those democratic goals.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I rise in support of H. Res. 110, a bill which congratulates El Salvador on its recent Presidential elections.

On Sunday, March 7, the people of El Salvador went to the voting polls to choose a new President and Vice-President. This election marked the second successful Presidential election and third general election since the signing of the 1992 Peace Accords which ended 12 years of brutal civil war in that small country.

H. Res. 110, introduced by myself and several members of the Subcommittee, congratulates the government and the people of El Salvador for completing this successful multiparty election which was deemed to be free and fair by an international observer group which included a member of my Subcommittee staff.

This election, in which every registered political party received votes, represented a clear expression of the will of the people of El Salvador; reaffirmed the success of the Peace Accords; and demonstrated the strength and diversity of the democratic process in El Salvador.

Since 1994, current President Armando Calderon Sol has worked tirelessly to ensure that the peace accords have been properly implemented and that El Salvador progressed both politically and economically out of the post-war era.

For that effort, and for the continued cooperation of the opposition FMLN leadership, El Salvador should be commended.

Now, President-elect Francisco Flores will lead a new government into the new century and I am confident he will continue the progress made thus far in national reconciliation and reconstruction.

We wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of El Salvador have made great strides over the past

seven years. This election serves to validate a key element of that progress and reaffirms their strong commitment to the democratic process.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 110, a resolution congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections. On March 7, 1999, El Salvador held free and fair elections for president and vice-president. I would like to take this time to personally congratulate President-elect Francisco Guillermo Flores Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintilla Schmidt on their recent victory and their continued commitment to democracy. This election was yet another milestone in the normalization of the democratic process in El Salvador, and I wish to commend this nation for its efforts.

El Salvador has come a long way since the 1980's, when the nation was in the midst of a terrible civil war. Many of you will recall that the war cost the lives of tens of thousands of Salvadorans and left the country in shambles. Now, the Salvadorans have replaced bullets with ballots. It was the strong leadership and guidance, coupled with courage, demonstrated by former President Alfredo Cristiani that rescued the country and paved the way for El Salvador's future. His successor, President Armando Calderon Sol, elected in a free and fair contest, held the same commitment to democracy and kept this nation moving forward. The stark contrast between war-torn El Salvador and the El Salvador of today is a tribute to its people and its leaders.

In a time where peace and unity are not always the goal of the majority, I believe Americans must continue to show support for our Salvadoran neighbors and their continued progress through this long and fragile process of democratization. I hope you will join me in congratulating El Salvador on this latest and most remarkable accomplishment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original six cosponsors, I come to the floor in strong support of House Resolution 110. I wish to congratulate the Salvadoran people and President-elect Francisco Guillermo Florez Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintanilla Schmidt on the free and fair conduct of the Presidential elections of March 7, 1999.

Since the signing of the 1992 peace accords, the Republic of El Salvador has conducted two democratic elections for President and Vice President. The peaceful and orderly manner in which these elections have been carried out, with the participation of ten parties representing the entire political spectrum, is proof of El Salvador's commitment to democracy, national reconciliation and reconstruction. Specifically, it demonstrates their ability to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords.

The United States must continue to support the efforts of the people of El Salvador to ensure political stability and the strengthening of the democratic process.

This progress however is being threatened in the wake of Hurricane Mitch. It is paramount that the United States take the lead in helping the region recover from the devastation of the hurricane. If it does not, we risk the unraveling of a fragile democracy and a return to the political instability that the region experienced for decades and threatened our national interests.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution congratulating the people and government of El Salvador on the free and democratic elections held last month.

The people of El Salvador know that the transition to democracy is rarely easy. However, in only a few short years, El Salvador has made great progress. Both international and domestic observers agree that the recent multiparty Presidential and Vice Presidential elections were free and fair.

These elections showed the strength and diversity of El Salvador's new democracy. They showed that political parties can engage in the type of substantive, peaceful debate that would have been unheard of only a few years ago.

But the demands of democracy do not stop with free elections. El Salvador has shown a commitment to democratic ideals by embracing a free press, freedom of religion, and freedom of association. Because there is no government in the world today that couldn't benefit from improvement, I encourage the people and government of El Salvador to seize upon their recent success and work toward improving their new democracy and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, dozens of nations are at a crossroads today. Because democracies are not always neat and tidy, many will be tempted to take the easy path. But the easy path leads toward authoritarianism and inevitably to exploitation. The path toward democracy is sometimes difficult and it is often unsightly. But El Salvador's success stands out as an example of what can be accomplished by choosing the path toward democracy.

Today we congratulate those who have made democracy possible in El Salvador.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 110.

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.

CONGRATULATING QATAR FOR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 35

Whereas His Highness, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, the Emir of Qatar, issued a decree creating a central municipal council, the first of its kind in Qatar;

Whereas on March 8, 1999, the people of the State of Qatar held direct elections for a central municipal council;

Whereas the central municipal council has been structured to have members from 29 election districts serving 4-year terms;

Whereas Qatari women were granted the right to participate in this historic first municipal election, both as candidates and voters;

Whereas this election demonstrates the strength and diversity of the State of Qatar's commitment to democratic expression;

Whereas the United States highly values democracy and women's rights;

Whereas March 8 is recognized as International Women's Day, and is an occasion to assess the progress of the advancement of women and girls throughout the world; and

Whereas this historic event of democratic elections and women's suffrage in the State of Qatar should be honored: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) commends His Highness, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, the Emir of Qatar, for his leadership and commitment to suffrage and the principles of democracy;

(2) congratulates the citizens of the State of Qatar as they celebrate the historic election for a central municipal council; and

(3) reaffirms that the United States is strongly committed to encouraging the suffrage of women, democratic ideals, and peaceful development throughout the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD and say the remarks that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), were he here, would be delivering. He is at the White House today. I would like to give his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is House Concurrent Resolution 35, a concurrent resolution congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on

the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999.

The gentleman from New York is the primary sponsor of this measure and wanted to particularly thank the co-chairs of the Congressional Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for their support for these elections and their cosponsorship of this resolution.

Qatar is a strong ally of the United States in the Persian Gulf and is moving toward the 21st century under the leadership of His Highness, Sheikh Hamad, the Emir of Qatar. That leadership includes expanding the civic contribution to Qatar's governance.

Our colleagues will agree that the United States highly values democracy and women's rights. So we were more than pleased to learn of the successful municipal elections that Qatar had conducted in which women, as well as men, were granted the right to vote and run as candidates.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 applauds the Emir of Qatar for his leadership and commends the citizens of Qatar for participating in this important civic function. Clearly, this election demonstrates the strength and diversity of the State of Qatar's commitment to democratic expression.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 also reaffirms that the United States is strongly committed to encouraging the suffrage of women, of democratic ideals, and peaceful development throughout the Middle East.

We therefore were pleased to learn that the Qatari Government is in the process of drafting a constitution. This document, once adopted, will cause the creation of a Qatari parliament.

Mr. Speaker, in discussions with Qatari officials, they informed us that the State of Qatar considers the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as their structural model. Congress therefore looks forward to these developments and to maintaining and strengthening its relationship with Qatar.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 celebrates an important milestone in the development of Qatar, and I urge our colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to all its citizens by lending their support to this important resolution.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 35, regarding the recent historic elections of a central municipal council in Qatar, and I strongly commend the cochairs of our Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who traveled to Qatar to monitor these elections.

Mr. Speaker, the decree issued by the Emir of Qatar establishing the central municipal council was the first of its kind. The council was structured to have members from 29 election districts serving 4-year terms. For the first time in Qatar history, open elections were ordered and in an unprecedented decision women were granted the right to participate both as candidates and as voters. While these elections were at the municipal level, they were an important expression of a commitment to democratic ideals and the first step toward advancing women's rights in the region. The elections took place on March 8, 1999, a day also celebrated as International Women's Day, further emphasizing the significance of women's suffrage. It is important for the United States Congress to recognize this historic event and to support it as a turning point towards democracy and equal rights for women in Qatar.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of H. Con. Res. 35 to honor the State of Qatar and its citizens on the historic elections that took place there on March 8. I am pleased to have this opportunity to share my recent experiences in Qatar.

I had the great honor to travel to this Persian Gulf country as an election observer with my colleague SUE KELLY, with whom I serve as co-chair of the Women's Caucus.

This marks an historic step toward women having seats at all tables, not only the kitchen table, but the peace table, the economic development table, and international affairs table. All of these opportunities begin with full voting privileges for both men and women—a first among the Gulf Cooperation Council countries of the world.

By comparison, Kuwait has an elected parliament which exercises limited legislative and oversight powers, but women are not allowed to vote.

Oman has an elected Consultative Council, however only selected male and female citizens are enfranchised and the Sultan retains the final say over the composition of the Council.

Bahrain had an elected parliament which was dissolved by the Emir in 1975.

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Saudi Arabia have no elected institutions.

I congratulate the citizens of Qatar on this important step for women. It took America 145 years to give women the right to vote; it took Qatar only 27 years. It is wonderful to see Qatar giving rights to women while other countries like Afghanistan are taking them away. In Afghanistan, women and girls are not permitted to work or to go to school, and they have limited access to health care or prenatal care.

We live in a world economy and we must recognize that elections and democracy help us in our shared world. An elected government is a more stable government. Qatar's step toward democracy directly benefits the United States because it leads us toward stability and peace. It is important for our nation to support the democratic steps of our allies in the Persian Gulf.

It is important to remember that democracy is a journey, not a destination. With the historic step of allowing both men and women to participate in its first-ever municipal elections, Qatar has taken the first step toward embracing democracy.

The Emir, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, is committed to democracy and has even talked of continuing towards democracy by having an elected parliament. He has already made great strides in education and economic development. I was proud to represent the United States and meet with members of Parliament from United Kingdom, France, Germany, Lebanon, Jordan, Morocco, Oman and Kuwait—who came to witness these historic elections.

I was impressed by how carefully planned the election was. Two hundred and forty-two candidates ran in 29 election districts to serve four-year terms on a central municipal council. Six women ran for office. While none of the women won, Dr. Wadha Al Suwaidi came in second in her district by only 28 votes to Nasser Faleh al Dosari.

I had the opportunity to meet with many candidates. They were well educated, and well prepared. Many had very impressive credentials as ambassadors, teachers, and each had prepared a platform of issues on everything from libraries, bridges, and garbage to parks, nurseries, and recycling.

The scene on election day was extraordinary. It looked a lot like an American election, complete with banners, posters and campaign materials. The election was held on a national holiday and schools and many businesses were closed. Many schools were used as polling places, and candidates set up nearby tents to continue campaigning throughout the day.

We saw many long lines in Qatar, and there was a better than 95 percent voter turnout of the registered voters. It reminded me of the long lines seen during South Africa's first election with people standing in lines for hours in the hot sun.

It was a very fair election. They even sealed the ballot boxes with wax during prayer breaks.

I met with many of the candidates. One of the female candidates who I met, Mouza Abdullah Al-Maliki, has been working for the vote for several years. In 1993, she was part of a group that petitioned the previous Emir for the vote. She is very grateful to have the vote. She told me, "It means democracy, it means freedom, it means awareness for women in all aspects of her life."

To celebrate the first ever direct elections in which women have been allowed to participate in the Gulf, it is important that we pass H. Con. Res. 35 congratulating Qatar on its historic elections. I hope that we will be able to move this bill quickly to show America's support for democracy and universal suffrage throughout the world.

ADDITIONAL FACTS

Dr. Wadha al Suwaidi came in second in her district by only 28 votes to Nasser Faleh al Dosari. This is very significant because 50 women in her district didn't vote.

Of the approximately 600,000 people in the country, there are 150,000 Qatari citizens. Of these, about 75,000 are eligible (over age 18

and not a member of the police or military force.) Approximately 23,000 registered, which was split almost 50–50 between men and women.

I saw our American embassy in Qatar, which was recently evacuated. It stood—exposed and vulnerable—right on a busy intersection. Our embassy workers are currently working in makeshift areas, some are even working out of their homes. I hope that work on the new embassy continues, and that our state department personnel will soon be able to work in a safer environment.

In Lebanon, 3 of 128 Members of Parliament are women. One of them is Mouauad Naela whose daughter lives in New York City.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman GILMAN, and Ranking Member GEJDENSON for giving me time to share my support for H. Con. Res. 35, as well as observations from my trip to Qatar last month.

I recently visited Qatar with my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, to witness their historic election on March 8, and lend encouragement to the process that they are beginning. While we were in Qatar, we had the opportunity to meet with the women candidates and Qatari citizens, as well as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Foreign Minister and the Emir's wife, Shaykha Mouza who has been a leader in the effort to bring American institutions of higher education to Qatar in addition to organizing the municipal council elections, which took place on March 8.

In many countries in that region, women lead very sheltered lives and are unable to do many activities that we take for granted. Women are often unable to drive, much less go on to study in college. In Qatar, we saw women doing these things. We saw them everywhere you would expect to see women here in the U.S. interacting in a perfectly normal way, the same way that we do in many instances. This is rather progressive stance for many countries in this region.

On election day, as I traveled with other members of the delegation to the election sites, I was quite pleased to see the widespread support for the elections and the candidates. The election sites were full of life. Campaign materials and supporters were abundant. Qataris were lined up waiting to have their chance to cast their vote. What is more, I think that there are lessons we could learn from the candidates in Qatar as they sat together, sharing coffee with each other, each wishing the other success, even though they were running against one another. They were there together celebrating the beginnings of democracy and representation.

I also thought that the elections were well organized, those who worked at the polling sites did so with the dignity and excitement one would expect for a nation's first endeavor towards democracy.

I realize that there has been concern about the relatively low number of people eligible to vote in the elections. There are approximately 160,000–180,000 citizens in the nation. Just as in the United States there is eligibility criteria for voting. In order to be able to vote, you must be the daughter or son of a father who is a Qatari citizen and was born and raised there. As in the U.S., 18 is the minimum voting age, and the last criteria is, interestingly enough, that the person cannot be a member of the military or be employed by the Ministry of the Interior. The Qataris have concerns about mixing politics and their military forces. The final number of those eligible to vote has not been reported. However, we do know that of the approximate 22,000 people registered to vote, approximately 45% were women.

The queen, Shaykha Mouza spoke to the issue of the careful balance that needs to be struck between the traditional, conservative aspects of their society and the drive to move towards a parliamentary democracy. This is only the first election for a municipal council which is advisory in nature, but it is a valid step. I believe that it is important for us and for Qatar, that we pass this resolution congratulating the Emir's efforts on behalf of his nation.

As we all know, governing is a difficult task. It is a deliberative and often slow process, but the important thing is that the process moves forward. We need to salute and congratulate this nation for their step forward and encourage them to continue on their journey to the great experiment called democracy.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 35, as amended.

The question was taken.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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.

MICROENTERPRISE FOR SELF-RELIANCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Ewing). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 136 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. The purpose of the legislation is to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries. The rule provides for the customary 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report against consideration of the bill. In addition, the rule provides that the bill shall be read by section. The rule permits the Chair to grant priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments and considers them as read.

Further, as has become standard practice in this Congress, the Chair is allowed to postpone recorded votes and to reduce the time for electronic voting on postponed votes, and finally the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, to keep with our record of fair rules for the 106th Congress, I am pleased to report that this resolution is yet another open rule that affords any Member the opportunity to offer any germane amendments.

House Resolution 1143 is much needed legislation to enhance credit opportunities for microenterprises in developing countries. These businesses are so small, 10 or fewer employees, and the average loan is so low; most are less than $300; that they are thought of as microenterprises as opposed to small businesses. Microenterprises are the economy of the very poorest segment of the economy in developing countries, and estimates of their number range from one-third to perhaps one-half of the world's businesses.

Microenterprises have been an area of interest for U.S. foreign assistance for many years. In 1994, the USIA, USAID, formally launched the microenterprise initiative in partnership with Congress to expand funding for that department's microenterprise programs. The summit's goal for that year was to target half of the microenterprise resources to serve the poorest with loans under $300.

The ability to obtain credit is one of the most important factors in starting or expanding a microenterprise. Often these loan amounts are so low that a commercial bank would not find them profitable, or an entrepreneur has very little in the way of collateral, so the bank would consider them too risky. Yet most micro-loan institutions boast repayment rates of 97 percent or better, putting them at least on a par with major banks who lend to more affluent and traditional borrowers. I believe that supporting microentrepreneurs is an excellent investment in dramatically improving the quality of life of millions throughout the world. Providing access to loans can help low-income entrepreneurs expand their inventory or even hire additional employees and can truly enhance a person's self-esteem by giving him or her a genuine opportunity in life.

In addition, microfinance can serve as a powerful tool for building a more inclusive financial sector which serves the broad majority of the world's population, including the very poor and women, and thus generates more social stability and prosperity. This legislation states that the United States should coordinate among the G–7 nations to bolster support for the microenterprise sector by leveraging our investment with that of other donor nations.

H.R. 1143 appropriately makes microenterprise development an important component of U.S. foreign economic policy and assistance by expanding on the commitment of the USAID in its 1994 microenterprise initiative. I believe that in improving the access of the poorest, especially women, to much needed financial resources in developing countries will lead to the development of free, open and equitable international economic systems and contribute to the spread of freedom and human dignity in the world.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my dear colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and the others who have worked so hard on this legislation for their efforts in bringing this very important bipartisan bill forward. I strongly support H.R. 1143 and urge all of my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 1143 which is called the microenterprise bill for self-reliance. It is an act of 1999 of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

As my colleague from Florida has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle, they will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

This is a bipartisan bill that reflects broad congressional support.

A microenterprise is a small business with as few as one or as many as ten employees. Loans to these companies or small businesses are among the most cost-effective ways to help the poor lift themselves out of poverty.

I became familiar with the potential of microenterprise to reduce poverty because of the House Select Committee on Hunger, and I used to chair the international task force of the committee, and later I was chairman of the full committee. The Hunger Committee held hearings, we issued reports, we conducted public forums to inform Congress and the public on the importance of microcredit to reducing hunger and poverty around the world. In one report the Hunger Committee concluded that small loans to microenterprises can significantly raise the living standards of the poor, increase food security and bring about sustainable improvements in local economies. The committee further concluded that credit to microenterprises is one way to help end the cycle of poverty and hunger among urban and rural landless poor in developing countries. The bill before us today strengthens and enhances the United States leadership in the field of microenterprise development to fight hunger and poverty in the world.

I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) of the Committee on International Relations for their commitment to microenterprise and other poverty alleviation programs and for their hard work in bringing this important legislation to the floor. Special thanks is also due to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) for his instrumental leadership on this issue.

The bill is very similar to a measure that was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and myself in the 105th Congress. An amended version of the bill passed the House on a 393 vote to 21, but it got stalled in the Senate. I am particularly pleased that today's bill very closely resembles the original Amo Houghton bill and Hall bill from the last Congress than the version which passed the House.

No U.S.A. program is more effective in assisting poor people to end their own poverty than microenterprise development. The dollars have a multiplier effect since they are recycled to new beneficiaries when loans are repaid.

This bill is a good bill, and it will improve the lives of many of the world's poor with a minimum of cost. It is an open rule that was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule and of the bill.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I would like to thank my friend from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

The underlying bill is vital to the economic growth of developing countries. H.R. 1143 is a bipartisan bill cosponsored by my friend from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), and a number of others and is designed to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries.

For a number of years I have been proud to be a supporter of microenterprise programs. I support H.R. 1143 because it moves us forward and sets the direction for the future of microenterprise programs.

One of the most important elements of this legislation is the requirement to increase the amount of assistance devoted to credit activities designed to reach the poorest sector in developing countries and to improve the access to the poorest, particularly women, to microenterprise credit in developing

countries. We have been informed by the World Bank that more than 1.2 billion people in the developing world, one-fifth of the world's entire population, subsists on less than $1 a day. Today this Congress sends a message that America not only supports the political and religious freedom of all people, but also advocates the economic freedom of people in nations across this globe. The bill will make microenterprise development an important element of United States economic policy and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said that part of our foreign policy to maintain peace abroad was to promote market-oriented solutions to international problems, telling the story abroad of America's free enterprise way of life. As the United States leads the way in developing a new global financial architecture, I believe that microenterprise will play an indispensable role in that quest.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as it moves forward.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much for yielding this time to me, and I ask to be able to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for this time and join in by applauding this rule and, as well, acknowledging the vitality of the microenterprise program in developing nations. According to the World Bank, more than 1.2 billion people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, as we have just heard the previous speaker acknowledge, lives on less than $1 a day, and for Americans that is obviously a stark figure and a shocking figure. But at the same time there is hope, there is genuine desire to do better, and particularly for those small businesses and small-opportunity individuals in developing nations.

Wherever one goes and visits, whether or not it is the continent of Africa, whether or not it is in South America that is close to Texas and Central America, they will find those individuals that simply say, ''If you'll give me a fishing rod instead of a fish, I can make a difference.''

We had an opportunity in the session, the work recess session, to join a presidential mission dealing with the tragedy of HIV AIDS in Africa. Interestingly enough, one would ask how does the microenterprise program deal with the question of HIV AIDS? Mr. Speaker, the real issue along with the tragedy of AIDS, and prevention, and education, the impact on children, the number of offerings that will come about because of the tragedy of AIDS in Africa, is the idea of giving communities an opportunity to self invest and to create businesses where they can stay in these rural areas as opposed to traveling from place to place.

□ 1200

We met, for example, an elderly grandmother who was taking care of a number of her grandchildren due to the tragedy of them losing their parents to HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, one might find it curious and interesting, but she was making banana beer. Part of her efforts were through the support of USAID. Of course, many of these programs interact, but the enterprise program impacts on giving opportunity to those who have ideas to ensure that there is a return on their investment.

In February 1997, a global microcredit summit was held in Washington to launch a plan to expand access to credit for self-employment to the 100 million of the world's poorest families by 2005. I cannot imagine us in any way doing something more effective, more efficient and more far-reaching than to help those individuals who wish to help themselves in developing nations. One of the points we have heard is that we do want to build our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I support the microenterprise program and hope that we can continue to expand it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule for H.R. 1143, a bill to assist microenterprises in developing countries. This bill will authorize grant assistance to further the development of microenterprises in developing countries. The grants are to be provided to businesses, governments and other organizations in both the United States and abroad to expand the availability of financial services, credit and training for microentrepreneurs. In this manner these grants will assist the poorest of the poor in their endeavors to expand their incomes and their businesses.

The most recent statistics provided by the World Bank, indicate that 1.2 billion people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, subsist on less than $1 a day. That is right, they live on less than $1 a day. Women in poverty generally have larger workloads and less access to educational and economic opportunities than their male counterparts. This in turn means that women in these countries lack stable employment and frayed social safety nets.

Many in the developing world turn to self-employment to generate their livelihoods. I know first hand, from my trips to Africa that a large percentage of the workers are self-employed. The poor have shown remarkable courage in the face of poverty and have demonstrated an uncanny ability to expand their incomes and business when they have access to loans at reasonable rates.

It is the unfortunate truth that entrepreneurs are frozen in poverty because they cannot obtain sufficient credit at reasonable rates to build their asset base or expand their otherwise viable self-employment activities. It is not unusual for interest rates to be as high as 10 percent per day.

Similar measures have already proven successful in these developing countries. Nongovernmental organization such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, in Kenya, and networks such as Accion International, have been particularly successful in lending to poorest of the poor. This measure helps both the business and the individual to develop a sense of accomplishment.

I urge members to support this open rule which allows for bipartisan debate.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us, H.R. 1143. As we look at the reports issued by the World Health Organization, which document, as we have heard, that one-fifth of the world's population lives in extreme poverty and that poverty is one of the leading causes of death worldwide, the problem of how to help poor families appears so immense and widespread that it seems impossible to manage.

This, Mr. Speaker, is where microcredit comes in. It is a new vision for ending world poverty and it provides access to credit for the world's poor to convert their ideas into thriving small businesses. People like Salomie Chung and Elisa Crespo from my hometown of south Florida, who with the assistance of Kathleen Gordon of Working Capital Florida and Gail Neumann of Results-Miami no longer need to worry about survival and basic existence because they are now successful entrepreneurs.

These are just a few domestic examples, but microcredit is now at work in some form in over 40 countries.

Overall, the rate of repayment of the more established programs ranges from 95 to 99 percent. Foreign assistance used under the microcredit program is loaned and paid back with interest and is then recycled and used for new loans, thus, reaching even more of the world's poor.

Microcredit is an economically viable program which furthers U.S. development goals and humanitarian purposes, but it needs our unequivocal support to continue its mission and to build on its success.

That is the objective, Mr. Speaker, of the bill before us, House Resolution 1143. It expands upon previous legislation and ensures that at least one-half of overall resources allocated for microcredit within USAID are to be directed to programs serving the poorest of the poor with loans under $300. This could mean that tens of thousands more of the poorest will have the opportunity to empower themselves out

of the state of poverty that they are currently in.

The bill before us helps to guarantee the survival of programs which are endangered by crises beyond the control of the programs and of the borrowers. It calls for further action and initiative to be explored to help enhance the development of microcredit institutions.

As H.R. 1143 states, the development of microenterprise is a vital factor in the stable growth of developing countries and in the development of free, open and equitable international economic systems.

It is, therefore, in the best interest of the U.S. and of the United States Congress to support its growth and its expansion. By supporting H.R. 1143 and microcredit in general, we are investing in the human spirit and the desire of the world's poor to use their creativity, their talents and their skills to control their own destiny.

For the future welfare of the men, women and children worldwide who suffer the pain inflicted by poverty, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1143.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1143, which establishes assistance to microenterprise programs in developing countries. This bill is very important for a number of reasons which we have already heard. It establishes in law our support for microenterprise. Congress has not provided full authorization up until now for microenterprises in developing countries.

Second, this bill sets aside increased resources for microenterprise programs for the next 2 years.

Third, it ensures that half of the funding goes to programs which serve the very poor in loans of $300 or less. I recently saw some of these programs in Petra in Jordan, and in Marrakesh in Morocco.

I have been a longtime supporter of microenterprise lending. Several years ago, my senior legislative assistant went to Bangladesh to view the Grameen Bank and microenterprise at work in that country. As many know, the Grameen Bank was one of the first to establish such a program and to make microloans available to the poorest of the poor.

The premise of the Grameen Bank and other microenterprise programs is that the capitalist system in these countries does not have to be only for the rich, and credit should be seen as a human right. If we are looking for one single action that will enable the poor to overcome their poverty, we should choose credit. Charity and handouts help maintain and deepen poverty by taking away initiative. Human beings thrive on challenges, not on charity.

The Grameen Bank is now owned by the poor people of Bangladesh and it works exclusively with poor people. The less one has, the higher priority one has for loans. If one has nothing, they get the highest priority.

Ninety percent of the shares are owned by the borrowers. The board of directors consists of 13 members, nine of whom are elected by the borrowers and shareholders. It serves over 2.4 million borrowers, and the payback rate is 98 percent, money which can then be re-lent to others. So far, this program has lent out and has been repaid with over $2 billion in Bangladesh alone.

There are many examples of how these microloans have changed the life of the borrower. My legislative assistant spoke to a woman in a village in central Bangladesh. Five years earlier when she was living in complete poverty with her six children starving, she turned with some hesitation to the Grameen Bank.

Five years after her first loan, she graciously invited my assistant into her home, introduced her children who are all in school, and proudly showed off the cow that she had bought and the material she retails to support her family.

The first years were not easy. In fact, she told of selling the milk from her cow when her children were still hungry, but she knew she had to repay the bank loan to get another one and she knew that that was the way out of her poverty.

As my assistant left, she asked for her to pray that there would be no more widows in her village because life for a widow is just too hard.

In a neighboring village, a young woman of 26 owned two goats, one cow, ten hens and two acres of land and was earning twice the national average income. Her son was in the eighth grade in a country where not quite half the children complete the fifth grade. She had had a hard life as she was abandoned at 3 months by her parents, raised by a neighbor, married at 12, abandoned again at 13, this time by her husband when she was pregnant. She had never earned more than $37 a year and owned no land.

After her visit to the Grameen Bank, she began her own career which allowed her children to get to school and her to have a living wage.

Replicated throughout the world and now in the United States also, microcredit programs are working to eliminate poverty worldwide. Working in partnership with groups like Results, they have set a goal of reaching 100 million of the world's poorest families.

This bill is very important. It is a crucial piece that will help us reach our world and national goals. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1143.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the rule is open and it is a very, very good bill. This bill provides a lot of relief, a lot of help for hundreds of thousands of people across the world. We even do microenterprise very well in some States in our own country. It is a very good policy. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and all the speakers who have so eloquently portrayed why the underlying legislation is so important and why we need to move forward with it today. I also support the rule. It is a fully open rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 136 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1143.

□ 1211

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. EWING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have heard or seen the phenomenal success of microenterprise programs around the world. These programs reach the poorest of the poor with small loans that help them to work their way out of poverty.

The record of these programs is impressive, with the poorest clients repaying their loans at rates between 95 and 98 percent. Unlike other assistance programs, we do not give funds away. We lend them to people once considered the worst credit risks on earth.

Microenterprise programs proved that with access to credit, the poor can

repay their loans and work their way out of poverty.

The bill before the House is a result of almost 4 years of consensus building between the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and many of us have worked for a number of years on microenterprise development programs from their first beginnings at the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh to today when microfinancing institutions are some of the largest lenders in many developing countries.

The bill also builds on the work in the last Congress, the Houghton-Hall bill. The authors of that legislation will recognize that much of the language in this bill came directly from their bill.

This legislation started as a renewal of our bipartisan cooperative effort with the administration, including AID and the First Lady's office, to strengthen microfinance programs. We will recall the President's visit to Uganda where he visited a microfinance project and declared that this was one of the most successful ways to help the poor in developing countries to work their way out of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, this bill accomplishes several key goals. First, it contains the essential language that half of all microenterprise resources go directly to support programs that provide $300 loans or lower to the poorest of the poor.

This requirement traces back to the highly successful microcredit summit convened by Results to dedicate the international community to reaching half of the world's poor with credit programs by the year 2005.

□ 1215

The bill adds a new section to the Foreign Assistance Act governing grants to microfinance institutions, authorizing $152 million in appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and $167 million for fiscal year 2001.

I will note that these are consensus figures of the Microenterprise Coalition, advocacy and practitioners alike, and they are not strongly opposed by the administration.

The bill authorizes the micro and small credit program of AID that has helped many microentrepreneurs grow from small- to medium-sized businesses. The bill has also two major new sections that lay the foundation for the future growth of the microfinance sector.

First, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the bill establishes a microfinance loan facility to help rescue institutions which the U.S. taxpayer has supported with liquidity and support to prevent collapse.

We have all witnessed the destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch in Central America. The destruction nearly caused the collapse of several key microfinance institutions that the U.S. helped to build from the ground up. The ad hoc rescue package assembled by Brian Atwood at AID rescued these institutions so they can now head to recovery.

We have also had other near collapses, and the facility will help address these emergencies in a more systematic way.

Secondly, the bill calls for a number of reports by the President to lay out the future growth of these institutions, including a Federal charter. Using these reports, we hope to lay out a road map for the growth of the microfinance section over the next 10 years.

This legislation has 26 original cosponsors and has been endorsed by the Microenterprise Coalition, including RESULTS and FINCA. It is my understanding that the administration has moved mightily and now has only some concerns with the legislation, and does not oppose its adoption today.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I have one amendment that will make some technical changes to the bill, to its loan facility, that were worked out with AID. Other than that, I am not aware of any other amendments that will be offered today.

I urge the support of this legislation. It is a good bill.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 1143.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a product of many years of hard work on behalf of microenterprise. I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for several years of hard work on this issue.

I would also like to recognize two great leaders who have done so much to advance the cause of microcredit lending to the poor and to empower women in developing countries. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and AID administrator Brian Atwood have worked tirelessly to make sure that the United States takes a leadership role to expand access to credit for self-employment to 100 million of the world's poorest families. One-fifth of the world's population exists on less than $1 a day, and 32,000 children die each day from preventable malnutrition.

I had the opportunity to visit Ghana and South Africa last week, and I met with many women entrepreneurs who were the primary income earners for their families. Access to just a small amount of capital, I was told, would help them raise the standard of living for their entire families.

Many of the poor who do not have access to microenterprise programs are forced to pay interest rates of 10 percent per day to money lenders. In contrast, interest rates on microcredit loans average between 2 percent and 5 percent per week. The return rate on these loans is between 95 percent and 99 percent.

Let me briefly explain what this bill does. It permanently establishes two new sections in statutory law to govern microenterprise grants and loans. Under the grants section, it authorizes grants to support microlending programs. These grants are generally used to start new microlending programs. It authorizes $152 million for fiscal year 2000, and $167 million for fiscal year 2001 for microenterprise programs. It mandates 50 percent of all microenterprise resources to be used for poverty lending, defined as institutions that provide credit and other financial services to the poorest with loans of $300 or less in 1995 dollars.

Currently, 68 percent of loans are $300 or less, and about 47 percent of total resources support poverty lending.

This bill creates a loan facility inside of AID. The facility will provide concessional loans to United States-sponsored microfinance institutions to prevent bankruptcy caused by natural disasters, national wars, civil conflict, or national financial crises. The facility would be supervised by representatives of the Department of the Treasury, AID, and two representatives from the NGO community. It requires the President to prepare a report to Congress on the most cost-effective methods for increasing the access of poor people to credit, other financial services, and related training.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise Self-Reliance Act. The low-cost loans and training opportunities provided by this program create unimaginable opportunity and hope for people living in the poorest and most desolate areas of the world.

As a Member who is personally committed to the growth and prosperity of Central and South America, I have witnessed firsthand the benefits of microenterprise and the microcredit programs to the poorest of the poor. Through these programs, the U.S. has been able to encourage economic growth and self-dependency in countries less fortunate than our own.

The minimal cost of the microenterprise program yield great benefits and

have a tremendous long-term impact on the future economic and social development of many nations, specifically those in Central America.

I would like to give, if I may, a couple of individuals cases that I personally have seen, first that occurred in El Salvador maybe 10 or 12 years ago. They took us to a tailor shop where this gentleman volunteered to give me a three-piece suit, cut to my standard style and size and everything, for $100. I don't know how the rest of the Members feel, but this was unbelievable.

I found out that this gentleman in his time of need found out that he could get a sewing machine for $100 that he borrowed from the microenterprise. With that $100 and a pair of scissors, he started producing clothes. At the time that I saw him there, he had four sewing machines and the whole operation, and his $100 now had become $3,000 that he was able to invest. That was in El Salvador.

Several years later when we were in Nicaragua we asked, why in the world don't microenterprises come to Nicaragua? In this particular case they took us to a shopping area of downtown Managua and showed us a young lady there who had borrowed $200 to start off with. She put vegetables and flowers and seeds and so forth for sale. After 3 years in that small investment of about $200, I asked her what her inventory was. It was a little grocery store by then. She had $7,000 worth of groceries there.

All of this was done by small loans that were immediately paid back. Their loan qualities were unbelievable the way they paid it back, just as the statistics have already shown. I would just like to recommend highly that this is a wonderful program and we ought to do something about it.

In many impoverished countries there are no secure financial institutions where people can apply for loans, no training facilities to teach people a trade, and no encouraging signs of growth and prosperity. The microenterprise programs make these resources available, and allow people who once had no hope of sustaining a livable wage, it gives them a real chance to become self-sufficient.

As the U.S. continues to promote assistance, as opposed to handouts, I think it is important for us to applaud programs that grant an opportunity for growth. I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, which has proven to benefit the international community that needs our help most, the poorest of the poor.

Please support the Microenterprise Self-Reliance Act.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the spirit of bipartisanship to support the goals and the objective of microenterprises in developing countries.

Many of the world's poorest workers are self-employed. These entrepreneurs are trapped in poverty because they cannot obtain credit at a reasonable rate that will allow them to build their assets and expand their businesses.

The global credit program for microenterprises provides funds that will increase the flow of credit from the formal financial sector to the micro entrepreneurs, with a view to improving their productivity, income, and employment level.

Over the past years we have learned firsthand the dramatic impact that microenterprise has had on the lives of millions of the world's poorest families, enabling many of them to pull themselves out of poverty. Our support for microenterprise needs to be strengthened, and our resolve and commitment to ensure that we meet the goals and objectives of microenterprise fortified.

Two examples were shared recently by RESULTS with my office. In Uganda a woman borrowed money to invest in her brick-making company. She was producing 1,000 bricks, and she borrowed money, and she has now increased it to 5,000 bricks. She uses the money to school her children, to allow them to have a better opportunity than herself.

The second example is in El Salvador, a woman borrowed $57 to increase her bread-making business. She has been so successful she has now bought out her supplier.

These examples are indeed proof that this program is a success, not only for the people it is intended for, but also their ability to pay back the loans exceeds that in the private sector.

We must recommit ourselves to ensuring that 100 million of the world's poorest families are afforded the opportunity that many of us take for granted, the opportunity to direct and shape our future by investing our skills, talents, and energy into building, sustaining, and expanding small businesses.

H.R. 1143 grants that opportunity and assurance by authorizing grant assistance of $152 million in the fiscal year 2000, $167 million in fiscal year 2001, to further the development of microenterprise in developing countries. This is a modest investment that can have a powerful impact on the eradication of poverty.

Microcredit is not charity, nor is it big government gone astray, but rather, microcredit is a sound and wise investment that deserves priority and protection. Without a focused effort to empower individuals in the poorest regions of the world, dire poverty will continue to plague our global community, draining our capital resources, sapping our political will, and destroying countless human lives worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this desperately needed legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, Section 4(b)5 of the bill states that ''Assistance provided under this subsection may only be used to support microenterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in paragraph (1).''

I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH), do I understand correctly that this language prohibits requirements not directly related to the enterprise for which credit is extended from being imposed on a microcredit beneficiary as a condition on their eligibility for assistance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that this is correct.

This colloquy, for the purposes of the record and for my colleagues, has been worked out with the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and with his full concurrence.

The answer to the question is, that is correct.

Mr. BALLENGER. Requirements not directly related to the microenterprise cannot be considered as a factor affecting the amount or terms of the assistance that microcredit applicants are eligible to receive?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, that is correct. Funds provided by this bill may be used only to support microenterprise programs. A requirement that a microcredit applicant fulfill some unrelated precondition would constitute support for something other than microenterprise programs. Thus, such requirements are expressly prohibited by section 4(b)5.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thus, to take an extreme example, a program funded by this bill could not require that an applicant be sterilized before she is eligible for microenterprise assistance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. Section 4(b)5 would prohibit funding of any program that attempted to impose such a condition.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

□ 1230

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. I

thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me this time.

I am an original cosponsor and strong supporter of this bill. This Member first became familiar with the microenterprise concept during the 99th Congress. At that time, an organization known by its acronym of FINCA, F-I-N-C-A, worked closely with poverty stricken areas of Latin America and South America. The concept of microenterprises, I think had not had much visibility at all on Capitol Hill or in America until we learned about FINCA's good work.

Having since visited numerous developing countries while serving on the Committee on International Relations, this Member can testify to the utter despair and grinding poverty that is all too commonplace throughout so much of the world and to the hope which microenterprise programs can provide.

Much of the grinding poverty could be redressed by just a few dollars' worth of tools and raw materials. In countries where the average wage may be no more than 50 cents a day, as little as $10 can provide someone with the reed to make straw mats or leather for shoes. Just a few dollars can stock a peddler's cart and allow him or her to rise above helpless poverty.

Microenterprise initiatives will not make anyone rich, but it will pay for tuition for a child's basic education or the cost of a concrete surface to replace an old dirt floor, or a pump where the water is not tainted. Importantly, microenterprise can provide these small luxuries, or I would say basic elements of life, but they come only to those who are willing to combine these small loans with hard work.

Recipients of these loans certainly do work hard. It is reported that recipients repay the principal within the first month in many cases, and 95 to 98 percent of recipients repay the loans on time. Indeed, that repayment rate is incredibly good as compared to commercial banks' repayments. It also serves, I think, as a strong testament to recipients' receptivity to these programs.

The legislation before this body today gives an important boost to existing microenterprise programs like the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, where microenterprise has had great positive effects for a whole generation of women; or BancoSol, which now has the largest number of clients of any financial institution in Bolivia. This legislation will ensure their survival.

H.R. 1143 sets forth the guidelines to ensure that the needs of the poorest of the poor are addressed. One-half of all microenterprise resources are devoted to loans of $300 or less.

Importantly, the legislation establishes a facility specifically devoted to countries devastated by war or natural disasters. This is a particularly important provision, Mr. Chairman. It means all is not lost when torrential flooding destroys an entire economy, as was the case last year in Bangladesh. It means that people in war-torn regions can return home and try to start life anew, as has been the case in Rwanda and Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1143 speaks to the best part of our collective conscience. Through this legislation, the U.S. is offering hope to those who have no hope, a helping hand to those who want to make for themselves a better life.

This Member congratulates the author of this initiative, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations. It is largely through his efforts that microenterprise has become such an important part of our foreign assistance efforts.

This Member would also thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking Democrat on the committee, for his constructive efforts to move this legislation forward.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me this time and for his support of the legislation.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, first, to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), sitting in for the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), I thank her so much for yielding me the time. I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) as well as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), our ranking member, and the entire committee for bringing to us such an important bill.

As has been mentioned, whether in Bangladesh, India, Africa, or some other country of the world, including the United States, microcredit, the assistance to small businesses, primarily women I might add, is the difference between success and failure in so many children's lives.

As has been said earlier, the World Bank reports that 1.2 billion people in the world exist on less than $1 a day. That is 20 percent of the world's population exist on less than $1 per day.

This microenterprise legislation provides for the children of these families hope for the future. It provides a way where their parents, in many cases women, can have their own businesses, can earn their own fees and dollars and then send their children to school to receive an adequate education.

I commend the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and all of those who brought this bill to the floor.

I recently returned from overseas and had another first-hand look at some very successful microenterprise operations. They are in fact working. They are the difference between success and failure, not only in the woman's life, who in many cases is the breadwinner, is the nurturer of the family, is the person that instills strength and self-confidence in children, that one can be what one wants to be.

It has been reported that microenterprise, also the loans are repaid at a much higher rate than traditional lending practices; that, not only are the businesses successful, but the payback in large measure has been paid back.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us move H.R. 1143 out of this Chamber and to the signature of the President. It is the difference between success and failure. Microenterprising is a tool not only used in this country but in the poorest of the poor countries of the world to say that this is a wonderful world. When we work together, we can save many children's lives and offer them hope for the future.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding me this time and for leading the debate on our side of the aisle today and for her support for this program.

This is a neat, wonderful concept, and it is something that we can agree on, which also says a lot as well. We ought to be looking for more of these ideas.

It is a testament to the strength of the human spirit, this program. It has taught a couple of things. One is that poor people would much rather that we give them loans than grants, that we have confidence in their ability to pay money back, that all they really need is a little seed money to get started.

The second thing it teaches us is that the most underused economic resource in this world are the women of the world who have always been doing most of the work but very seldom have they ever had any real control, particularly economic control, over their lives.

So the programs that work are the ones that go out and find the women in the villages that know what is going on and have the fortitude and the determination to provide for their families and give them the resources. Boy, the ideas that they come up with and the kind of effort that they put into these little microenterprise efforts, they are just heartwarming.

It should be known also that these microenterprise banks charge a lot of money in interest, a lot of them, more interest than we would want to pay. Yet, invariably, the vast majority of these loans get paid off. It is just unbelievable what people can do with just a

little seed money if given the confidence and the resources.

So I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and all the others on the Republican side and certainly the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), our ranking member, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and all of the members of the committee.

We have got a good thing going here. It costs us very little money. The only people that seem to have some reluctance about this is the White House. I read their statement of administration policy, and I cannot really figure out what they are trying to say and what their objection would be. But I am sorry that they do not get fully behind this, because they have done a lot to make microenterprise programs work. They should have endorsed this piece of legislation. But I know that they are going to fully fund it, and they are going to get behind it, particularly USAID, and make it work.

We cannot always control the situations, and we have had some real catastrophes that have prevented people in Third World countries from being able to pay back their loans. Bangladesh comes to mind. So we need some provision to make sure that money is available. This provides that. It ensures that there is going to be this revolving fund available.

This is the right way to do it. We are institutionalizing it. This is going to get a unanimous vote, I hope, and it deserves one. The people of the Third World, to take advantage of this, deserve the little seed money that this provides to them.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for his kind remarks and also for his acknowledgment and recognition of the competence and the tenacity and the commitment of women to economic development and job creation.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield for just a moment, we men have always known that; it is just seldom that we ever admitted it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for coming out front and talking about it publicly.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. I support this bill because I have witnessed first-hand the uplifting effects of microcredit on the economic and humanitarian conditions of struggling nations around the world. I have closely monitored its enormously positive influence on women and ethnic minorities, those most likely to face discrimination in creating small businesses and establishing social support networks in their communities. H.R. 1143 would allow these essential developments to continue and expand, aiding the stability of new democracies and enabling all citizens a stake in their future directions.

The microcredit program, more than any other government initiative, is founded on the free market ideals central to America's greatness. By providing small amounts of start-up capital to aspiring entrepreneurs, productive businesses can be established which, in a collective manner, change society for the better. For example, when a woman in a small African nation borrows a few dollars to set up a crafts shop, she does far more than better her family's financial situation. She may create employment opportunities for others in her small community, she may held to break generations of poverty in her town, she may generate income that will allow the creation of even more commerce, she may break down age-old stereotypes of women's social roles, and she may make it possible for untold numbers of women to realize the opportunities provided to her by the blessing of microcredit.

As the distinguished Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), J. Brian Atwood, explained: "Microenterprise is one of our most effective tools to foster bottom-up growth and to give women an opportunity to make a place for themselves in business and in their communities." For only a minimal investment—few loans exceed $300, and the return rate is nearly 100 percent—we can peacefully alter centuries of history, one entrepreneur at a time.

H.R. 1143 will strengthen this much-needed program by authorizing increased funds ($152 million in FY 2000 and $167 million in FY 2001) and ensuring that at least 50 percent of microenterprise resources be used for poverty lending to the neediest participants in Third World economies. Furthermore, H.R. 1143 would permanently establish two new provisions in law to govern grants and loans, and it would create a loan facility inside USAID to help U.S.-sponsored microfinance institutions survive natural disasters, civil wars, and national financial crises.

I applaud these reforms, and I commend International Relations Committee Chairman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN and Ranking Member SAM GEJDENSON for their hard work in working out the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to recognize the extraordinary commitment of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to the microenterprise program. Since the earliest days of the Clinton Presidency, Mrs. Clinton has used her exceptional brilliance and influence to promote this initiative around the world. Long before other opinion leaders understood the importance of targeted microcredit investments, she was proclaiming the benefits of this program for women and families in a host of nations. I would also like to note the impressive contributions of Administrator Atwood in implementing this essential component of our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1143.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. Microcredit is the process of providing small loans to very poor people at commercial interest rates for the startup or expansion of small business ventures. It has been successful in promoting economic growth and ending the worst aspects of poverty in some of the most destitute places in the world.

Unfortunately, despite its proven track record, microcredit has not been utilized to its full potential. Funding for microcredit within the U.S. Agency for International Development has not kept pace with the growing capacity to lend. Despite the fact that in 1994 USAID set the goal of directing half of overall microenterprise funds to programs serving the poorest people in loans of $300 or less by the end of 1996, only about 41 percent of these funds are currently reaching this target population.

The Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999 calls for $152 million in fiscal year 2000 and $167 million in fiscal year 2001 and designates half of all microenterprise funds as loans of $300 or less for the neediest people in the world. Along with helping the world's poorest people, this legislation increases work skills and improves the economies of the developing nations where microcredit initiatives are in place. Currently, approximately 1.2 billion people—one fifth of the world population—live in extreme poverty. As long as poverty continues to plague so many millions, there will be no lasting peace or stability in our world.

Microcredit is one of the most cost-effective and successful ways to combat poverty and help achieve peace. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1143.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The concept of microlending has existed for over two decades, created by Muhammed Yunus through the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. This concept has enjoyed incredible success and has improved the lives of millions of people, especially women. The Grameen Bank has inspired microlending programs in fifty-six other countries and has been copied by 5,000 international institutions. In fact, this system has even been adopted by the Women's Self-Employment Project in Chicago to successfully wean unwed mothers off of welfare.

I am very pleased that the U.S. Congress is not only condoning U.S. participation in the microcredit system but expanding and improving our involvement in these programs with this legislation. I have seen the incredible impact that a small loan can have on a single family in the developing world. A short-term loan of $75 used to be unaccessible for most people in these countries. However, through the Grameen Bank and bilateral microcredit programs, these loans are now available and becoming more widespread. The reason for this success and expansion is due to the unparalleled rate of repayment. In 1997, the Grameen Bank had a 94 percent repayment rate.

Unfortunately, microcredit programs have been drastically impacted by the recent natural disasters and financial crises in various regions of the world. However, these events should not be interpreted as failures in microcredit programs, but as opportunities for expanding the program. Farmers in Nicaragua are in desperate need of a few dollars to replant their crops. Weavers in Thailand have seen their currency plummet and just need a

small amount of investment to keep their fledgling businesses stay afloat. While Grameen Bank loan repayment rates plunged to 68 percent immediately after the floods in Bangladesh last year, these rates rebounded to 88 percent in just a few months. H.R. 1143 will expand these credit programs and provided the cushion necessary to enable the financial institutions and other organizations operating these microcredit programs to help those that are in the most desperate need. This legislation provides some of the important infrastructure programs necessary for many countries struggling from recent crises to move from disaster assistance to economic development.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1143, the "Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999." H.R. 1143 would provide vital assistance in the form of credit and other financial services to microentrepreneur programs as part of a global approach to aiding the world's poorest individuals.

Many people in this world rely on self-employment as a necessary means for their livelihood. In this regard, the importance of the role of microentrepreneurs in our global economy cannot be overlooked. The general philosophy of the microenterprise industry is to bring new sources of income to segments of the population where job opportunities are low by providing small amounts of credit to those whom have not had access to commercial credit. Microfinance programs are critical to the fight against hunger and poverty. Such programs are a leveraging tool for decreasing dependence on foreign assistance. H.R. 1143 authorizes grants to support microlending programs in the amount of $152 million for FY 2000 and $167 million for FY 2001. Fifty percent of these funds must be used for loans of $300 or less.

Last year, the Financial Times reported that "though Latin American has moved furthest towards the commercialization of microfinance, it is also commonplace in other developing countries, and the World Bank estimates that more than $7 billion of microcredit is outstanding."

A report released by the U.N. last year acknowledges the success of microcredit in Latin America and Asia. However, the report states that "it is not clear if the extent to which microcredit has spread, or can potentially spread, can make a major dent in global poverty." The report based this conclusion on the assertion that "the poorest of the poor" are usually "not in a position to undertake an economic activity partly because they lack business skills and even the motivation for business." While I support H.R. 1143, I make this point for the purpose of impressing upon this Congress the importance of ensuring that the extension of funds to poor microentrepreneurs is in reality contributing to the battle against poverty and hunger.

Innovative ways of bringing economic vitalization to areas of the world that sorely lack any financial sustainability should be a priority for any global financial architecture. H.R. 1143 contributes to that strategy and I urge its passage.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by section, and each section shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

The Congress makes the following findings and declarations:

(1) According to the World Bank, more than 1,200,000,000 people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, subsist on less than $1 a day.

(2) Over 32,000 of their children die each day from largely preventable malnutrition and disease.

(3)(A) Women in poverty generally have larger work loads and less access to educational and economic opportunities than their male counterparts.

(B) Directly aiding the poorest of the poor, especially women, in the developing world has a positive effect not only on family incomes, but also on child nutrition, health and education, as women in particular reinvest income in their families.

(4)(A) The poor in the developing world, particularly women, generally lack stable employment and social safety nets.

(B) Many turn to self-employment to generate a substantial portion of their livelihood. In Africa, over 80 percent of employment is generated in the informal sector of the self-employed poor.

(C) These poor entrepreneurs are often trapped in poverty because they cannot obtain credit at reasonable rates to build their asset base or expand their otherwise viable self-employment activities.

(D) Many of the poor are forced to pay interest rates as high as 10 percent per day to money lenders.

(5)(A) The poor are able to expand their incomes and their businesses dramatically when they can access loans at reasonable interest rates.

(B) Through the development of self-sustaining microfinance programs, poor people themselves can lead the fight against hunger and poverty.

(6)(A) On February 2–4, 1997, a global Microcredit Summit was held in Washington, District of Columbia, to launch a plan to expand access to credit for self-employment and other financial and business services to 100,000,000 of the world's poorest families, especially the women of those families, by 2005. While this scale of outreach may not be achievable in this short timeframe, the realization of this goal could dramatically alter the face of global poverty.

(B) With an average family size of five, achieving this goal will mean that the benefits of microfinance will thereby reach nearly half of the world's more than 1,000,000,000 absolute poor people.

(7)(A) Nongovernmental organizations, such as those that comprise the Microenterprise Coalition (such as the Grameen Bank (Bangladesh,) K–REP (Kenya), and networks such as Accion International, the Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA), and the credit union movement) are successful in lending directly to the very poor.

(B) Microfinance institutions such as BRAC (Bangladesh), BancoSol (Bolivia), SEWA Bank (India), and ACEP (Senegal) are regulated financial institutions that can raise funds directly from the local and international capital markets.

(8)(A) Microenterprise institutions not only reduce poverty, but also reduce the dependency on foreign assistance.

(B) Interest income on the credit portfolio is used to pay recurring institutional costs, assuring the long-term sustainability of development assistance.

(9) Microfinance institutions leverage foreign assistance resources because loans are recycled, generating new benefits to program participants.

(10)(A) The development of sustainable microfinance institutions that provide credit and training, and mobilize domestic savings, are critical components to a global strategy of poverty reduction and broad-based economic development.

(B) In the efforts of the United States to lead the development of a new global financial architecture, microenterprise should play a vital role. The recent shocks to international financial markets demonstrate how the financial sector can shape the destiny of nations. Microfinance can serve as a powerful tool for building a more inclusive financial sector which serves the broad majority of the world's population including the very poor and women and thus generate more social stability and prosperity.

(C) Over the last two decades, the United States has been a global leader in promoting the global microenterprise sector, primarily through its development assistance programs at the United States Agency for International Development. Additionally, the United States Department of the Treasury and the Department of State have used their authority to promote microenterprise in the development programs of international financial institutions and the United Nations.

(11)(A) In 1994, the United States Agency for International Development launched the ''Microenterprise Initiative'' in partnership with the Congress.

(B) The initiative committed to expanding funding for the microenterprise programs of

the Agency, and set a goal that, by the end of fiscal year 1996, half of all microenterprise resources would support programs and institutions that provide credit to the poorest, with loans under $300.

(C) In order to achieve the goal of the microcredit summit, increased investment in microcredit institutions serving the poorest will be critical.

(12) Providing the United States share of the global investment needed to achieve the goal of the microcredit summit will require only a small increase in United States funding for international microcredit programs, with an increased focus on institutions serving the poorest.

(13)(A) In order to reach tens of millions of the poorest with microcredit, it is crucial to expand and replicate successful microcredit institutions.

(B) These institutions need assistance in developing their institutional capacity to expand their services and tap commercial sources of capital.

(14) Nongovernmental organizations have demonstrated competence in developing networks of local microfinance institutions and other assistance delivery mechanisms so that they reach large numbers of the very poor, and achieve financial sustainability.

(15) Recognizing that the United States Agency for International Development has developed very effective partnerships with nongovernmental organizations, and that the Agency will have fewer missions to carry out its work, the Agency should place priority on investing in those nongovernmental network institutions that meet performance criteria through the central funding mechanisms of the Agency.

(16) By expanding and replicating successful microcredit institutions, it should be possible to create a global infrastructure to provide financial services to the world's poorest families.

(17)(A) The United States can provide leadership to other bilateral and multilateral development agencies as such agencies expand their support to the microenterprise sector.

(B) The United States should seek to improve coordination among G–7 countries in the support of the microenterprise sector in order to leverage the investment of the United States with that of other donor nations.

(18) Through increased support for microenterprise, especially credit for the poorest, the United States can continue to play a leadership role in the global effort to expand financial services and opportunity to 100,000,000 of the poorest families on the planet.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to make microenterprise development an important element of United States foreign economic policy and assistance;

(2) to provide for the continuation and expansion of the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to the development of microenterprise institutions as outlined in its 1994 Microenterprise Initiative;

(3) to support and develop the capacity of United States and indigenous nongovernmental organization intermediaries to provide credit, savings, training and technical services to microentrepreneurs;

(4) to increase the amount of assistance devoted to credit activities designed to reach the poorest sector in developing countries, and to improve the access of the poorest, particularly women, to microenterprise credit in developing countries; and

(5) to encourage the United States Agency for International Development to coordinate microfinance policy, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State, and to provide global leadership in promoting microenterprise for the poorest among bilateral and multilateral donors.

SEC. 4. MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT GRANT ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second section 129 (as added by section 4 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–320)) as section 130; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 131. MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT GRANT ASSISTANCE.

''(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

''(1) the development of microenterprise is a vital factor in the stable growth of developing countries and in the development of free, open, and equitable international economic systems;

''(2) it is therefore in the best interest of the United States to assist the development of microenterprises in developing countries; and

''(3) the support of microenterprise can be served by programs providing credit, savings, training, and technical assistance.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—(1) In carrying out this part, the President is authorized to provide grant assistance for programs to increase the availability of credit and other services to microenterprises lacking full access to capital and training through—

''(A) grants to microfinance institutions for the purpose of expanding the availability of credit, savings, and other financial services to microentrepreneurs;

''(B) training, technical assistance, and other support for microenterprises to enable them to make better use of credit, to better manage their enterprises, and to increase their income and build their assets;

''(C) capacity building for microfinance institutions in order to enable them to better meet the credit and training needs of microentrepreneurs; and

''(D) policy and regulatory programs at the country level that improve the environment for microfinance institutions that serve the poor and very poor.

''(2) Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) shall be provided through organizations that have a capacity to develop and implement microenterprise programs, including particularly—

''(A) United States and indigenous private and voluntary organizations;

''(B) United States and indigenous credit unions and cooperative organizations;

''(C) other indigenous governmental and nongovernmental organizations; or

''(D) business development services, including indigenous craft programs.

''(3) In carrying out sustainable poverty-focused programs under paragraph (1), 50 percent of all microenterprise resources shall be used for direct support of programs under this subsection through practitioner institutions that provide credit and other financial services to the poorest with loans of $300 or less in 1995 United States dollars and can cover their costs of credit programs with revenue from lending activities or that demonstrate the capacity to do so in a reasonable time period.

''(4) The President should continue support for central mechanisms and missions that—

''(A) provide technical support for field missions;

''(B) strengthen the institutional development of the intermediary organizations described in paragraph (2);

''(C) share information relating to the provision of assistance authorized under paragraph (1) between such field missions and intermediary organizations; and

''(D) support the development of nonprofit global microfinance networks, including credit union systems, that—

''(i) are able to deliver very small loans through a vast grassroots infrastructure based on market principles; and

''(ii) act as wholesale intermediaries providing a range of services to microfinance retail institutions, including financing, technical assistance, capacity building and safety and soundness accreditation.

''(5) Assistance provided under this subsection may only be used to support microenterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in paragraph (1).

''(c) MONITORING SYSTEM.—In order to maximize the sustainable development impact of the assistance authorized under subsection (a)(1), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish a monitoring system that—

''(1) establishes performance goals for such assistance and expresses such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent feasible;

''(2) establishes performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the goals and objectives of such assistance;

''(3) provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to such assistance to enhance the sustainable development impact of such assistance, particularly the impact of such assistance on the very poor, particularly poor women; and

''(4) provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to measures for reaching the poorest of the poor, including proposed legislation containing amendments to improve paragraph (3).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) There are authorized to be appropriated $152,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $167,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 to carry out this section.

''(B) Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 5. MICRO- AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.

Section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151f) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 108. MICRO- AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.

''(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

''(1) the development of micro- and small enterprises are a vital factor in the stable growth of developing countries and in the development and stability of a free, open, and equitable international economic system; and

''(2) it is, therefore, in the best interests of the United States to assist the development of the enterprises of the poor in developing countries and to engage the United States private sector in that process.

''(b) PROGRAM.—To carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance to increase the availability of credit to micro- and small enterprises lacking full access to credit, including through—

''(1) loans and guarantees to credit institutions for the purpose of expanding the availability of credit to micro- and small enterprises;

''(2) training programs for lenders in order to enable them to better meet the credit needs of microentrepreneurs; and

''(3) training programs for microentrepreneurs in order to enable them to make better use of credit and to better manage their enterprises.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish criteria for determining which entities described in subsection (b) are eligible to carry out activities, with respect to micro- and small enterprises, assisted under this section. Such criteria may include the following:

''(1) The extent to which the recipients of credit from the entity do not have access to the local formal financial sector.

''(2) The extent to which the recipients of credit from the entity are among the poorest people in the country.

''(3) The extent to which the entity is oriented toward working directly with poor women.

''(4) The extent to which the entity recovers its cost of lending to the poor.

''(5) The extent to which the entity implements a plan to become financially sustainable.

''(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Assistance provided under this section may only be used to support micro- and small enterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in subsection (b).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) There are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 to carry out this section.

''(B) Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall be made available for the subsidy cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, for activities under this section.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the cost of administrative expenses in carrying out this section.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection are in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 6. MICROFINANCE LOAN FACILITY.

Chapter 1 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding the following new section:

''SEC. 132. UNITED STATES MICROFINANCE LOAN FACILITY.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to establish a United States Microfinance Loan Facility (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Facility') to pool and manage the risk from natural disasters, war or civil conflict, national financial crisis, or short-term financial movements that threaten the long-term development of United States-supported microfinance institutions.

''(b) SUPERVISORY BOARD OF THE FACILITY.—(1) The Facility shall be supervised by a board composed of the following representatives appointed by the President not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999:

''(A) 1 representative from the Department of the Treasury.

''(B) 1 representative from the Department of State.

''(C) 1 representative from the United States Agency for International Development.

''(D)(i) 2 United States citizens from United States nongovernmental organizations that operate United States-sponsored microfinance activities.

''(ii) Individuals described in clause (i) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(2) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development or his designee shall serve as Chairman and an additional voting member of the board.

''(c) DISBURSEMENTS.—(1) The board shall make disbursements from the Facility to United States-sponsored microfinance institutions to prevent the bankruptcy of such institutions caused by (A) natural disasters, (B) national wars or civil conflict, and (C) national financial crisis or other short term financial movements that threaten the long-term development of United States-supported microfinance institutions. Such disbursements shall be made as concessional loans that are repaid maintaining the real value of the loan to microfinance institutions that demonstrate the capacity to resume self-sustained operations within a reasonable time period. The Facility shall provide for loan losses with each loan disbursed.

''(2) During each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002, funds may not be made available from the Facility until 15 days after notification of the availability has been provided to the congressional committees specified in section 634A of this Act in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under that section.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the last representative to the board is appointed pursuant to subsection (b), the chairman of the board shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the policies, rules, and regulations of the Facility.

''(e) FUNDING.—(1) Not more than $5,000,000 of amounts made available to carry out sections 103 through 106 of this Act for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 may be made available to carry out this section for each such fiscal year.

''(2) Amounts made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts available under other provisions of law to carry out this section.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

''(2) UNITED STATES-SUPPORTED MICROFINANCE INSTITUTION.—The term 'United States-supported microfinance institution' means a financial intermediary that has received funds made available under this Act for fiscal year 1980 and each subsequent fiscal year.''.

SEC. 7. REPORT RELATING TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prepare and transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the most cost-effective methods for increasing the access of poor people to credit, other financial services, and related training.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a)—

(1) should include how the President, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, will jointly develop a comprehensive strategy for advancing the global microenterprise sector in a way that maintains market principles while assuring that the very poor, particularly women, obtain access to financial services; and

(2) shall provide guidelines and recommendations for—

(A) instruments to assist microenterprise networks to develop multi-country and regional microlending programs;

(B) technical assistance to foreign governments, foreign central banks and regulatory entities to improve the policy environment for microfinance institutions, and to strengthen the capacity of supervisory bodies to supervise microcredit institutions;

(C) the potential for federal chartering of United States-based international microfinance network institutions, including proposed legislation;

(D) instruments to increase investor confidence in microcredit institutions which would strengthen the long-term financial position of the microcredit institutions and attract capital from private sector entities and individuals, such as a rating system for microcredit institutions and local credit bureaus;

(E) an agenda for integrating microfinance into United States foreign policy initiatives seeking to develop and strengthen the global finance sector; and

(F) innovative instruments to attract funds from the capital markets, such as instruments for leveraging funds from the local commercial banking sector, and the securitization of microloan portfolios.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 8. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS GLOBAL LEADER AND COORDINATOR OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the United States can provide leadership to other bilateral and multilateral development agencies as such agencies expand their support to the microenterprise sector; and

(2) the United States should seek to improve coordination among G-7 countries in the support of the microenterprise sector in order to leverage the investment of the United States with that of other donor nations.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of State should seek to support and strengthen the effectiveness of

microfinance activities in United Nations agencies, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which have provided key leadership in developing the microenterprise sector; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct each United States Executive Director of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) to advocate the development of a coherent and coordinated strategy to support the microenterprise sector and an increase of multilateral resource flows for the purposes of building microenterprise retail and wholesale intermediaries.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 3, beginning on line 22, strike ''While this scale'' and all that follows through line 25.

Page 17, line 15, strike ''part 1'' and insert ''part I''.

Page 19, line 2, strike '', and'' and insert '', or''.

Page 19, after line 16, insert the following:

''(d) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

''(1) POLICY PROVISIONS.—In providing the credit assistance authorized by this section, the board should apply, as appropriate, the policy provisions in this part applicable to development assistance activities.

''(2) DEFAULT AND PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS.—

''(A) DEFAULT PROVISION.—The provisions of section 620(q) of this Act, or any comparable provisions of law, shall not be construed to prohibit assistance to a country in the event that a private sector recipient of assistance furnished under this section is in default in its payment to the United States for the period specified in such section.

''(B) PROCUREMENT PROVISION.—Assistance may be provided under this section without regard to section 604(a) of this Act.

''(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CREDIT ASSISTANCE.—(A) Credit assistance provided under this section shall be offered on such terms and conditions, including fees charged, as the board may determine.

''(B) The principal amount of loans made or guaranteed under this section in any fiscal year, with respect to any single borrower, may not exceed $30,000,000.

''(C) No payment may be made under any guarantee issued under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misrepresentation for which the party seeking payment is responsible.

''(4) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—All guarantees issued under this section shall constitute obligations, in accordance with the terms of such guarantees, of the United States of America and the full faith and credit of the United States of America is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations to the extent of the guarantee.

Page 19, line 17, strike ''(d)'' and insert ''(e)''.

Page 19, strike line 23 and all that follows through line 5 on page 20 and insert the following:

''(f) FUNDING.—(1)(A) Of the amounts made available to carry out this part for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001, up to $5,000,000 may be made available for—

''(i) the subsidy cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, to carry out this section; and

''(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), the cost of administrative expenses to carry out this section.

''(B) Of the amount made available under subparagraph (A) to carry out this section for a fiscal year, not more than $500,000 may be made available for administrative expenses under subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(2) Amounts made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts available under any other provision of law to carry out this section.

Page 20, line 6, strike ''(f)'' and insert ''(g)''.

Page 20, line 16, strike ''and each'' and insert ''or any''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was crafted in conjunction with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the administration to fund the microfinance loan facility.

The amendment provides that up to $5 million may be used to leverage up to $30 million to rescue a U.S.-supported microenterprise institution whose financial situation has been undermined by natural catastrophes or other events out of the control of that institution.

We have seen key microfinance institutions undermined in Bangladesh and Central America where it is hard to run a bank after all your clients have been killed or made homeless by a flood or by a hurricane. With the ad hoc rescue packages we have assembled in the past, we have been able to not only prevent the collapse of U.S.-backed microfinance institutions, but to turn them into lending agents of the recovery process, especially in Honduras.

This amendment would help create a microfinance loan facility to ensure that we no longer have to put together ad hoc packages to rescue such institutions. I think it is a good amendment, and I hope it has the full support of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1245

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 136, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. 1143, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1:15 p.m.

□ 1337

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT) at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 46 by the yeas and nays, and H. Con. Res. 35 by the yeas and nays.

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

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 46.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—412

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

NAYS—2

Paul
Sanford

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Armey
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Carson
Cooksey
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Goss
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Lantos
Largent
Oberstar
Rangel
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Wexler

□ 1401

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 81, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATING QATAR FOR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)

Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Carson
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Goode
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Lantos
Largent
Oberstar
Rangel
Tierney
Wexler

□ 1413

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time previously allotted to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

There was no objection.

HEARTBROKEN FAREWELL TO JOYCE CHIANG

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am truly heartbroken today to rise to say a final farewell to my friend and former staff member, Joyce Chiang.

On January 9, Joyce vanished from her neighborhood. On April 1, she was found on the shore of the Potomac River in southern Fairfax County. Word yesterday of positive identification brought an end to the long vigil kept by her friends and family, and brought an end to the hope that we would see her bright smile once again.

Joyce was born in Chicago, but she lived in California, and she was a California girl. Bright, beautiful, smart as a whip, she volunteered as an intern in my Los Angeles office when she was still a teenager.

In 1990, while a student at Smith College, she spent January in my Washington office as an LBJ intern. At the end of the month, she had to rush back to Smith, because she was Senate Finance Committee Chair of the Smith College Student Government Association, and she had to plan for budget season. In her senior year, Joyce's fellow students elected her to be president of their student body.

Last year, as my daughter was deciding where she might want to go to college, she sought Joyce's advice and, as a result, she is today a student at Joyce's alma mater, Smith College at Northhampton, Massachusetts.

Joyce graduated from Smith in 1992 and showed up in my office looking for a day job so she could go to law school at night at Georgetown University. I was delighted to give her that job, knowing the benefit was more mine than hers.

True to form, she was a wonderful friend and staffer. In the years from 1992 until 1995, she advanced in responsibility until she became my expert advisor on immigration law. That expertise led the INS to offer her a job as a special assistant to the Director of the Office of Congressional Relations.

Upon her completion of law school, she transferred to the INS office of General Counsel where she was primarily responsible for coordinating and directing the myriad of activities required to implement the 1996 Immigration Act.

Joyce was not only hardworking, bright, and selfless, her personality was so engaging that she literally lit up any room she entered. She was both within and without a beautiful person. That I had the opportunity to know her and work with her will always be a memory of great joy to me.

I cherished her friendship as I do that of her two brothers, Roger and John, and her mother, Judy. I know that they have found some consolation in learning just how many people loved their daughter and sister. Hundreds of her friends from Smith College, from Capitol Hill, from the INS, from Georgetown Law School, and from her community and neighborhoods came together to search for her, to stand vigil in both Washington and Los Angeles, and to pray for her and her family.

I send to Roger, John and Mrs. Chiang my deepest sympathy and love, and pray that they will find comfort in knowing the full extent to which Joyce's life fit the words of the Prophet Micah: ''What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?''

SUPPORT MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO SACRIFICE THEIR LIVES FOR OUR NATION

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we as a Congress and as a nation are very concerned about the current conflict in the Balkans. It is sad that too many times we do not think of our military or address the problems they face until they are called to duty. Only then are we reminded of the critical role they play in defending this great country and our interests.

Like so many of my colleagues, I do appreciate and value the service of our

Nation's armed forces, whether at war or at peace. In the Third District of North Carolina, which I am proud to represent, we are fortunate enough to have four military bases.

I have had the opportunity to spend many hours meeting privately, off base, with dozens of military pilots, commanders, and enlisted personnel. These men and women will tell us what many of my colleagues will, our military's quality of life is far below what it should be. In fact, low pay levels have forced almost 12,000 of our enlisted military families to accept food stamps to survive.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. A junior enlisted soldier at an E1 rank receives approximately $11,500 in basic pay for his service in addition to a housing allowance. But, Mr. Speaker, this same soldier also pays over $3,000 in taxes on that salary.

These are the men and women called upon to defend this Nation. They are placed in harm's way to protect the freedoms my colleagues and I enjoy every day. How can we expect our troops to focus on, or successfully complete, their missions if they are worried about their husbands, wives, and children back home that are struggling to put food on the table?

Our troops accept the ultimate responsibility. They sacrifice their lives for this country, and they accept it voluntarily. Yet, despite the critical job they undertake, many are paid so little they are forced to take on second jobs. Many others are left to rely on government assistance to feed their families.

Last month, I introduced a bill to provide our enlisted military families who are eligible for food stamps with a $500 tax credit. It should not take a conflict like that in Kosovo to remind us of the important part our armed services play in protecting the freedoms of this Nation, but it often does.

Now, as we turn on the evening news and can see our military in action, Congress has an excellent opportunity to show its support for our Nation's troops and work to address the needs of our military. While this $500 tax credit cannot alone guarantee military families will not have to receive food stamps, it can, together with the anticipated increase in basic pay, help show our support and appreciation for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the amount of encouragement we have already received in the House for this bill. But I will be asking each and every one of my colleagues from both parties to join me in support of this effort. Now is the best time to show our military that we value their job and their sacrifice.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting our military families and join me in supporting H.R. 1055.

God bless our troops, Mr. Speaker, and God bless America.

CHINESE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the House's attention again a continuing problem with Chinese illegal immigration in Guam.

This past Tuesday, on April 6, 82 were apprehended while preparing to come on shore. On Wednesday, April 7, nine more Chinese illegal immigrants were discovered by a U.S. naval vessel whose permits to work on Saipan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, had expired, and they had decided to try their luck on Guam and boarded a small 18-foot boat bound for Guam.

On Friday, April 9, 93 illegal immigrants were apprehended as their boat ran aground on a reef off of Ritidian Point.

On Sunday, April 11, 38 suspected illegal immigrants, including two women, were caught off of Agat where they arrived on the dilapidated wooden boat.

The number of apprehended Chinese illegal immigrants in Guam caught since January of this year is now up to 473. On a per capita basis, this would be like 5,000 illegal immigrants washing up on the shores of Florida.

A couple of weeks ago, I informed this body about the criminal and inhumane ramifications of this wave of illegal immigrants into Guam. The Chinese are smuggled by crime syndicates which charge them anywhere from $10,000 to $30,000 each. They set sail in squalid quarters and are sometimes abused by their smugglers. They travel over the open seas for over 20 days.

Upon successfully completing the trip, they are made indentured servants and have to pay off their debt to the smugglers who brought them to the U.S.

With the arrival this week of almost 200 illegal immigrants, we see the rise of other factors in Guam. Guam is undergoing current economic crisis caused by the Asian downturn, and we have no basis upon which to deal with them. Yet the INS has gone bankrupt and refuses to house these illegal immigrants and refuses to process them into the United States mainland because they have no funds.

So the Government of Guam has taken on the responsibility to house these illegal immigrants at a cost of $97 a day in facilities now holding over 400 occupants when they were designed to hold only about 150.

Unlike other areas inside the U.S. mainland, Guam does not have large charitable organizations capable of handling these people. Another factor has been the environmental cost of the waves of illegal immigrants. The ship which ran into the reef on Friday has leaked fuel into Guam's waters, damaging the reef and killing other marine life.

According to the INS officer in charge on Guam, Mr. David Johnston, the waves of illegal immigrants will not stop unless some action is taken immediately. What I have suggested through H.R. 945 is to change the INA in order not to allow or narrow the gap for claiming political asylum in Guam.

What these Chinese syndicates do is use the political asylum claim on Guam in order to further their efforts and to profit from human misery and then bring them into the U.S.

Another thing that we must do is that there is currently a proposal in the White House which has not seen complete fruition, and that is to form an interagency task force to deal with issues of insular areas. This is a critical need. It is important that the White House immediately, sometime this week, convene an interagency task force meeting involving the Department of Justice, the Department of Transportation with the Coast Guard, the Department of Defense and the Department of State in order to address this crisis in Guam.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last evening I indicated that I would be back to finish today what I started yesterday as to why I introduced legislation that calls on the Congress to be full partners when we determine which civil war we will enter or which we will not. That certainly is the responsibility of the Congress.

□ 1430

My legislation basically says that no DOD money can be used to send ground troops into Kosovo unless approved by the Congress of the United States.

Now, it is right to condemn Milosevic for driving ethnic Albanians out of Kosovo, particularly after the bombing began. And, of course, unfortunately, at the same time, as I mentioned yesterday, we play up to China.

Now, Yugoslavia has 114,000 military and they are the size of Kentucky. China is the size of the United States and they have 2.8 million military. They have another reserve of 1.2 million. They are the worst human rights violators in the world. Their own statistics indicate that they execute more in 1 year than all of the rest of the countries in the world, and yet we play up to them. We know that they send nuclear and chemical arms to rogue nations that we have to deal with.

Again, I hear a lot of people in the well now supporting this issue who were not here when 1.8 million Sudanese found death through either starvation or because of execution. What

was the difference? Where were we then? Who was here in the well claiming that somehow or other we should enter that civil war? What about 2.6 million refugees in Afghanistan at the present time, and the other 1.5 million who the Afghan government has dislocated? Who is crying about our involvement there or whether we should be involved?

As I indicated yesterday, when the administration came before us and said we are going into Bosnia for a year, I asked what are we going to do in a year? It began in the 4th Century, the problems in the Balkans. It began in the 4th Century with the fall of the Roman Empire. It was exacerbated in the 10th Century with the rise of the Ottoman Empire. What will we do in a year to undo all the hatred that has been built through all of those centuries? And of course the answer, as we now know it, is nothing. Four years later and $7 billion later we are still there.

And when the White House came before us and said we are going into Haiti for a year, I said this will be the 11th time; the last time we were there 15 years. What will we do differently this time? The answer is nothing, because again we are still there and still spending the money of our taxpayers.

I got to the point where I talked about apples and oranges because people like to somehow or other say this has something to do with Hitler and Nazi Germany. That is nonsense. It has nothing to do with that at all. There is no correlation at all.

What happened at that particular time is the free world did the same stupid thing we do always. After a war, we melt down our defenses. We sat there and we watched Germany build the largest war machine anyone could ever imagine. And so when poor old Chamberlain has to go and try to do a little negotiating to buy time, we blame him as an appeaser. What else could he have done?

We saw a big military buildup in Germany not with the idea of staying within Germany, of course, but with the idea of moving all over the continent, and perhaps all over the world. So there are no similarities in that particular situation.

It is important that we as a Congress be part of this decision-making process when we decide that we are going to enter someone's civil war. Why? Number one, the draft. We positively have to come with the draft. We have spread our forces so thin that the Secretary of the Army last week was out recruiting on his own, trying to get people to join, because we have depleted our forces dramatically. So we better be involved because the draft will be an issue.

We better be involved because body bags will be coming back. We better be involved because, as someone said in an article this weekend, an all-volunteer army is dangerous. It is dangerous because it is used very quickly without much thought. Yes, I am concerned about three GIs. I am also very concerned that GIs would have been where they were. What kind of planning was that? I am also concerned about our raining bombs and missiles on trains carrying passengers who have nothing against us and have not participated in the efforts going on in Kosovo at the present time.

So, again, I call on my colleagues. Join with me and merely say that the Congress of the United States has to be very much involved when we determine which civil war is to our interest and our security and which is not. We will be making decisions, and draft will be one of those decisions, and that will change public opinion dramatically.

RECOGNITION OF DISTINGUISHED U.S. VETERAN JOE P. POE, JR.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the Congress a distinguished United States veteran by the name of Joe Poe from Dunn, North Carolina.

As our Nation focuses on the mission of our men and women in uniform in Yugoslavia and other parts of the world, I rise to pay tribute to one who has already served. Joe, his wife Marilyn, and their children suffer from undiagnosed Gulf War related illnesses.

Joe served in the United States Army for 20 years before retiring in 1992. His assignments have included serving in the 82nd Airborne and the 101st Airborne Divisions, as a drill sergeant in Panama in Operation Just Cause. He also served in support of joint special operations, and as a team sergeant for a forward surgical team in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

During his career, one of Joe's greatest contributions was helping write and implement the Army's doctrine on forward surgical teams. He is the recipient of the Bronze Star, the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and other high honors, decorations and badges.

The Gulf War should have been Joe's last battle, but it was not to be. Following his service, Joe began to experience disabling side effects as a result of his service in the Persian Gulf. Six years later, and thanks to the determination of Joe, his family and the efforts of Kate Darwin, a dedicated social worker on my staff, Joe became designated as 100 percent disabled and became one of the first acknowledged cases of Gulf War related illnesses by the United States Department of Defense. I am grateful to Kate and commend her for her tireless efforts battling the Federal bureaucracy on behalf of Joe and other veterans.

Even though his speech has slowed considerably now, the whole world listens to Joe Poe. He spends countless hours on the internet contacting other Gulf War veterans and lawmakers to organize them to support Gulf War veterans and their causes.

Late last year, with limited time remaining in the legislative session, Joe and other North Carolina veterans arrived in Washington to press lawmakers to pass legislation on behalf of Gulf War Veterans. As a result of their efforts, H.R. 4035, the Drugs and Informed Consent Act, and H.R. 4036, the Persian Gulf Veterans Health Act were passed, thanks to Joe and his boundless determination and his continuous effort.

I learned things from this. Never underestimate Joe Poe and never underestimate the unshakable will of the human spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD an article dated September 30, 1997, from the Daily Record of Dunn, North Carolina, on Joe Poe.

ONCE FIGHTING FOR COUNTRY, NOW FIGHTING FOR HIS LIFE

JOE POE WORKS EVERY DAY TO FIND ANSWERS FOR HIM AND OTHERS ABOUT WHAT HAS CAUSED HIS GULF WAR ILLNESS.

(By Andy Rackley)

Talk with Dunn's Joe Poe and it is easy to understand why so many people have rallied around him and feed off his determination.

Visit with Mr. Poe for more than 10 minutes and it is also easy to see why friends, family members and casual acquaintances call him an unsung hero.

Mr. Poe, a 20-year retired Army veteran, was once the lean, mean fighting machine which invokes the spirit of the elite soldiers in the U.S. Army. He tells of numerous military stories with a fire in his eye which keeps even the non-interested drawn into his tales.

However, the final few years of Mr. Poe's service saw him journey to what he thought would be his final battle—less than a year before his retirement—on the desert basin of the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Poe was team sergeant for a forward surgical team during the Gulf War. There were only two such teams. The team was part of a doctrine in which Mr. Poe's brilliant mind helped design.

NOW USES CANE

Now, a little more than six years after Mr. Poe's participation in the Gulf War, Mr. Poe's mind is still beaming with brilliance, however, it has slowed somewhat.

The soldier which used to walk several clicks (kilometer) in an hour with a 60-pound rucksack on his back, now has to walk with the use of a cane and can barely support his own weight. The man who helped rewrite the Army's doctrine on forward surgical teams, now takes about 30 minutes to type a paragraph on a computer. Regardless of the obstacle and the limitations caused by his illness, he gives a smile and carries on in his fight.

According to Mr. Poe and his family, he has Gulf War illness. He has been poked and prodded by numerous hospitals from Fayetteville to Winston-Salem to Washington,

D.C. The prognosis is always different. And the prognosis is never Gulf War Syndrome. He suffers from numerous symptoms like migraines, memory loss, concentration problems, balance, speech, vision-loss and others.

Though frustrated sometimes to tears over the government's attitude toward he and other veterans' suffering from an unknown illness, Mr. Poe still arrives at work early in the mornings—except when he just can't seem to make it in—at the family's business. American Artisans on South Clinton Avenue in Dunn. Though he is no longer able to work with the business, he goes there and digs in for a daily battle of researching information on Gulf War illness, developing and linking numerous veterans groups across the state and nation, and being a support link for other veterans.

DEAD ANIMALS FOUND

He is uncertain of how he contracted the disease, but he does tell frightening stories of his time spent in the Gulf War to include dead animals being found near his camp and mysterious colored clouds. Mr. Poe was near the ammunition depot where Iraqi chemical weapons were destroyed.

He said there were more than 1,600 other reports of mysteriously dead animals. ''DoD (Department of Defense) said the animals died from a natural occurrence of anthrax,'' he said. ''Maybe one or two or maybe a herd, but not 1,600 different reports of animals dead and the flies on them dead, too. It had to be something more.''

He also tells of multiple detections of nerve agents by several units near his camp to include his unit. Mr. Poe was one of the people who gave a report to DoD about the detection of nerve agents. Mr. Poe and his three teammates all suffer from some type of illness.

According to Mr. Poe's wife Marilyn, her husband was already sick by the time he returned from the Gulf. ''We—the children and I—knew something was wrong He had numerous problems and symptoms which you could not define as to one sickness. Everything was steady and in slow progression until 1995 when Joe's speech became dramatically affected, he had trouble walking and just getting around. And he has continued to get worse,'' she said.

FAMILY SHOWING SYMPTOMS

Mrs. Poe and the children have also began to feel signs of the sickness. Mrs. Poe has come down with multiple sclerosis and the children are having problems with their joints. These are the biggest concerns Mr. Poe has. Is his sickness affecting those around him? He has limited his time spent with others in church or eating out with the family because of his fears and concern for others.

''We just want answers,'' Mrs. Poe said. ''I think a lot of the doctors we've seen are also frustrated. A lot of them don't know what is going on or how to help. And those who may know something in the Veterans' hospital may not be able to help because of higher authorities. We just want help before it is too late.''

Mr. Poe doesn't have an answer to the illness facing he and fellow veterans, but every day he adds another piece of information to his Gulf War illness collection. Other veterans say Mr. Poe's fight each day is a huge step for all Gulf War veterans.

One of those people who call Mr. Poe a hero is his wife. ''One thing about Joe is that he has always done things for the benefit of others whether it was his role as a husband, his role as a father or soldier. He always gave it his all and then some. What amazes me is that even with his situation, he is still thinking of others.''

FIGHTING FOR OTHERS

Mike Ange, another local veteran affected with Gulf War Illness, said Mr. Poe is definitely a modern-day hero. ''He has a tremendous medical problem that nobody really knows how to fight. Despite that, he gets up every day and spends most of the day fighting not just for himself, but for others as well.''

Larry Perry, spokesperson for the Desert Storm Veterans of the Carolinas Association, echoes those remarks. ''Joe puts unbelievable amounts of time and energy into this fight. It takes guys like Joe to win this thing. His fight, I hope, will one day lead us to victory.''

Mrs. Poe said their fight has been solidified by the great community they live in. ''I can't say enough about Dunn. The people believe in Joe's fight and they are very supportive. People like those at First Baptist Church who have gone above and beyond what is normally expected. And U.S. Rep. Bob Etheridge who stands behind Joe and other veterans,'' she said.

The Poes have sent their blood off to be tested for mycoplasmal infections at the Institute for Molecular Medicine in Irvine, CA. However, the testing procedure has been put on hold until funds can be raised to continue research. The testing of veterans' blood by the medical institute is not financially-supported by the Department of Defense. The Poe's blood samples are two of 500 waiting to be sampled. Out of the 500 samples, 200 of those are from North Carolina.

Mr. Poe and other veterans plan to hold annual meetings to help disseminate up-to-date information on Gulf War Illness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago we balanced the budget for the first time in 29 years. Now we must meet our next great challenges, making sure that Social Security and Medicare are there for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I like tax cuts, I like them as much as the next person, that is why I voted for $95 billion worth of tax cuts in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. But with Social Security and Medicare set to go broke in the years 2034 and 2015 respectively, it should go without saying that fixing Social Security and Medicare should have first priority over any more tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have put together a budget that does not put one penny toward extending the life of either Social Security or Medicare. Instead, in my judgment, my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle are ready to squander $780 billion worth of our surplus on open-ended irresponsible tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment we ought to save Social Security and Medicare first before we spend any more of the surplus on any more tax cuts.

TRIBUTE TO OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT, DR. PHILLIP GORDEN, DIRECTOR OF NIDDK

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment this afternoon to praise a truly outstanding public servant of the Federal Government, someone who has contributed to healthier lives for literally millions of Americans. I speak of Dr. Phillip Gorden, who is stepping down this year after 13 years as head of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

As a member of the appropriations subcommittee which funds the National Institutes of Health, I have had the opportunity to work with Dr. Gorden for the past 5 years. He is one of the Nation's preeminent health care professionals, and I am proud to say he is a fellow Mississippian. Dr. Gorden's hometown of Baldwyn, Mississippi, is in my congressional district, and I know he maintains close ties to his Mississippi roots. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he and I are among the few people in Washington, D.C. who subscribe to the Baldwyn News, a small but very informative weekly newspaper in North Mississippi.

After earning an undergraduate degree from Vanderbilt University and then graduating from the Vanderbilt School of Medicine, Dr. Gorden completed residency and a fellowship at Yale University before joining the NIH back in 1966. He began his career as a senior investigator in the clinical endocrinology branch at the NIDDK and later became its clinical director. He assumed the position of NIDDK director in 1986.

I share the strong interest Dr. Gorden has in supporting the NIH's mission to acquire new knowledge to prevent and treat disease and disability. I have seen firsthand the results of his commitment to this important mission. Dr. Gorden's effective leadership has led the institute to great advances in fighting some of the most chronic and debilitating diseases which afflict the American people.

On his watch, Dr. Gorden has seen the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases grow to become the fifth largest NIH institute, with a budget expected to top $1 billion when NIDDK celebrates its 50th anniversary next year.

The institute's research efforts have brought breakthrough discoveries in the prevention and treatment of diabetes, digestive ailments, nutritional disorders, diseases of the kidney, urological tract and blood.

In his final testimony before our subcommittee this year, Dr. Gorden expressed great optimism about the prospects for the NIDDK as it prepares for

the 21st Century. He said we are on the brink of enormous clinical progress and pointed to extraordinary research momentum propelling us toward major medical advances. His leadership has been a key factor in making these advances possible.

Though he will soon leave as head of the institute, Dr. Gorden has charted an ambitious and steady course for the NIDDK as it begins both a new century and its second 50 years of service to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for us to recognize outstanding public servants for a job well done. Our thanks today go to Dr. Phillip Gorden for his lifetime commitment to improving the quality of life for his fellow citizens. Millions of Americans are living healthier lives as a result of the research Dr. Gorden and his colleagues have done and continue to do at NIH.

EXPRESSION OF SORROW AT TRAGIC DEATH OF JOYCE CHIANG

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) who spoke before me, and like the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. LOIS CAPPS) who will speak after me, I rise to express sorrow at the tragic death and to commemorate the short but inspirational life of Joyce Chiang.

□ 1445

On January 9, Joyce was last seen in Dupont Circle, and she was not seen thereafter. A body was discovered on April 1, and yesterday that body was positively identified as being Joyce.

Joyce lived a life of public service and public involvement, starting with her involvement with the student body government at Smith College, where she served as student body president, continuing here in the House of Representatives on the staff of the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and continuing to her service at the INS, where she spearheaded the implementation of the 1996 immigration bill.

Joyce never stopped contributing, never stopped involvement in public life. And Joyce was an incredible human being to all who knew her. As everyone who I have talked to says, and we all say the same thing, she lit up a room every time she walked in.

Those who knew Joyce were not surprised at what was an incredible and unprecedented outpouring from her friends when she became missing. I participated in the first of many vigils for Joyce held at Dupont Circle, and hundreds showed up to express their concern and their love of Joyce. And almost immediately, posters of Joyce appeared all over the City of Washington, urging people to contact authorities if they had any knowledge of her whereabouts.

Not only her friends, but also and especially her family missed and worried about Joyce. Her family endured with courage and religious faith the unendurable 3 months knowing that their sister, their daughter was missing.

Our heart goes out to her brother Robert, in Texas, and her brother Roger, who lives here in the District of Columbia and who spent so much time publicizing Joyce's absence in the hope that someone would be able to identify Joyce's whereabouts, hopefully to help us find her, help the authorities find her during her life.

And I am proud to represent and my heart goes out to two residents of the San Fernando Valley, her mother Judy, who has spent so long and prayed so hard for Joyce, and especially to my very close friend, my successor in State government and Joyce's brother, John, who has lived through with his family what I just cannot imagine living through, 3 months of Joyce's absence.

Joyce will be remembered by so many. She was an inspiration to so many, and she will be missed by so many.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for yielding.

And with our mutual colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), I simply want to join on this sad day to remember Joyce Chiang and send my most heartfelt condolences to her family and her many friends, her friends particularly here on Capitol Hill.

As the mother of two grown daughters, I can only imagine the suffering of this family, and the anguish, over the past 3 months. I realize that mere words can be of little consolation at a time like this, but I do hope that the warm memories and very fond recollections that Joyce inspired will provide some comfort over time.

I did not know Joyce like my colleagues, but I feel connected to her through her brother Roger, who has been the family's courageous public voice over these past several weeks. And Roger is from my family, that is, the University of California at Santa Barbara family. He was a student of my husband Walter, an active UCSB alumnus, and is a close friend of many of the young people who worked for Walter and work with me.

To Roger and to the countless others who loved Joyce, my heart is with them today.

KOSOVO REFUGEES: AN EXODUS OF BIBLICAL PROPORTIONS

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, an exodus from Kosovo of biblical proportions is taking place. Thousands upon thousands of refugees stream across the border 24 hours a day.

There was a newspaper headline in Europe that said ''Europe's turn in the killing fields.'' That writer must have seen what I saw, a catastrophe that should have been anticipated. Ethnic Albanian refugees from Kosovo are now paying a heavy price for this poor judgment.

I just returned from a 4-day visit to the Balkans. I went to focus on humanitarian conditions and the massive numbers of refugees flooding out of Kosovo each day. I traveled to Kukes and Morina on the Kosovo-Albania border. And when I left, an estimated 270,000 to 300,000 refugees had crossed the border.

The scene there is heart-wrenching. Our first introduction was the stench, the overpowering smell of urine and feces from refugees with no place to go to the bathroom. In many places the ground was covered with feces. It will not be long before disease breaks out, especially among the people who are already dehydrated, malnourished, and sick. Four cases of measles had been confirmed as of last Tuesday.

Refugees are everywhere, camped on hillsides, along the road, in parks and plazas, and in parking lots. Most arrive as an extended family in carts and trailers being pulled by farm tractors or, in some cases, by horses. Some arrive in cars, but many are on foot, an unending procession of people who had been threatened; and many have been separated from their families.

Everyone had a bad story. There is no need to document the reports, but every report was different: ''I lost my husband.'' ''I lost my wife.'' ''I lost my son.'' ''I lost my daughter.'' And we should now have people documenting that for a war crimes trial but also for history.

The country of Albania has responded admirably to this entire crisis. It is a poor country but it has opened up its heart and its homes. Still, in spite of the tremendous effort of people on the scene, the refugee situation is still a disaster. The Clinton administration, the international community, and NATO were ill prepared to deal with this crisis they should have anticipated. The information was there, but those who decided the course of events, particularly the Clinton administration, did not listen.

People on the ground in Kosovo before the bombing campaign began warned that the Serbs could begin to brutalize ethnic Albanians.

Some comments and suggestions:

The brutality has been taking place for too long. Serbian President Milosevic is the father of the Kosovo tragedy, as he was in Bosnia and even before. Beginning in the fall of 1991, when Serbs shelled and bombed and laid siege to Vukovar, he has continued this pattern of destruction. This is just another chapter.

Two, Milosevic is an evil man who has directly caused nearly a decade of terror and killing. Nine Serb generals have just been warned that they may be named as war criminals. Should Milosevic head the list? And the answer is ''yes.''

Three, there is a life-and-death crisis in Albania. President Clinton should immediately send a high-level delegation of NSC, State Department, and Defense to go on the scene, people who can make decisions.

Four, massive amounts of infrastructure supplies and communications equipment are needed at the border, along with people to assemble and operate.

Five, there is a huge shortage of food and people are starving today. But once the influx of refugees ends, the problem of sustaining them for a longer period is no less critical.

Six, refugees report that a vast number of houses and buildings and infrastructures have been destroyed. Every family said, ''My house had been burned.'' ''My house had been destroyed.'' We need to help them rebuild, and that will take a long time for them to return.

Seven, it is doubtful that Kosovo can ever again be part of the Yugoslav Federation. It will take a long time to implement workable solutions. In time, Albanians will tire of having to deal with the refugees who infringe upon their normal life. Most Kosovo refugees have no documentation, no identity cards, no medical history, no records. This will take a long time to reconstruct. And everyone I spoke to said they want to go home.

Lastly, we must do everything possible to help the suffering refugees. These victims of war have lost their homes, their livelihoods, and in many cases their identities. Additionally, having witnessed firsthand their struggle to survive and having seen their fear and their tears, I believe our country, the United States of America, and NATO's resolve with our partners must be to stop once and for all the brutality of Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following report of our visit to Albania:

REPORT BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FRANK R. WOLF OF VIRGINIA, VISIT TO ALBANIA: REFUGEES—AN EXODUS OF BIBLICAL PROPORTIONS, APRIL 4–7, 1999

This report provides details of my trip to Albania on April 4–7, 1999. I met briefly with Albanian leaders in Tirana and spent the bulk of my time at the Kosovo-Albanian border near Morina and the nearby town of Kukes. Thousands upon thousands of refugees streamed across the border, 24 hours a day. They desperately need lifesaving care now and will require sustaining aid for a long time until all the problems resolving around Kosovo are solved, and they can once again return home.

An exodus from Kosovo of biblical proportions is taking place, I saw a newspaper headline yesterday, ''Europe's turn in the killing fields.'' That writer must have seen what I saw, a catastrophe that should have been anticipated. Ethnic Albanian refugees from Kosovo are now paying a heavy price for this poor judgment.

I just returned from a four-day visit to Albania—my second since mid-February. I went this time to focus on humanitarian conditions and needs with tens of thousands of refugees streaming across the border from Kosovo each day.

By the time we left on Wednesday, an estimated 270,000–300,000 refugees had cross the border from Kosovo. They have added about 10 percent to the Albanian population in a matter of only a few days.

We arrived in Tirana on Eastern Sunday courtesy of Americares—one of the many non-governmental organizations (NGO's) saving lives, delivering food, water, blankets, medicine and other items desperately needed in large quantities.

Our airplane, a Belgian Air Force C–130 Hercules, seconded to Americares, was loaded with baby food, flour, and other emergency supplies. About 20 passengers were on board, mostly print and TV journalists and Americares staff and volunteers. A few NBC people from the TODAY show were there. We crowded in amid relief supplies, wherever there was room to sit.

The Tirana airport is just beginning to come alive with relief supplies and equipment arriving from many nations. U.S. Air Force personnel, with their positive attitude and ''can do'' spirit, have set up a tent city to get the planes off-loaded and the goods dispersed. They are doing a great job, and planes do not linger on the ground.

We left Tirana very early the next morning for Kukes, a northern Albania town nearest the border crossing. It is a drive of six to nine hours or more, depending on traffic, weather and luck. We travelled with USAID's Disaster Response Team (DART) which was going to assess and coordinate relief efforts.

It is the only road to Kukes. It is the only road available to transport relief supplies to Kukes. It is the only road for newly arriving refugees to travel out of Kukes to the villages, towns and cities throughout Albania where they will stay, or be moved to other countries.

It is a treacherous road—a dangerous road through mountains and valleys with steep drop-offs of hundreds of feet. It is barely two lanes wide with no barriers to prevent going over the edge. The roadway is dotted with flower adorned memorials to earlier accidents and fatalities.

We bounced from pothole to pothole around tight S curves, dodging traffic going in both directions. Worse, the roadbed in a number of places is being undercut by the passage of heavy trucks. Chunks of road are just falling off. As more and more relief trucks make the trip, the roadway may deteriorate to the point where it is impassable.

Officials are looking at creating an airstrip near Kukes capable of handling up to C–130 Hercules aircraft. They need to hurry.

In Kukes we joined with Catholic Relief Services (CRS). Like other NGO's, CRS is doing a remarkable job with what they have to work with. The overall relief effort was late in getting started, is slow in coming up to speed and, thus far, is overwhelmed by the vast number of refugees.

Our first introduction to the area was the stench—the overpowering smell of urine and feces from the enormous numbers of refugees with no place to go to the bathroom. In many places, the ground was covered with feces. It won't be long before disease breaks out under these conditions, especially among people who are already dehydrated, malnourished and sick. Four cases of measles had been confirmed by Tuesday and the NGO's were trying to arrange a massive inoculation program.

The number of people in Kukes was startling. This is a town of 23,000 inhabitants which is growing by tens of thousands each day. About 30,000 refugees are estimated to cross the border every day, 24 hours a day. Only about 15,000 to 20,000 refugees are transported from Kukes daily to other places. The population continues to swell. The most common estimates are that about 80,000 refugees were in Kukes on Tuesday and Wednesday.

They are everywhere, camped on hillsides, along the road, in parks and plazas, and in parking lots. Most arrive as an extended family in trailers being pulled along by tractors, or in some cases, by horse. Some arrive in cars, but many are on foot. Their only possessions are carried on their back. Our time at the Morina border crossing was an overpowering, emotional experience. We saw an unending procession of people and families, each with a horrific story to tell. Many had been travelling for days under constant threat of being harmed or killed by Serb militia.

Perhaps just reaching the border was an emotional release for them. There were many more women, children and elderly than younger men. Tears were streaming down their faces—many sobbed uncontrollably. We had an interpreter and the tales they told were chilling.

An 18-year-old boy from the village of Blac was randomly pulled out of line and shot to death—in front of his mother and family. They wouldn't even let his mother kiss him goodbye.

An elderly paralyzed woman was given 10 minutes to leave her home. There wasn't even time to get her medicine. As they moved away, the family home was set afire—blazing behind them.

Everyone has a story. Most have had their homes destroyed. There is a need to document these reports while they are still fresh, not only for war crimes, but for history as well.

The refugees have little food, water, shelter, sanitation or medical care. We went with a CRS feeding mission on Monday night. It was scheduled after dark to keep the hungry people from seeing what was going on and getting out of hand at food distribution points. But it didn't work. As soon as the distributors showed up, starving people began clamoring and struggling for food. The trucks were overwhelmed and had to speed away to keep people from being injured. Police were helping as much as they could but they are too few. We saw individual policemen on duty for 24 hours straight. Many Albanian families, and especially some in Kukes, were warm, welcoming and generous. Many opened their homes to refugees they did not know and had no earlier connection with.

I visited two apartments in Kukes to see for myself. In one, the residents vacated their two-room apartment so that a Kosovar family of 17 could have a place to stay. The grandfather was blind and just sat facing a wall. There was a baby girl, just weeks or perhaps a few months old. They had been a thriving family in Kosovo, but now have nothing, not even an idea of what the future holds.

In the next two-room flat, 10 refugees stayed in one room and 17 in the other. The host Kukes residents stayed with them, all sleeping on the floor.

Albania is a poor country in wealth, but rich in generosity.

We also sat in on a coordinating meeting of NGO's who are struggling to cope, many themselves on the edge of exhaustion and sickness. The room was filled with coughing and sneezing—respiratory cases about to happen.

The talk was of how to provide the most help. Who could do what? Who could best ease the shortfall of supplies? The overall conclusion was one of inadequacy, of being overwhelmed, of having too little to share among too many. And the talk was especially about poor logistics and communications.

The refugees situation in Albania, in spite of the tremendous effort of people on the scene, is a disaster. I think the Clinton administration, the international community and NATO were ill-prepared to deal with this crisis they should have anticipated. The information was there, but those who decided the course of events, particularly the Clinton administration, did not listen.

Satellite imagery could detect the large lines of refugees forming along the way to the borders, but this information has not been available to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) with overall coordinating responsibility.

People on the ground in Kosovo before the bombing began warned of the possibility that Serbs would begin to brutalize ethnic Albanians. I visited Kosovo in February, a few days before Rambouillet talks broke down ending hope for a truce with NATO peacekeepers in Kosovo. Many Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), UNHCR and NGO representatives and diplomats predicted then that ethnic Albanians would be attacked before NATO troops could arrive. In Kosovo, nearly every Serb family is armed, not with Saturday-night specials, but with Kalishnakov automatic rifles. The Serbs Army and Police are heavily armed, too. Real concern existed that, hidden from western observers, helpless and unprotected ethnic Albanians would be brutalized. That is exactly what happened. Had this been anticipated by decision-makers, measures to provide relief and the basis for survival of refugees could have been put in motion. Shiploads, and caches of relief supplies then could have been positioned nearby.

Even now, when it is clear that enormous problems exist, too little is being done. There is much talk of providing for the long run. But people are dying today. Massive amounts of life-giving supplies are needed now.

I would like to close with a few comments and recommendations.

1. This brutality has been taking place for too long. Serbian President Milosevic is the father of the Kosovo tragedy as he was in Bosnia and even before. Beginning in the fall of 1991 when Serbs shelled, bombed and laid siege to Vukovar, Croatia, Milosevic has continued a pattern of destruction. Kosovo is just the latest chapter.

2. Milosevic is an evil man who has directly caused nearly a decade of terror, killing and destruction. Nine Serb generals have just been warned that they may be named as war criminals for their actions in Kosovo. Shouldn't Milosevic head the list?

3. There is a life and death crisis in Albania. President Clinton should immediately send high level people from the National Security Council, State and defense department—people who can make decisions on the scene—to the border crossings in Kukes. A decision-maker/policy person has yet to visit there. And that's where you have to go to see what is really happening. Too many visitors stop briefly in Tirana and quickly move on, thinking they know what is taking place. They don't. Today, the refugee problem is hemorrhaging at the border. That's where the compress now needs to be applied. Once the influx of refugees ends, and they are placed throughout Albania, the same amounts of massive help and support must be re-targeted to provide long-term assistance.

4. Massive amounts of infrastructure supplies and communications equipment are needed at the border along with people to assemble and operate them. It is not enough to ship a load of tents. People to erect them, dig toilets and purify water must be there as well. Equipment alone is insufficient. Operators and technicians must be there, too. When refugees stop coming to the border, these needs will continue throughout Albania where massive numbers of refugees will be housed.

5. There is a huge shortage of food, and people are starving today. Once the influx of refugees ends, the problem of sustaining them for a longer period will be no less critical. Albania can't feed itself. Food is the country's largest component of imports. Albania is going to need help.

6. Albania also has difficulty maintaining law and order, even in Tirana. In many remote areas, police protection is non-existent. Unemployment is very high, and there is no capacity to provide work and economic sufficiency for refugees. The Albanian government will need to be propped up and the economy improved.

7. Refugees report that a vast number of houses, buildings and infrastructure have been destroyed in Kosovo. Rebuilding will take a long time and care for refugees must be worked out while this take place.

8. Little is known about the refugee situation in Montenegro, but it will undoubtedly add to the overall problem.

9. It is doubtful that Kosovo can ever again be a pat of the Yugoslav federation. It will take a long time to implement workable solution. In time, Albanians will tire of having Kosovo refugees to deal with and infringe upon normal life. Most Kosovo refugees have not documentation, no identity cards, medical histories or necessary records. Even the license plates were ripped from cars as they crossed the border. This, too, will take time to reconstruct.

10. And lastly, let me say a word about the press. Without their coverage as refugees began to pile up, it would have taken even longer to recognize the crisis at hand. The press has done a good job of telling the world what is happening and in mobilizing people to come to the aid of hundreds of thousands of the neediest people. Members of the press should be proud of their work.

STILTSVILLE: A COMMUNITY OF STRUCTURES IN SOUTH FLORIDA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, a writer in one of our hometown newspapers once said that ''Miami is two parallel universes of life on water and life on land.'' She was describing Stiltsville, a community of structures located approximately 1 mile south of Key Biscayne, Florida, part of the Congressional district that I am proud to represent.

It is difficult to describe in words the picturesque and peaceful view that the homes supported by stilts looming above the water makes against the Florida skyline. Stiltsville began in the 1940s with the Quarterdeck Club, a beautiful locale featured in Life magazine for its unique architecture and location on the northernmost extreme of pristine Biscayne National Park.

By 1960, at least 25 structures existed which represented distinctive architectural facades with brightly colored wood frame buildings resting on steel foundations. Stiltsville served for many years as the backdrop for many television shows, movies, books, and advertisements, including the long-running television show ''Miami Vice.'' It has been a favorite of movie makers, of boaters, and tourists alike because of its unique features and its frame against the Miami skyline. Unfortunately, due to the hurricanes that often plague our south Florida shores, only seven of the original 25 structures remain intact today.

Stiltsville homes are privately owned and represent no cost at all to the Florida taxpayers. These seven remaining structures have now been equipped with especially engineered features which have been adapted to meet the rigors of a hurricane-prone area.

The remaining seven homes provide not only aesthetic beauty for the landscape but a haven for fish and other sea life that inhabit the area. For boaters and fishermen, Stiltsville is often used as a navigational guide and as a shelter for many during storms.

For Floridians, Stiltsville symbolizes the Miami of yesterday and the Miami of today. In fact, Florida governors since Governor Leroy Collins have spent time at Stiltsville. Many of our local civic and charity groups have used these homes, including the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the Miami Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary Club, just to name a few.

For many of our cities across our Nation, there are local historical sites that give our cities character and that make them unique. For south Florida, Stiltsville is one of those places that gives our community flavor and keeps us linked to the history of our great State.

It is unfortunate, however, that in spite of the historical and cultural symbolism that Stiltsville holds for all

of Florida, it is looking at the possibility of being demolished by the National Park Service. Its current lease with Biscayne National Park expires on July 1 of this year, and a recent petition for national historic designation was denied even though Stiltsville is regularly a part of the South Florida Historical Association Tours.

The Dade Heritage Trust, which is Miami-Dade County's largest historic preservation society, has worked for almost 30 years to preserve landmarks that enrich the texture of our city's present and future, and the benchmark used by the Dade Heritage Trust for judging structures to be historic is 50 years. Yet an exception has been made for Stiltsville because the members know that the colorful origins of the community itself dating back to the 1930s and 1940s make it a wonderful component of Miami history.

Even the State Historic Preservation Officer of Florida has supported a National Register nomination for Stiltsville. According to noted historian Arva Moore Parks, Stiltsville is a very fragile piece of history worthy of salvage. And certainly many of us in south Florida share that sentiment.

In our district, with the help of dozens of local organizations, such as Save Old Stiltsville, the Florida Department of State, the University of Miami, and the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, we have begun an effort to ensure that Stiltsville will remain a part of Miami's history and that future generations will be able to enjoy the beauty that Stiltsville adds to Biscayne Bay.

□ 1500

Together, we hope to make this dream a very real part of south Florida and our State and our country for years and generations to come.

FORMER SPEAKER GINGRICH VINDICATED—BUT NO ONE KNOWS IT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I come to correct the record, for a politically motivated injustice. It is titled ''Newt Gingrich Vindicated, But No One Knows It,'' by Brent Bozell. I would like to read and summarize this article for the RECORD on an issue of basic justice.

''The judgement is in. After 3½ years of investigation, the Internal Revenue Service has cleared Newt Gingrich and his allied nonprofit groups of any violation of tax laws in the controversy over his television history course, 'Renewing American Civilization.'

''So after having run countless news reports highlighting the accusations that ultimately forced Newt Gingrich to pay $300,000 in fines,'' did the media correct the record?

I would like to let my colleagues, maybe for the first time, understand and know what Newt Gingrich was about. In our Republican Conference, the then Speaker, Newt Gingrich, and his lawyers met with the entire conference. They said that he would be exonerated 100 percent in this. There was no chance of him being found guilty. But it would take one or more years of court trials and dragging the Republican Party through this event. The Speaker stood up and said, ''I am not going to do this, because we are focusing on a balanced budget, on saving Medicare, on having welfare reform, and having tax relief. And if I go through this court case and don't give the Democrats their pound of flesh by paying this fine, then we will not have a balanced budget or save Medicare or have welfare reform.'' And he agreed to pay that fine. That is the kind of a gentleman Newt Gingrich was.

Do you think that the news media after this was announced did anything or said one word? Let me quote from the article again.

''ABC, CBS and NBC devoted exactly zero seconds to Newt Gingrich's vindication. Only CNN's Brooks Jackson filed a TV report, on the early-evening show 'Inside Politics.'

''He then showed old footage of Democrats David Bonior of Michigan, in which he said, 'Mr. Gingrich engaged in a pattern of tax fraud,' and John Lewis of Georgia, 'We now have a Speaker under investigation for lying to the outside counsel investigating his involvement in a massive tax fraud.'

''Jackson quoted from the IRS decision: 'The (Gingrich ''Renewing American Civilization'') course taught principles from American civilization that could be used by each American in everyday life, whether the person is a welfare recipient, the head of a large corporation or a politician. The course was not biased toward particular politicians or a particular party. The facts show the class was much more than a political platform.' Of course, that was clear to anyone who watched the course.''

And I quote from Mr. Gingrich: I urge my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), ''I urge my colleagues to go back and read their statements and watch how they said them with no facts, based on nothing more than a desire, and I quote, to politically destroy a colleague.''

The article continues. ''But the damage wasn't done simply by devious politicians. It was done by the media itself. National Public Radio reporter Mara Liasson justified the event by saying that he only did what Newt Gingrich did to Jim Wright. 'Bonior learned his lesson from him,' she said.

''To appreciate the media's antagonism—then, now and probably forever—toward Newt Gingrich, compare their treatment of him with their coverage of a real crook, Webster Hubbell. They roasted Newt when he was charged and then ignored him when he was cleared. Hubbell was celebrated when he was cleared of tax evasion charges filed by Ken Starr, but when a Federal court reinstated the charges on appeal, the networks aired no coverage.

''Let's get this straight. Webster Hubbell embezzled half a million dollars from his law firm partners in Arkansas. After he resigned from the Justice Department in disgrace, the President's friends paid him almost another million dollars for, quote, supposed jobs that asked for no work, money he pays next to zero taxes on.''

I would ask my colleagues to take a look at what they said in this well, and I would ask them to apologize publicly and in writing to the Speaker.

THE FOLLY OF COMMITTING GROUND TROOPS TO KOSOVO

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the decision to send ground troops into the war in Kosovo, it is important for us to look at the historical events surrounding that particular area and to then look at the request that is being made, that will probably be made for this Congress to approve in some fashion or other, a request from the administration to commit American troops to this folly.

During the break, I was given an article that I found quite sobering, from an individual in my district. The title of the article is ''Serbia: The lesson of Army Group E.'' It came off of the net, World Net Daily, Friday, March 26. The author, a gentleman by the name of Joel A. Ruth. And I quote from this article because I think it needs to be widely read and widely heard, again, as we approach this potential decision to send American troops in. It says:

> Before we engage the Serbs in a limited war over Kosovo, it would be wise to review the experiences of the 22 German divisions that were committed to stamping out Serb resistance between 1941 and 1945. While the Germans also had the help of 200,000 Croatian, Slovenian and Bosnian Moslem volunteer auxiliaries, they still could not do the job, and with a combined army of over 700,000 men willing to commit atrocities that the United States and her allies would never contemplate in this, quote, civilized day and age.
>
> In the end, and without direct Allied help, the Serbs succeeded, through extreme human sacrifice and one of the bloodiest partisan wars ever fought in history, in recapturing over half their country by the time the war had ended on all the other fronts.

Army Group E surrendered to the Serbs and was subsequently force-marched the length and width of Serbia without food until every German soldier had dropped dead by the wayside.

The fate of the Croatian Slovenians and Moslems who had helped the Germans was mass murder; all prisoners were taken, shot and clubbed or tortured to death and dumped in mass graves. Over one half million soldiers and their families were thus exterminated by the Serbs, over 1 million murdered if one counts the victims of the German Army Group E.

After the war the Serbs under Marshal Tito were determined that no outside aggressor would ever enjoy an advantage in occupying any part of Serbia ever again. Therefore, for the next 40 years, a massive system of underground defenses were constructed deep under the mountains, atomic bombproof and capable of maintaining a million-man army underground for several years while guerilla warfare would rage against any future aggressors. These underground facilities contain massive quantities of munitions, field hospitals, food stocks, fuel and consist of thousands of miles of tunnels which can enable a guerilla force to strike and vanish to safety during bombing and artillery strikes.

Believe me, if the Germans who utilized the most brutal tactics could not subdue the Serbs in 5 years when they did not possess such a defensive infrastructure, how much harder is it going to be now that they have spent 50 years in preparing for the next invaders?

The article goes on to claim that any attempt on the part of NATO and this administration to participate in any such venture would be just as full of folly and certainly would be just as bloody. And the idea that we can bomb Milosevic into submission is, of course, if you are taking this at face value, if the information supplied in this particular article is correct, then that theory, that strategy, is idiotic.

For if there is such a system of caverns and caves within Serbia where a million men could be housed and probably are being housed even at the present time, then how can we possibly expect to really cripple him through any amount of bombing that we can possibly do? It will, of course, take armed forces on the ground, and it will, of course, turn into the same sort of bloody situation that preceded us there some 50 years ago.

So I ask my colleagues once again to reconsider, when we are asked to commit American forces to this area, that we consider the lessons of history as it is so often difficult for us to understand. But it is important for us to realize that history does repeat itself, that this is a bad place for us to be with no particular reason for us to be there.

SCHOOL MODERNIZATION INITIATIVE—KEY COMPONENT OF 1999 DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the priorities of the Clinton administration and congressional Democrats is improving education. Democrats recognize that the future of this country depends upon ensuring that all American children receive a high quality education that prepares them for the jobs of the 21st century. Democrats believe that every public school must be a place where facilities are up to date and in good repair, where classrooms are not overcrowded, where the environment is safe and drug-free, where students have adequate textbooks and computers, and where teachers are well-qualified. This is why Democrats are once again promoting an aggressive, comprehensive agenda to strengthen and improve our Nation's public schools.

This evening, I would like to highlight a key component of the 1999 Democratic education agenda, the school modernization initiative. This initiative will help address the tragic conditions of overcrowded and crumbling American schools. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, thousands of our public school children are trying to learn in schools that are overcrowded and in desperate need of repair. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that our country has the highest number of students in our history and enrollment will continue to grow at a considerable rate for at least the next decade. In order to keep pace with this growth, the Department of Education has estimated that we need to build 6,000 new schools over the next 10 years just to maintain current class size. This crisis is compounded by the fact that in addition to our overcrowded schools, many of our existing schools are in desperate need of repair. According to a 1998 report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, American schools are in worse shape than any other part of our Nation's infrastructure, including our roads, our bridges and our mass transit. Moreover, in 1995, the nonpartisan General Accounting Office, in an in-depth study on the condition of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools, found that 60 percent of our schools in all regions of the countries are in desperate need of repair. Thirty-eight percent of our urban schools, 30 percent of our rural schools and 29 percent of suburban schools have at least one building in need of a new roof, a new plumbing system, a new floor or a new electrical system. In addition, 58 percent of our Nation's schools face serious environmental problems, such as ventilation, heating, air conditioning and lighting problems, along with environmental hazards such as asbestos, lead in the water and lead-based paint and Radon.

□ 1515

These conditions are dangerous and unacceptable. Leaky roofs, buildings in despair and overcrowded classrooms are not merely annoyances or inconveniences. They are barriers to learning.

This is substantiated by study after study that has produced strong evidence of the link between academic achievement and the condition of our schools. Students who attend class in clean, safe buildings not only do better academically, they also receive a far more positive message about their self worth than students who must attend run-down and overcrowded schools.

That is why President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress have a responsible and realistic blueprint for improving our schools. In order to help States and localities address this critical issue, the President has again included his school modernization initiative in his budget proposal for this year. Democrats in the House and Senate support this much needed proposal and have included it in their family first agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal creates a Federal tax credit to finance the interest on bonds which States and local school districts can issue for school construction and repair. These bonds would generate $22 billion in funding to build and modernize our public schools while costing the Federal Government only 2 to $3 billion over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, this is not another program leading to federal control over local public schools. Instead under this legislation the Federal Government will be a partner with State and local governments. It will be States and localities that will determine their needs and decide when, where and even if they want to spend Federal funds to modernize their schools, and State and local participation in this program will be totally voluntary.

Most importantly, local school districts around the country are in favor of this proposal.

While it is true that historically States and local districts have shouldered the majority of the responsibility for our schools, this crisis is of such a magnitude, an estimated $12 billion nationally, that States simply cannot solve this problem alone.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national crisis. The education of our children is not only critical to their personal growth, but to our country's ability to compete in the highly technical and global economy of the 21st century. Federal support is essential and in the best interests of our Nation.

In closing I would like to give my colleagues an illustration of the severity of the problem.

This is a picture of Balmont High School in Los Angeles, although it could be anywhere in this Nation. As

my colleagues can see, the roof of this gymnasium has multiple leaks, and when it rains, they need to put garbage cans in order to collect the water so that the gym is not completely flooded.

These are pictures of two other schools in Los Angeles, both with extensive water damage which has caused the ceiling tiles to fall off, leaving wiring and piping exposed. It is clearly not a safe environment in which our children can learn.

Mr. Speaker, what message are we sending to our nation's children and their parents if Congress sits idle while our schools continue to fall apart? I urge my colleagues to support the democratic school modernization initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), a man who is a champion of education and the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Task Force on Education and Training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, the gentlewoman's request to give the balance of her time to the gentleman from Texas is agreed to, and the gentleman from Texas is recognized for the balance of the 60 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to help carry the ball on these issues of such importance to our children's education. The work the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Roybal-ALLARD) is doing on behalf of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus is outstanding, and I congratulate her.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus' Education Task Force, it is my privilege to discuss the caucus' legislative priorities in the area of education for the 106th Congress. Let us start with the unacceptably high hispanic dropout rate.

Simply put, this is an urgent problem that is not getting any better. Over the last 25 years the dropout for both white and African American young adults has declined by almost 40 percent. Hispanic youth, however, have only shared in part of this improvement. Far too many of our students fail to reach their academic potential. Nationwide the percentage of hispanic students dropping out of school is twice the rate of other ethnic groups. Over all, about 38 percent of hispanic young adults have dropped out of high school compared to only 17 percent of African American and only 8½ percent of our white young adults. These figures are simply unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, our current economy, unlike 40 years ago, generates few meaningful jobs for people without a high school education. Because of the restructuring of our Nation's economy, not having a high school diploma or its equivalent poses a much stronger burden than it did decades ago when jobs with social and economic mobility were within reach of these with limited educational background and skills. In our present economy even high school graduation is not enough to pave the way to a middle class life. The good jobs are knowledge intensive.

Throughout the past 2 years the Congressional Hispanic Caucus has focused particular attention on the hispanic dropout crisis, but there remains much work to be done. As a Member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I look forward to working with my colleagues in my Committee on Education and the Workforce and on both sides of the aisle of Congress to eradicate this educational crisis.

On the subject of bilingual education I want to give credit where credit is due. I applaud the congressional leaders who are working to improve educational opportunities for hispanic students such as my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) who recently, only 2 weeks ago, presented his ideas regarding excellence in education for limited English proficient students. Congressman REYES has made some excellent points which I agree with and endorse on the complex issue of bilingual education.

The Ysleta Independent School District in El Paso, Texas, is proof that bilingual education works. It is a place where two languages are used without apology and where becoming proficient in both is considered a significant intellectual accomplishment. We need to prepare our limited English proficient students to function, to excel, in a world economy where being bilingual is an asset and a resource. School districts such as Ysleta recognize and understand that bilingualism is an asset, an intellectual accomplishment, and I applaud Congressman REYES and El Paso for their progressive thinking.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest elementary and secondary federal aid package targeted at low income and low achieving students. Funding for ESEA currently represents an annual $12 billion investment in our Nation's future. ESEA is a vital program to all of the Nation's children. It includes critical funding for many programs aimed at serving the hispanic student population.

As President Clinton has stated, the 30 percent dropout rate of hispanic high school students is a national economic crisis of great urgency. Expansion of exemplary education programs is needed to increase the education attainment level in the hispanic community as well as school modernization, as well as after school programs, class size reduction in Grades K through 3, teacher training and expansion of gear-up programs at the middle schools. These significant issues must be considered in the reauthorization of the ESEA, and I certainly hope we are going to reauthorize ESEA in this Congress as an entire package, not piecemeal.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my esteemed colleague from the great State of New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, education is my number one priority since I came to Congress. Providing our children with a good education and a bright future is one of our most effective tools for ending gun violence, drug abuse and poverty in our country. I spend so much time in my schools back on Long Island talking with students, teachers, our principals, superintendents and our parents about how we can make the education system work better. In visiting these schools I see students and teachers who are committed to education, and these are visits that have shown show me what there is in grade schools in my district. But these visits have also shown me what our schools and where they need help. Many of the buildings in which our students learn are inadequate, overcrowded and certainly in poor condition.

As my colleagues have pointed out, building new improved schools must be a top priority. That is why I am delighted the administration has made school construction a top priority. But hand in hand with building more schools is reducing class size.

I was delighted with the administration's initiative to hire a hundred thousand new teachers over the next 7 years to reduce class size in Grades 1 through 3 to a national level of 18 students. I actually would take this down one step further. I happen to believe that we should only have 15 students in every classroom through 1 through 3. We have seen the research that shows 15 in a classroom is where our young students make the most progress. This is simply common sense.

It states that what most parents and teachers already know from experience—smaller class size promotes effective teaching and learning. Smaller class size allows for a smaller manageable work load for the teachers and enable children to receive individual attention. This type of one-on-one attention can solve a lot of the problems before they start.

I am on the the Committee on Education and the Workforce and will be spending most of this year addressing problems like these: teacher training, school construction, reducing class sizes. We reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. With all of this, it is so important to make sure our teachers that are in the classroom now also have continuing education so they can come up to the time that we are talking about as far as being able

to use computers so they can teach on the Internet. So, I strongly support continuing education for our teachers.

The act which I refer to is ERISA. It deals with all aspects of K through 12 education.

We all know what it will take to improve our educational system: well-prepared teachers, new buildings, less crowded classrooms. It is time that we show our young people that we are committed to their education and to their future.

□ 1530

I am one of those believers that believes education can help our whole country as a whole. The more we educate our young people, certainly the better job opportunities they will have in the future. The better job opportunities they have in the future will help our businesses across this country, and that certainly will keep our economy strong.

We have to look at this as a whole picture. All we have to do is ask anyone, whether it is from Long Island or New York, whether it is California, whether it is New Mexico, what is the number one issue as far as you are concerned? It is education. It is the key to the future of this country.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to my friend, the gentleman from the great territory of Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how much passion, or more precisely how much hysteria, the issue of language can generate. I use the word ''hysteria'' because concern and fear about the supposed decline of English language usage in the United States bears no relation to reality.

We are 2 months into the 106th Congress and already three bills and one resolution have been introduced in the House of Representatives to make English the official language of the U.S.

The underlying premise of English-only legislation is expressed in H.R. 123, which says, ''Throughout the history of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of different backgrounds has been a common language.''

The problem here is that the premise of English as a national glue is faulty. It ignores and, by default, it trivializes the very thing that has made the United States a beacon to the politically and economically oppressed people of the world. Wave upon wave of immigrants have come to the United States not to speak English, for heaven's sake. They have come because they are desperate for freedom. They are desperate to participate in this great democracy. They are eager to participate in the American dream.

The enduring bond between our culturally diverse population is and always has been a shared commitment to the democratic principles of freedom, justice, liberty and equal opportunity for all.

Most immigrants come to the United States to build a better life, and every immigrant knows that in order to make the American dream a personal reality, English fluency is a must. There are immigrants who literally lose sleep to master English.

The issue is not whether immigrants want to learn English. They have more than demonstrated their determination to speak the language. The question is how best to promote fluency and general learning among young immigrant students, and this brings us to the heated controversy over bilingual education.

I endorse bilingual education and I am anxious to see the development of programs and funding to increase the number of bilingual teachers. Last year as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, I submitted a proposal to create a scholarship program for students who are proficient in English and Spanish and want to be teachers in the Nation's public school system.

The scholarship would be named after Frank Tejeda, the former Representative from the 28th District of Texas, who died in 1997 while serving his third term in Congress. This proposal was passed by the House, but was not included in the higher reauthorization education bill that came out of conference.

Bilingual education programs need to be applied with flexibility and with an eye to their effectiveness. Students learn in a variety of different ways, and it is the difficult job of educators to balance program structure with the flexibility necessary to address individual needs.

Educators must constantly evaluate the effectiveness of existing and proposed bilingual programs because there is something seriously wrong where minority parents have to sue school districts in order to opt out of bilingual programs which in theory have been established to meet their children's English language needs.

Unfortunately, English-only proposals are simplistic and a reactionary response to the challenges of a multicultural society. Worse, they threaten to deprive minorities of their heritage, their culture and the protections guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

If the free speech provision of the First Amendment does not protect language, what does it safeguard? How does one separate speech from the language that frames it? English-only proponents seem to forget that the very purpose of a democracy is to give people a voice. Congress should have no part in silencing those who cannot articulate their needs, their problems or their issues in English. To do so is definitely un-American.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this year we have an opportunity to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I, like many of our Members, we are all concerned in terms of the changes that we foresee and some of the things that might happen. One of the things that I would like to do this afternoon is talk about the importance of bilingual education.

One of the main programs the schools rely on is bilingual education. For many of these youngsters and the students in my district, this is not an option but a necessity. This program allows these individuals an opportunity to be able to learn the core items of the curriculum in their native language so that they will be able to function as quickly as possible in the English language.

This program allows our children to feel included in the learning process. From firsthand experience, I can say that I started in the first grade not knowing English, and it took me 5 to 6 years to comprehend what was occurring in the classroom. Now I have learned that language acquisition requires from 5 to 7 years to be able to learn a second language, and so it is important for us to have a good understanding of what it takes to learn a second language.

Programs like bilingual education will allow our students the opportunity to learn not only English but learn basic subjects in the native tongue that are essential for continued growth and development.

As we move to a global economy, more and more languages will be considered a necessary resource. The highly competitive nature of today's global economy underscores the importance of knowing more than one language. America needs bilingual education to produce educated, well-informed citizens.

The Texas Educational Agency commissioner supports this idea by stating, ''In the future all children should be trilingual: proficient in their native language, proficient in a second language and proficient in computer literacy. The business community understands the value of trained multilingual employees. We must offer a work force that can meet such demands.'' This is the commissioner from Texas.

By supporting bilingual education, we are supporting our country and also the importance of learning English, at the same time retaining as much of the native language as possible.

It also is important that through bilingual education and various types of

options, the two-way developmental bilingual education programs, for example, English speakers and language minority students are in the same classrooms learning all grade level skills at the same time.

Studies show that the most successful programs, models for language for minority students, as well as for native English speaking, bilingual education is a tool that fosters a successful future for these Americans. Bilingual education is an investment that pays off.

If we are to make changes in bilingual education, I hope that it is to improve in terms of assessing the importance of teacher training. We do need teachers to be well trained, to be able to provide that instruction. We also need the ability of the staff to be evaluated and for those programs to be assessed to see how well they are doing. Also important are the initiatives that include parents in the teaching of their children.

These are drastically needed and we hope that as we look forward that these are some of the things that we will be looking at.

Again, I would also just stress that in the bilingual education we will also see dual language instruction that allows both monolingual English-speaking youngsters as well as monolingual Spanish-speaking and other language youngsters be able to work together and learn both languages at the same time.

As we move forward in the global economy, we all recognize the importance of knowing more than one language, and I hope that as we look forward, we move in this direction. I hope that there is no talk of eliminating bilingual education or thinking that Washington, D.C., is a platform for implementing a national 227 initiative. This is not the place. There will never be a time for it to be addressed.

If we do not continue to support bilingual education, we will do a disservice to our children and our Nation. I encourage everyone to support the program. It is a beautiful program.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great and progressive State of North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for putting together this special order this afternoon because it is on a topic that is important not just to our Hispanic students and their families; it is important to every American.

Let me take just a moment to speak as a former State superintendent of the State of North Carolina, a State that is seeing tremendous growth in our enrollment of students of Hispanic background.

Let me also thank the gentleman for his leadership on educational issues as a leader in the Hispanic Caucus, and also as a cochair of the House Education Caucus, the Democratic side, and his work there. He understands the needs not only of Hispanic students and Latinos, but of all children in our public schools; and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has a rapidly growing Latino population, as do many of the other States in this country. They come, as my colleagues who have preceded me to this rostrum today have said, for economic opportunity. They come for a variety of reasons; and, yes, they bring their children and want them to have the same educational opportunity as other children.

As a superintendent, I worked hard to serve the educational needs of our Latino community, because they are an important component of the future of this country. If anyone who is watching today does not understand that, all they need do is read our papers and look at the demographics and how our country is changing and the contributions they are making to our society in so many ways today and will continue to in the future.

The biggest barrier to children, the biggest barrier to their learning, is language. We have just heard that. If a child cannot understand the language, then they have a difficult time understanding math or science or history or whatever they are being taught.

In North Carolina, and in most of the school systems in this country, but I will speak specifically about North Carolina and our needs at the national level to do some of these things, implementing English as a second language has served the Latino community better than anything else.

The reason for that is that young children need to understand the language. As I have said, the number of non-English speaking students, not just Latinos but of all languages coming to our shores, have skyrocketed in North Carolina in recent years. It has increased almost 29 percent; 32 percent last year was the increase in just the Latino numbers in our State.

English as a second language works better for youngsters who are in kindergarten to second grade. Let me say why. It takes only 6 to 18 months for those students at a very early age to be proficient and be able to handle it in the classroom, but for high school students it takes 5 to 7 years to bring them up to speed.

Why? Because we do not have the teachers, we do not have the resources and we are not focusing, in my opinion, as we should.

Let me say of an elementary school in my State, happens to be in my district, in Lee County, in Sanford, where they have an outstanding teacher. She taught Spanish for a number of years. She lived in Spain for about 5. She teaches prekindergarten youngsters.

In just 1 year, in just 1 school year, she can bring those students to proficiency. They can acclimate to the classroom and compete with other students and do an outstanding job. That is an indication of immersing students in English, giving them an opportunity in the second language. They spend a number of hours each day in this class, but they also get to go to their regular classes. That is why English as a second language is so important.

There is not enough funding at the Federal level and not enough at the State level to meet the needs of our students. The Hispanic Caucus is providing tremendous leadership on education, as well as this issue of language barriers. It is not isolated to this caucus because they reach across the lines and work with all the other caucuses, because we have a lot of children in our schools who need this help. I think we have an obligation to put our message and our vote where our mouth is.

□ 1545

It is easy for Members to come to this floor and talk about how important education is, and then they fail to realize if a child cannot understand the language, they cannot learn. Today we have a number of students and others in the gallery. I will guarantee the Members, they would tell us the very same thing.

I want to thank the Caucus for their help, not just on the language issues, but the understanding of the needs of children in classrooms that are overcrowded; in putting more teachers in the classroom, and in helping by voting in support of the 100,000 teachers, as the President proposed.

They have also have also been helpful in supporting H.R. 996, a bill that I introduced, the Etheridge School Construction Act, to fit the needs of these communities that are growing so rapidly. The classrooms are overcrowded. Teachers do not have decent places to teach. That is just not acceptable in a day and time when we have the resources to make it happen.

This bill would provide tax credits to finance local construction bonds across the country in those areas that have great needs. Texas is one of those States. That is one of the second fastest-growing States in America. It will make a difference. I thank them for their help on that. We now have over 100 cosponsors on this bill. I urge the Members of the other body to join us.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank my colleagues from Texas and all those in the Caucus who are working so hard to make education for all children a top priority, but specifically making sure that languages are available for those children who do not understand the English language, to help them to get up to speed so they can become a full player in this economic system of the 21st century, because the future will belong to the educated.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Members are reminded not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. SANCHEZ), the most populous State in the Nation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today a little bit about school construction, and in particular because my colleague who just spoke, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) spoke a little bit about the school construction bill, and I would like to tell America and my colleagues, so they will sponsor this bill, a little bit about it.

The Expand and Rebuild America's Schools Act is H.R. 415. I know quite a bit about it because I am the author of that bill. We put it in last year and we did not get it passed. This year we hope that we will be able to do it. What does the bill do? The bill addresses one of the most crucial crises facing this Nation; that is, where do we educate our children?

Now, some people would say that at the Federal level we should not be dealing with school construction. I would say that we deal at the Federal level with those issues that do not get answered at the State or local level. One of the major problems that we have with our schools is where do we educate our children, the room in which we educate our children.

I happen to represent a great area, Anaheim, California, Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Irvine, the central portion of Orange County. In the next 5 years, our school population will grow by over 25 percent. That is almost twice as fast the rate of growth as the five fastest growing States with respect to school population across the Nation.

That means not only is California growing faster in the amount of children who are entering public schools, or Texas, for example, or Florida, or New York, or Illinois, but in central Orange County we are growing at twice that rate.

That means that if we take a look at a school district, for example, Anaheim City School District, an elementary school district, kindergarten through 6th graders go there, there are 17,000 children attending that school district. Every year we grow by more than a thousand children.

I know about this school district because I attended it as a child, and the very same school that I attended with about 500 or 600 children today houses almost 1,000 children. Those other schools that are patterned exactly like the elementary school that I attended in the rest of the district have 1,000, 1,100, 1,200 children attending in the space that was made for 600 children.

How do these kids get there? How is it that we are able to put them in the classrooms? We have portable classrooms. We now have double sessions. That means that some children go early in the morning and others come later in the day, so we have a double session going. We now have year-around school. We do not have the traditional 9 months on and 3 months of the summer off. We actually have 4 different tracks of students going to school at any given time.

Now, imagine if you were a mother and you have two or three children, and let us say one of those children is in the middle school or the high school, and they have their own school program going, where they are going 9 months and then 3 months off. And let us say you have two young children also at home, both attending the elementary school. One could be going at 8 in the morning, and the next one would have to be going to school and starting at 10:15.

Now, imagine, you are a mom at home and you have these three children, and you are trying to take them around to soccer and to school and to the doctor's appointments and all, and all three schedules are not the same. So if you are a mother who wants to take three children at the same time to the same school, you cannot do that any longer in the city of Anaheim. It is very difficult to do.

Then, of course, there are the safety issues of sending our kids like that, kids who go out in the morning because they have a 7:30 or 8 a.m. schedule, and kids who come home late because they are on the late schedule and may be walking home in the dark. Think about the problems that we are creating with respect to the school schedules.

Then, of course, there are the portable classrooms that we are now putting onto that school that houses 600 children so we can house more, so we can house the 900 or the 1,000 or the 1,200 children, portables that sit on blacktop and the green grass, where I used to play: less space, double lunches, children going in at 7:30 in the morning so they can have lunch at 9:30. Think about that. We would not do that to ourselves in the business world.

Let us talk about business, because I am a businesswoman. If I were to start a small business today, let us say out of my home, like so many people are doing today, how many telephone lines would I have coming into my office, that extra room in my house set up as my office? At least three, do we not think?

Let us say it was just you working on a consulting basis or doing things like accounting or what have you. You would have at least three lines. One, you would want to be on the Internet. You would want to have your computer set up; two, you would probably like to have a fax; three, you would probably have a line or maybe two lines where someone could be calling in and you could put them on hold while you talk to somebody else.

Well, in these elementary schools in Anaheim, the entire school has only three phone lines to it. Now imagine, you are the principal. You are calling out. There is one phone line. If your PTA was great and was able to raise funds, you would have a fax machine in your office, and you might be faxing some information out to a colleague or somebody else.

Then, of course, kids get sick, so in the morning parents are calling in to say, my kid is not coming to school. If you are a parent and calling in and there is one line dedicated to the fax and one that the principal is calling out to talk to a parent or to somebody else, that means there is one line, one line to call in and say your kid is sick. Imagine if there are 40 children sick that day out of 1,200. That could be a possibility. Imagine the busy signals that you would get or the inability to get through.

Now, imagine if there was a problem at the school and there was a safety hazard or something was going on and you only had three lines, also. You would not start a business in your own home with less than three lines. Why do we allow elementary schools to have 1,200 children, 10 or 15 staff people, 80 teachers, and only three phone lines? That is the state that our schools are in today. That is why room, the fourth R, is so necessary.

That is why at the Federal level we need to be concerned about the rooms in which we teach our children. They should be modern. They should have the technology of the future. They should have the computers and the Internet and the telephone lines, but more importantly, they should be a space that our children could learn in.

The bill that I am offering is not about taxing people more and sending it to Washington, and then deciding what schools we want to be nice to and sending it back to California or Texas. It is about letting people actually keep the money in their area by not sending it to Washington, by giving tax credits.

Schools that qualify would need to have help, they would have to be on a heavy burden list, one like the city of Anaheim, where we need more classrooms, and we can show that we need the growth. Schools would also be required to work public-private partnerships and have businesses working with them, and maybe the businesses would buy the bonds that the local agency issues.

Third, the responsibility of deciding to issue bonds in order for the interest to be given as a tax credit by the Federal Government would have to be a local decision. That means that on a local level, a community needs to get together and decide that they are willing to pass a bond issue in order to build a school in their area.

Local control, not sending the money to Washington, but giving it back, in a sense, in a tax credit, that is what the Rebuild American Schools Act would do. That is why I hope that when people realize that this is really about putting responsibility on the local level to decide that they are going to do something about it, and the Federal Government stepping in and saying, we are going to help you to do that, we are not going to give it to you, but we are going to help you to solve your problem, that is why this act, this bill, makes a difference and is important.

It is a matter of national security. It is a matter of national security that our children learn in a school environment that is conducive to the 21st century, not in what people have to learn in in Anaheim.

I know because I used to go there as a child. I have seen the closet where the janitor used to push his barrel with his mops and put them away for the night. That closet has been turned into a classroom for six special ed children and their teacher. This is what we are doing to our children, we are putting them in closets so they can learn. How do we expect them to learn? How do we expect people to learn, children to learn, if they do not have the classroom space?

I was talking about portables earlier. The Santa Ana Unified School District, another area that I represent, if we took the portables that sit on its 26 permanent schools and pulled them off and made real permanent schools out of those portable classrooms, there would be 27 new schools built; 26 existing, 27 worth of portable classrooms on those areas.

There is no room to play. There is no room for recess. There is no room for lunch. If it is hot, as it gets in Southern California, there is no shade when you are eating your lunch. If it rains, what do children do? There are even some classes that are taught outside without a classroom.

This is why the Federal Government needs to get involved, and we get involved in a very specific way, with those classrooms that need to be built by the neediest schools all across the Nation, with responsibility at the local level to decide to build them, and with returning money, not sending money to Washington, D.C., but leaving it in the local level to be invested in local communities.

That is why I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 415. I know there are many sponsors already who have spoken today on that bill, and I appreciate the time that they have given me, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from the great State of Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for organizing this special order this afternoon.

It is hard to ignore the fact that our country is one of the greatest in the world, Mr. Speaker, and we have crumbling classrooms and overcrowded classrooms. Research has shown that students do not learn well in overcrowded classrooms and schools.

Some schools have problems with ventilation, heating, air conditioning, lighting, water, along with environmental hazards, such as asbestos. Worst of all, many schools do not have access to the Internet. The advantages of the Internet are unlimited. It is one of the most important educational tools, and provides instant access to a wealth of information.

□ 1600

We need to provide the necessary funding to enable local schools not only to modernize and to rebuild their classrooms, but to make sure each student has access to the Internet.

One of these schools could be preparing the first person to land on Mars, cure cancer or AIDS, or halt global warming. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity this last Friday to have an astronaut from the Johnson Space Center, Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, to visit a number of middle schools in my district in Houston, Texas.

He looked out over the 8th graders in each of the rooms and said, ''You are the generation that will be on Mars.'' We need to make sure those eighth graders are prepared to make that step onto Mars.

Also last week, Mr. Speaker, during our break, I had a chance to visit the AAMA Learning Center in my district. AAMA is the Association for Advancement of Mexican Americans. They have a charter school in Houston, Texas. They received E-rate funding for their charter school in the amount of a little over $35,000.

I was happy to see this funding was being used to provide counseling in reading and computer training to these youth in my district, but particularly Hispanic youth.

The AAMA school, the George I. Sanchez High School, was established to take dropouts from our public school system and give them that second chance or that opportunity. When charter schools became in vogue, George I. Sanchez had been around for a number of years. When charter schools became in vogue, the George I. Sanchez School became one of those charter schools and is successful today, Mr. Speaker, because of the success. They are benefiting from the E-rate that will help that charter school help educate these students who are the leadership for tomorrow.

We need to make sure that programs like AAMA's have the necessary funding so that all children have access to quality and innovative education to be competitive in this global economy we have.

In addition, we need to finish the job of hiring the 100,000 new teachers to reduce class sizes in the early grades. My wife is a public school teacher in the Aldine district in Texas. Even in high school we have problems with overcrowding in our math classes. It is tougher to teach 35 children algebra, Mr. Speaker.

In Texas, in 1984, the gentleman from south Texas knows because his former elected position was a State Board of Education member in Texas, Texas law changed it to where we had 22-to-1 pupil/teacher ratio in grades K through 4. That is great. The problem is we could not even keep up, and there are a lot of waivers having to be granted because of the need.

We need that 22-to-1 not only on a State level, but we need it to be 20-to-1 or 18-to-1 on a national level, particularly in elementary school grades, because that is where we set the tone for children to be good students.

Of course, before they get to be high school algebra students or science students or English or math, we need to make sure those class sizes are also small. Because if we are preparing our children to take our place not only as astronauts and physicists and Members of Congress, we need to make sure they have every opportunity.

Let us focus our energy on school modernizing initiatives so our children can learn in a safe and clean environment. Let us create a learning environment in our schools that inspires education and imagination. Let us reduce those class sizes so every child gets the attention and the guidance they need.

Finally, let us provide state-of-the-art technology so that each child is prepared for the challenges and demands of the 21st century. These are measures that will make a difference in the education of our children and that will provide for the best learning environment for our children.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) has two very attractive and cute little girls, Mr. Speaker, and I have watched them, not only the 2 years he has served and now his third year, his second term in Congress.

I remember my children went to public schools in Texas, and now a daughter who is starting medical school in Texas and a son who is going to graduate school at Texas A&M, they went to public schools. Public schools educate most of the people in our country.

We cannot say that we are going to fail the public schools simply because they have a harder job today than they did when I was in public schools in the 1960s. We need to make sure we give them the resources, the technology,

the facilities, the smaller class sizes, and also the qualified teachers to be able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for allowing me to participate with him today.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), my friend and distinguished member of the delegation from my State.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a different but equally important issue affecting education in America. As we prepare to embark upon the 21st century, all of us know that the Technology Age is upon us.

We live in a time when new ideas and innovations impact the way that we live, the way that we learn, the way that we work, and even the way that we play. Today's children cannot remember a time when fax machines, calculators, computers, or the Internet were not a part of their daily lives.

Their world and the future that they will inherit will require not only an understanding of these innovations, but an ability to fully utilize them and integrate them into their work environment. No matter what occupation our children pursue, every American child must be versed in the technology that is permeating our society today.

Mr. Speaker, a program that is making a tremendous impact is the E-rate program. This program through the Schools and Libraries Corporation is providing discounted telecommunication services and Internet access to schools and libraries across the country.

As a nation, we cannot afford to have only the affluent areas access the benefits of technology. Consequently, through this program, the E-rate program, equal opportunity has been provided to minority and poor areas in urban and rural communities.

The demand for this program and the funding is tremendous, as has been indicated by over 30,000 applications requested in the very first year. Fortunately, we were able to fund the majority of these requests through the E-rate fund with a total of almost $1.66 billion committed around the country.

Even so, however, there were many school districts and libraries that were left out. Nearly 500 million in requests went unfunded this year. This means that not all schools and libraries received the necessary resources that they needed. That, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

There is good news and there is bad news. The good news is that there is a round two for the E-rate. The bad news now is that in round two there will be 2,000 more applications than last year. With over 32,000 applications pending, clearly the need for discounted services and internal connections remains very high.

We as a nation have always prided ourselves on giving each and every child the opportunity to receive an education that will benefit them in their future employment. This year as schools and libraries around the country make applications for round two of the E-rate discount, we must make sure that not one child is left out in achieving technical literacy.

I want to encourage every Member of this Congress to stand up for our schools and libraries and encourage that they apply for year two funding. This is just as important as additional teachers, just as important as additional funding and additional pay for teachers, and certainly just as important as school construction and remodeling monies.

Our children's future depends upon the educational tools and skills that we provide them today. We, as a nation, must uphold our commitment to our children. This will determine the solvency and the prosperity of our Nation and secure the future of their children.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important keys to success to Americans is our education. That is why it is one of the top concerns in the Latino community and a high priority in the Unified Democratic Agenda.

We heard our youth requires increased literacy and more education plus enhanced technological skills. My District in southeastern Los Angeles County is absolutely no stranger to high dropout rates, and I discussed this with all of my school districts. These students leave school and are unable to be good, productive citizens in our area.

There are many types of approaches that the people in my district have come up with to fight the dropout rate and improve education. However, this does not mean that we in Congress and the Federal Government do not have a responsibility to work with them.

There are many types of approaches to fight these dropout rates that we hope to be able to, together, fight for. That is why we need to have more teachers, school modernization, funding for alternative programs that help keep our next generations of Americans in school.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important keys to success in America is education. That is why education is one of the top concerns in the Latino community and a high priority in the Unified Democratic Agenda.

To succeed in today's economy, our youth require increased literacy, more education and enhanced technological skills. But our schools are overcrowded and need to be equipped with the latest technology; teachers need better training; and we need to address the unacceptably high Latino drop-out rate.

Thirty percent of Latinos 16 to 24 years old have dropped-out of school. The number for African Americans is 13 percent and for non-Hispanic whites it is 7 percent. Among Latinos with limited English proficiency, about 50 percent have dropped out.

My district, in southeastern Los Angeles County, is unfortunately no stranger to high drop-out rates. Just a few weeks ago, I was discussing this very issue with an administrator at Bell Gardens High School, which serves the East Los Angeles and Montebello communities in my district.

At Bell Gardens High School, they have another problem in addition to the traditional drop-out rate as we know it. They have a very high transiency rate—about 30 percent. These are students who leave school and then come back several months or a year later. Their education is interrupted and they have difficulty readjusting to the educational program, which makes them even more likely to leave school again.

Local teachers and school officials have been tackling the drop-out and transiency problems in multiple approaches. One is to increase parent involvement in their children's education, so that the learning experience at school is reinforced at home.

Another approach is to improve libraries. There seems to be a correlation between the size and quality of libraries and the ability to capture students' interest and keep them engaged in the educational process.

A third approach is the Pathways program, which gears students toward a specific career path. This program has been successful at making high school education more relevant to the lives of students who might otherwise not see the necessity of staying in school. When they can link each of their classes to a future job, school suddenly becomes a much higher priority for them.

For those students who are living adult lives, either because they are parents themselves or they have to work full-time hours to support their parents and siblings, Bell Gardens High School has implemented "alternative programs." These are flexible educational programs designed to fit the schedules and demands of these students' lives.

These are the types of approaches that people in my district have come up with to fight the drop-out rate and improve education. Let us not mislead ourselves into thinking that all the solutions to our schools' problems can be found here in Washington. Excellent ideas are developed in the local schools in our districts.

However, this does not mean that there is no role for Congress and the federal government. It is our responsibility, as servants of the people, to ensure that local schools have the resources they need so that special programs, such as those at Bell Gardens High School, succeed. That is why we need to fight for more teachers, school modernization, and funding for alternative programs that help keep our next generation of Americans in school.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to discuss an important, brand-new education program called "Gear Up."

Two weeks ago, I hosted an information workshop in my south Texas congressional district to spread the word

to our local teachers, colleges, superintendents and school board members about what a difference the Gear Up program can make in the lives of our junior high school students.

This exciting new initiative is designed to prepare underprivileged students for college. Gear Up is a competitive grant program and supports early college awareness activities at both the local and the State level.

Specifically, this initiative will award multiyear grants to locally designed partnerships between colleges and high-poverty middle schools plus at least two other partners, such as community organizations, businesses, religious groups, State education agencies, parent groups or nonprofit organizations, to increase the number of students going to college among the low-income youth.

Gear Up partnerships will be based on the following proven strategies: working with a whole grade level of students in order to raise the expectations for all students; starting with sixth or seventh grade students and continuing through high school graduation with comprehensive services, including mentoring, tutoring, counseling, and other activities such as after-school programs, summer academic enrichment programs, as well as college visits; promoting rigorous academic coursework based on college entrance requirements; informing students and parents about college options and financial aid, and providing students with a 21st century scholar certificate—an early notification of their eligibility for financial aid.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge and encourage all local educational agencies to get involved in applying for this important grant. It is my firm belief that mentoring programs such as Gear Up can make all the difference in the lives of our middle school students.

A mentor may be the person who makes the difference by providing a role model for positive behaviors, like studying hard and staying away from trouble, by helping with academic work, by encouraging the student to take the right college-preparatory courses, or by providing extra moral support and encouragement.

We have a fantastic opportunity to help our local students—their future success depends on our leadership now. They fail if we fail to live up to our responsibility to ensure them the strongest chances for academic success.

Mr. Speaker, expanding after-school opportunities is a top legislative priority for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Our President is committed to triple funding for the 21st Century Learning Center Program, which supports the creation and expansion of after-school and summer school programs throughout the country.

Experts agree that school-age children who are unsupervised during the hours after school are far more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and tobacco, commit crimes, receive poor grades, and drop out of school than those who are involved in supervised, constructive activities.

The program increases the supply of after-school care in a cost-effective manner, primarily by funding programs that use public school facilities and existing resources.

In awarding these new funds, the education department will give priority to school districts that are ending social promotion by requiring that students meet academic standards in order to move to the next grade.

The President's budget includes $600 million in fiscal year 2000 to help roughly 1.1 million children each year participate in after-school and summer school programs.

I have visited many of the schools in my congressional district. I have listened to teachers, principals, supt's, and schoolboard members. I have suggested they try converting schools to "After School Community Centers." After school snacks, tutoring, mentoring, homework, organized sports, theatre, number sense.

I strongly support funding for this program and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KELLY. 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

WOMEN IN BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is near and dear to my heart, women in business, specifically women-owned small businesses.

As the mother of four and a former small business owner myself, I know just how hard it is to balance the full-time job of being a mother and then adding to it the challenges of owning and running your own business.

From women-owned construction firms to women-owned public relation firms to Donna, Jo-Jo, and Angela who own Donna's Hair Design in my own district town of Chappaqua, New York, all of these women deserve all of the support that we here in Congress can give them.

Everyone needs to remember that small business is the most important sector of our economy. Currently, in the United States, there are approximately 8.5 million women-owned businesses. That is 8.5 million women-owned businesses, 36 percent of all businesses in the United States. These 8.5 million businesses employ 23.8 million employees. These businesses have seen their sales increase from $2.3 trillion to $3.1 trillion in just the last 6 months.

My congratulations to all of the hardworking women who are doing more than their share to contribute to the economy of our Nation.

The number of women-owned small businesses have increased by 89 percent in the last decade. During the same period, these businesses have increased their revenue by 209 percent. Women are a force to be reckoned with in today's economy.

□ 1615

During my life, I have had many roles: The mother of four, a public school teacher, a college professor, a rape crisis counselor, a professional patient advocate, a small business owner, and now a United States Congresswoman.

I have learned countless lessons in these roles and have brought them with me to the House of Representatives. Many of these lessons were learned as a small businesswoman. This has given me some insight as to what women need in order to fully compete with their male counterparts, and for this reason I have devoted my energy to working with the Committee on Small Business to enable small businesses to run more efficiently.

I have introduced legislation again this year that expresses the sense of Congress regarding the need to increase the number of procurement contracts that the government awards to women-owned businesses. The Federal Government is America's largest purchaser of goods and services, spending more than $225 billion each year, and women should have more access to these projects.

In 1994 Congress set a 5 percent procurement goal for women-owned businesses. Five years later, however, the rate of procurement for women-owned businesses is 1.9 percent. This percentage is a poor reflection on the access to these jobs when considering the rate of growth of women-owned businesses.

I want to continue to do what I can to improve the procurement process for women in this Congress, and I am happy to say that a few weeks ago the House passed H.R. 774, The Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999. This bill authorized appropriations of $11 million for the expansion of this program in fiscal year 2000.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. JIM TALENT), for his work, as well as the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from New York (NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ), and many other people who worked to make this accomplishment here on the floor of the House.

Currently, there are 60 centers now operating in 40 States. These centers assist women in many ways, including helping them to focus their business

plans through courses and workshops, providing information on capital, as well as helping the women choose their location. The centers have the freedom to tailor their programs based on the needs of the communities in which they work.

Recently I have been able to meet with many women business owners and some of the women who run these centers and heard firsthand the challenges and the successes of these businesses. These are just a few of the issues that women business owners face. There are many others, like tax and regulatory issues, ensuring fair access to capital, that we all need to stay involved with.

I know my colleagues here share my concerns. Let me close by congratulating all of the women businesses in our Nation. I know all too well how difficult their jobs are. They are an important part of our Nation's economy, and I will continue to do what I can to ensure that they are not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in discussing the need for this Congress to help America's working women. I am proud to be a part of the Women's Caucus and I am proud that this caucus is committed to raising and addressing important issues concerning women.

Today, more than ever, working women are no longer the exception, they are the rule. America's working women are redefining the workplace as we know it. They are learning how to balance their dual responsibilities of work and family. In today's business world, women own about 6.5 million companies. That is one-third of all the businesses in America. Today, women are creating businesses at twice the rate of men. In fact, it is estimated that by the year 2000 women will own 40 percent of American companies.

These facts make it vitally important this Congress address the issues and the interests of this growing segment of our economy. Yes, it is becoming increasingly clear that women's issues are economic issues. Jobs, taxes and economic growth are the top issues for today's women.

Since women are creating more jobs than men, they are disproportionately affected by burdensome taxes, rules and regulations, and too often it is too difficult for women-owned businesses to get started. Once started, it is often difficult for women-owned businesses to stay afloat.

According to a 1995 survey of women-owned businesses, 84 percent of women entrepreneurs used their own personal savings to start their businesses. And once underway, women business owners often find themselves dipping into their savings to stay in business.

Mr. Speaker, as a small business owner myself, I have made it a commitment to stand up and speak out and stay focused on the issues that face women-owned businesses. Female entrepreneurs are here to stay, and while it is true that Washington cannot create wealth, it is no less true that we have an obligation to make the business environment as conducive as possible for women.

I believe that excessive government taxation, regulation and litigation hold back our working women by holding up production costs. Government taxes prevent female employers and employees from keeping more of their hard-earned money, and it has often been noted that today taxes consume more of the family income than families spend on food, education and shelter, or anything else. We need to make our tax system flatter and fairer so that our women will not have to work almost half the year to foot government costs. Working women need to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money.

We also need to review our regulations as well. Each year over 100,000 pages of new rules and regulations are produced in Washington, and many of these guidelines overlap and they are repetitive.

Moreover, it has been estimated that regulations cost businesses over $700 billion each year. These regulations impact every single business owned by women. And since businesses often have to raise prices to afford these new regulations, it is estimated that each American family pays an extra $700 per household to cover the cost of regulations.

It has also been estimated that regulations add as much as a third to the cost of building an airplane engine and almost double the price of a new vaccine. Mr. Speaker, we need to be working on ways to increase, not decrease, the number of women in business, and adding cost is not the way to do that.

Moreover, government rules and litigation often subject our small businesswomen to years of legal battles and legal costs. Let us let our working women spend more time in the board room and less time in the courtroom. Only then can we truly create a conducive business environment for women.

Mr. Speaker, today's working women are the pioneers of tomorrow. As they struggle to create more jobs, growth and opportunity, let us make our government work for our women, not against them; stand by their sides, not ride on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that working women have yet another job waiting for them when they get home at night. In our efforts to enhance and encourage the careers of women, I am afraid we sometimes lose sight of the fact that many of our working women are also working mothers. These working mothers need the opportunity to balance their schedules between work and home. After all, meetings with our children are more important than meetings with our staffs.

I was a working mother of three, and I understand there is no price tag put on the time we spend away from our families. That is why when I became Mayor of Fort Worth several years ago, I took an active interest in ensuring our employees had the kind of schedules necessary to take care of their jobs and also take care of their families.

One of the tools we used to help create a family-friendly city hall was comp time. This program allowed workers to choose time off instead of overtime pay. It is extraordinarily popular in the public sector, but it is still not available in the private sector. Let us help our working women by giving workers in the private sector the same choice.

Mr. Speaker, the working women of America are essential to ensuring that our Nation continues on a path of economic growth and personal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support measures which promote and protect the dual role of American women as leaders in the office and leaders at home.

I want to thank the Women's Caucus for raising awareness about the importance of women's issues.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, for bringing attention to these important issues that affect women and for drawing attention to the contributions that women business owners have made.

It is true that women business owners now employ more people than the Fortune 500 companies combined in the United States. They have made great strides, but we know that women in the work force still face discrimination in many, many forms, both as business owners and as employees.

Women in the work force today, as we enter into the 21st century, still earn only 74 cents for every dollar that men earn at the very same jobs. This persistent wage gap forces families into poverty and deprives them of the benefits that women would earn if only they were men; that is, if only they were men making more money at the very same jobs.

This discrimination follows women into their retirement. Because they make less money through their working years, they have fewer private pensions and they get fewer Social Security benefits. Often they have less health care coverage during their working years, and so they bring into their retirement years more disease. They are less well.

I want to focus for a minute on the issue of Medicare because now this

Congress is engaged in a great debate on what we are going to do about Medicare. And I would say that while it is important for Congress to ensure Medicare solvency in the future, any proposal must protect women who receive Medicare.

Of course, Medicare is a program that serves both men and women, but women comprise most of the beneficiaries. Elderly women aged 65 outnumber elderly men three to two. There are 20 million elderly women on Medicare and another 2 million women who are on Medicare because they receive Social Security disability benefits. In fact, 58 percent of all elderly beneficiaries are women.

Seventy-one percent of the beneficiaries aged 85 or older are women. That is, of course, because women live longer than men do. Women aged 65 years and older are more than twice as likely as older men to live within 125 percent of the poverty line. That is to say that they are twice as likely as men to have to live on $10,000 a year or less, and we know how hard that is.

Recently, older women were projected to spend over $200 a year more on out-of-pocket health care costs than men. And we know today that the elderly are spending a greater percentage of their income on health care out-of-pocket than they did when Medicare was enacted in 1965. This is a particular burden for women.

One of the proposals that has been on the table that frightens me the most and should frighten older women the most is that of raising the eligibility age for Medicare from 65 to 67. To underscore how dangerous that would be, currently there are a million people between the ages of 62 and 64 without insurance, and three out of five of those are women. So currently the numbers of uninsured people in the older age groups are mostly women already.

Many women are uninsured because they are younger than their already retired husbands who are on Medicare and they do not have employer-based insurance themselves. Raising the eligibility would deny people access to health care during their early 60s and would expand their need for more complicated and expensive treatment in later years.

There are many problems with some of the proposals that are on the table, but the reality of raising the age of eligibility for Medicare is that it would accomplish one thing, and that is, it would increase the numbers of uninsured people. Because employers are not looking for women aged 65 to 67 to hire and to provide health care benefits to, it would dramatically increase the numbers of people who are uninsured, and most of those people would be women.

So I would say if we care about elderly women in the United States, then we want to make sure that we do not agree to any proposal that increases the age of eligibility.

□ 1630

I thank my colleague from New York for allowing me this time to speak on this important issue.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute our Nation's women business owners and to join my colleagues in the Congressional Women's Caucus in bringing to the forefront the impressive contributions women business owners are making to the strength and vitality of our economy.

Over the past 2 decades, women-owned businesses have been amongst the fastest growing areas of our economy. In 1973, when I started my home-based law practice, women owned less than 5 percent of all businesses in the United States. By 1997, that figure jumped to 36 percent. Over the last decade, the number of women-owned firms increased by 89 percent nationwide. Employment nearly tripled and sales nearly doubled.

Who are today's women business owners and how can we help ensure that they are free to grow and prosper? There are more than 8.5 million women-owned businesses in the United States, employing nearly 24 million people. That is more than all of the Fortune 500 companies combined.

Where do we do business? Everywhere. Today, women own businesses in all sectors of the economy, not just in the service sector or the so-called traditional women-owned business areas. In fact, the top growth industries for women-owned businesses in recent years has been in construction, wholesale trade, transportation, communications, agribusiness, and manufacturing.

What is it that motivates women to start their own businesses? The National Foundation for Women Business Owners surveyed women across the country and found that nearly half stated one of two reasons. A great idea for a product or service, or the realization that they could do for themselves what they had previously done for an employer. Frustrations with the corporate environment, including feeling unchallenged and experiencing a glass ceiling were also cited as motivation for women to become entrepreneurs.

The foundation also asked women why they stay in business. Not surprisingly, the greatest reward of business ownership for women is gaining control over their own fate, and the greatest challenge of business ownership for women is being taken seriously.

In my home State of Illinois, the largest and most comprehensive women's business assistance center has thrived for 14 years. The Women's Business Development Center has served over 30,000 women through counseling, training, financial assistance, and new marketing opportunities. Thanks in part to the help of the center, in Illinois there are now over 336,000 women-owned businesses employing 23 percent of all Illinois workers and generating 15 percent of the State's business sales.

But despite the explosive growth in women's business ownership in the United States, we still generate only 18 percent of all business revenues. So there is still much work to be done, and Congress can help accelerate the growth and success of women-owned businesses.

Women need new and more access to market opportunities and to contracts at all levels of government. Women need access to technical assistance to develop and grow their businesses.

Most importantly, like all businesses in the United States, women-owned businesses must be free from excessive regulation and taxation, and they must have access to markets for their products and services abroad.

I thank my colleague for allowing me to participate today on this important issue.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague and friend from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, and particularly my friend from New York, who put this together tonight and for all who have spoken so eloquently in honor of women and Women's History Month.

I come to the floor of the House today to salute the mothers of Women's History Month, the National Women's History Project, known as ''The Project.'' The Project is from the Sixth Congressional District in California, the district that I am so very proud to represent.

Almost 1 year ago, I traveled to Seneca Falls, New York, with a group of my colleagues to celebrate our Nation's women, the 150th anniversary of the Women's Rights Movement. This was truly a special occasion because Sonoma County, which is where I live, is the birthplace of the National Women's History Project, the organization responsible for the establishment of Women's History Month and a leader in the 150th anniversary of the women's rights celebration.

The Project is a nonprofit educational organization founded in 1980. They are committed to providing educational resources, recognizing and celebrating women's diverse lives and historic contributions to society. Today, The Project is repeatedly cited by educators, by publishers and journalists as the national resource for information on U.S. women's history.

Thanks to The Project's efforts every March, boys and girls across the country recognize and learn about women's struggles and contributions in science,

literature, business, politics, and many, many other fields.

As recently as the 1970s, women's history was virtually unknown, left out of schoolbooks and classroom curriculum. In 1978, as chairwoman of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women, I was astounded by the lack of focus on women in our education system. Later, The Project petitioned Congress to expand the national celebration to the entire month of March. Due to their efforts, Congress issued a resolution declaring the month of March to be Women's History Month.

Each year since then, nationwide programs and activities on women's history in schools, in workplaces, and communities have been developed and shared.

Under the leadership of Mary Ruthsdotter and through the hard work of these wonderful women, the celebration of International Women's Day was expanded and declared by Congress to be National Women's History Week.

Together, the women of the Project succeeded in nationalizing the awareness for women's history. I want to acknowledge Molly MacGregor for her thoughtful leadership and Lisl Christy, Cindy Burnham, Jennifer Josephine Moser, Suanne Otteman, Donna Kuhn, Sunny Bristol, Denise Dawe, Kathryn Rankin, and Sheree Fisk Williams. They are the women that are at the Project presently. All of these women serve as leaders in the effort to educate Americans of all ages about the contributions of women in our society.

I also want to pay tribute to the ''first lady'' of Marin County, California, just across the bridge from San Francisco, part of my district. This woman's name is Vera Schultz. Vera was the first woman on the Mill Valley, California, City Council and the first woman on the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

Vera's career in Marin County during the late 1940's and early 1950's was a pivotal era in Marin's social and political history. As the area grew in population with the opening of the Golden Gate Bridge, Vera had an important vision and dedicated herself to the changing face of Marin County. Vera faced great opposition to reforming an unfair tax structure that would have taxed newcomers at a higher rate, and she also fought hard so that Marin County could have the very best possible civic center.

Vera knew that Marin deserved the best, so she got the best. Due to her persistent prodding, in 1959, Frank Lloyd Wright submitted his plan for the Marin County Civic Center, and in 1960 construction began. Marin County now has another precious treasure to share with our country because of Vera Schultz.

As I pay tribute to Women's History Month, I am truly grateful to Vera Schultz and to all the devoted women at the Project because of their continued commitment and for making an indelible mark on our country. We now understand the importance of women in our history.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for organizing and leading us in this wonderful opportunity to speak here on the floor regarding issues which we can give our attention to, which really do affect women across this country.

It is a real pleasure to hear the wide range of emphases that have been mentioned already today, and we have more coming. But whether it is women in their own businesses, and as they own and participate in business, whether it is the way Social Security affects women and Medicare affects women in all of these areas, there is much to speak about pertaining to women in this recognition of Women's History Month.

I want to rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of a most important piece of legislation which is among us and at our table in Congress today, and that is the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

Just 2 weeks ago, I joined the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) in introducing this bipartisan bill, which will help to treat low-income women who have been diagnosed with cancer.

In 1990, Congress took a very important first step to fight breast cancer and cervical cancer by authorizing a screening program for low-income, uninsured, or underinsured women through the Centers for Disease Control; and they called this program the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, and now it is in place over this past decade in virtually every part of our country.

Now, the problem is that while the program covers screening services, it does not cover treatment for women who are found to be positive and in need of services through this screening program. Thus, these vulnerable, poor women are left to an ad hoc patchwork of providers, volunteers, and charity care programs, making their treatment unpredictable, delayed, and in so many cases incomplete and resulting in really disastrous results for themselves and their families.

Approximately 3,600 women per year are diagnosed through the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. And now that they are diagnosed, they need services. All the screening in the world will not help if women who are diagnosed with the disease do not have access to quality treatment for their condition.

And so, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, which is before us now, gives States the opportunity and the option to provide Medicaid coverage to uninsured or underinsured women who have been diagnosed through the early detection program but cannot afford treatment.

I was very heartened a couple of weeks ago to notice in our first hearing in the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce that the hearing that we held on this particular issue that there was unanimous, it seemed, and very bipartisan support for enacting this legislation.

And I was pleased that one of my constituents, Dr. John Cox, the Director of Student Services at the University of California at Santa Barbara, was one of the expert witnesses; and the various people who presented were lauded by both sides of the aisle for their recognition that this early detection program is working well. But what it is uncovering is the need for services for these very women.

With that enthusiasm that we felt in the room that day, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and I and some other members of the committee have set aside Mother's Day as our goal for obtaining 218 cosponsors on the bill to bring it to the floor for a vote. What better way to honor mothers across the Nation this year than by providing this life-saving treatment?

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my commitment to working in a bipartisan manner, and I know my colleagues today will be joining that effort, toward passing the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

This bill is widely supported by women's health groups and is a top priority for the breast cancer community, including the National Breast Cancer Coalition and the California Breast Cancer Coalition.

Over 100 Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, men and women, have already signed on to be original cosponsors. I urge my other colleagues to sign on as well.

I cannot think of a better Mother's Day gift for women across the Nation than to pass this legislation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for letting us share this particular special order with America. I do not think there is any week with any more importance or month as significant as Women's History Week. The contributions of women in this country are so outstanding until if every woman in Washington were to be here today, they could not say enough about what women have done. On both the

local, State and national level, women have made significant contributions to our society and they will continue to do so. Our role in government is increasing. Our role in the health medical sciences is increasing. Our role in science is increasing. Our role in every facet of American culture is increasing. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, women now are sort of the bedrock of the family. We seek to be the glue to hold it together. Regardless of what phase of life that we participate in, we still feel that we have the family as our most significant contribution. We give, we yield, we culture, we nurture our children and we do our best to have them grow into outstanding individuals.

I came today to talk about a health problem that is so devastating to young women. Many of my colleagues may not have ever heard of this disease. It is called lupus. It kills women in their childbearing years. It cripples them. It maims them. It makes them feel as if they have no life-style at all. When you hear the word again, you will say, that is a devastating disease that is pretty much outstanding in significance and incidence among young women. It is serious, it is inflammatory, and for the past 6 years I have tried to get this bill authorized in the Congress so that the National Institutes of Health would receive at least 20 to $50 million a year for research into lupus. If you could see some of the young women that become seriously impaired by lupus, you would say to the health subcommittee of Labor-HHS, that is a disease that needs to be stopped. The immune system becomes so overreactive that it goes out of control. The antibodies in the woman's body attack her other tissues. This causes inflammation, causes redness, swelling, and it affects women nine times more than it does men. Between 1.4 to 2 million Americans have been diagnosed with this disease. There are so many cases that go undiagnosed and that doctors cannot many times diagnose lupus. Many times the diagnosis for lupus is worse than the treatment, and doctors are not very adept at finding out whether or not a woman has lupus or not. Our body's immune system is known for protecting the body, but if a woman has lupus, the immune system just goes haywire, it loses its ability to tell the difference. It is not infectious, it is not rare, it is not cancerous, but it is not well known. It is more prevalent than AIDS, Mr. Speaker, sickle cell anemia, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis and cystic fibrosis combined. So you can see what a devastating disease it is and its impact on women. It is so important that during Women's History Month that I call America's attention to this devastating disease and how much it is leading to the impairment of women.

I can relate to lupus firsthand. I had a sister to die from it. There are so many people here in this Congress who have had relatives. I have had several hearings on lupus. We are losing our children, Mr. Speaker, we are losing our sisters, our mothers, grandmothers and friends. We need to really do something about this deadly disease. We need to say to NIH, look, more research is supposed to be done on this disease. There has to be a cure. American women are at high risk for this deadly and debilitating disease. There is a need for more professional awareness. That is why I am glad that my wonderful colleague gave me this opportunity to come to the floor and speak about lupus because of its significance to women and during Women's History Week. We must fight those diseases that cause morbidity and mortality among the ranks of women.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) the cochairwoman of the House Women's Caucus.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order and for her fine leadership in this body this year and other years in support of women's issues and family issues. I was elected in 1992, the so-called Year of the Woman, when many Americans voted for women candidates not as a slogan but as a force to be reckoned with. We came to Congress. There were 48 of us. Our presence did make a difference in doubling moneys for health care for women and access to clinics, in child care, in education, in many, many areas. And we have made progress since then in the number of women that are elected.

In 1999 there are 89 women who hold statewide offices across this country, and there are other positive signs. There are now three women governors, 58 women in the House, and nine women Senators. In fact, the First Lady might even choose to run for the Senate in New York State. We have women in posts that never have been held before. We have the first woman to ever serve as Secretary of State, Attorney General, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, head of the National Science Foundation, and many, many more.

But I am still concerned that women did not receive the vote until 1920, a right that we should have been born with. In fact, my mother was born without the right to vote. We all owe a great debt to the many women who came before us, on whose shoulders we stand, who worked for and fought for women's rights, Alice Paul, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Carrie Chapman Catt and many, many others, because the vote is so important. The vote is what enables women to be not only at the kitchen table but the peace table, the economic development table, the congressional table. It is important that we as Members of Congress support other women in other countries as they work for and gain the right to vote.

Earlier today, a resolution passed this House authored by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the chairman of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). It was supported by every Member of this body. It congratulated Qatar on the first ever election to be held where men and women could vote and where women could stand for that right.

The gentlewoman from New York and I traveled all the way to the tip of the Gulf to be part of this historic and important event. It was held on March 8, International Woman's Day. What better way to celebrate the progress and advancement of women and girls throughout the world than by giving women the right to vote and stand for office in an emerging democracy in the Gulf. The Gulf Cooperation Council, which is in the area, this is the first such election to take place, and we hope it will encourage the movement forward in other countries.

In comparison, Kuwait has an elected parliament which exercises limited legislative and oversight powers, but women are not allowed to vote. In Oman they have an elected consultive council; however, only selected male and female citizens are enfranchised, and the Sultan retains the final say over who is part of that council. Bahrain had an elected parliament which was dissolved by the Emir in 1975, and the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia have no elected institutions. So we hope this historic election in Qatar will be a banner, a leadership step for the region.

We live now in a world economy and we must recognize that democracies help us in our shared world with stable environments and really improved rights for individuals. It was very exciting for the gentlewoman from New York and myself to meet the six women who were running for office. One almost won. She lost by 24 votes, but next time we hope that she will win. It looked very much like an American election, with banners and rallies and meetings, just good plain campaigning.

Any democracy is a journey. It is one that begins with many steps. This was the first step towards a full parliamentary election. It was for an advisory council. But it is an important first step. Seeing the faces of the individuals reminded me very much of the faces that I saw on television of our brothers and sisters in South Africa when they first received the right to vote. It was exciting, it was historic and it was wonderful to be there. But as we work here in Congress, we are working every day to help women and families and children.

Just this week, along with the gentlewoman from New York, we introduced a very important bill that will

provide screening and protection for breast cancer and prostate cancer. Roughly 1,500 cancer-related deaths per day take place in our country. Early detection of cancer through screening can extend a patient's life, reduce treatment time and cost, and improve a person's quality of life. The first step we need to take to reduce the number of cancer-related deaths is to increase access to screening exams in the private sector.

In 1997, Congress, through the Balanced Budget Amendment, included a bill that Barbara Vucanovich and I had authored in 1992. Barbara was a survivor of breast cancer. It called for the coverage of annual mammograms for women in Medicare. It was very important that this bill passed and was part of the Balanced Budget Amendment. It will save hundreds of thousands of lives.

The bill we introduced will extend these same benefits to Americans under the age of 65 if they are at risk and if the patient and their doctor know that such a test is needed. Most insurance companies provide coverage for some cancer screening, but that coverage is inconsistent and often does not provide coverage for the appropriate type of screening test given a person's risk level. My office has received comments from not only colleagues and constituents but doctors who talk about plans that do not cover tests that are needed to save lives and to prevent cancer from growing. If it is caught in the beginning, it is a very minor procedure. Yet if it continues to a more life-threatening stage, it is not only costly in terms of suffering but also in terms of medical dollars.

□ 1700

This bill assures that all individuals with health insurance are guaranteed coverage for important cancer screening tests such as mammograms and prostate cancer screening. Science has proven that these screening exams work. If a doctor and patient have decided together that the patient would benefit from a screening exam, insurance companies should not have the right to deny coverage of a potentially lifesaving exam. This bill will save lives and lower the cost of treating cancer by increasing the rates of early detection.

We have worked together on a number of bills, not only in health care, but in child care, in helping women-owned businesses and strengthening educational opportunities for our young people and our people who are displaced from work, and I look very, very much forward to working with my colleagues in the Women's Caucus, especially the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) who has been an outstanding leader in so many issues, particularly those that help women in business, women, children and families.

I want to note that the Women's Caucus has probably been the most successful caucus in a bipartisan way of actually passing and enacting legislation. It was my privilege to work with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) last year when we really enacted into law many important measures to help women, children and families, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) on the other side of the aisle.

So I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for organizing this special order for women's history. We have to realize that we are making history every day as we work here to strengthen the rights that so many women gave their lives for as they worked to gain the right to vote for women in this country. I thank her for going to Qatar with us and being part of that exciting election, and I thank all my colleagues for going on record and voting in support of the elections and the right for women to stand for office in Qatar.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I especially thank her for her initiative in organizing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, have spent much of my life working on women's issues. Many of them are discrimination issues, many of them are not, and if you would ask the average woman which of the literally hundreds of women's issues are more important, you would have a hard time coming up with a single answer. But I think you would probably find more women saying that pay today is important than any other issue, and that is because women are out here and have to be out here working.

Senator TOM HARKIN and I simultaneously introduced the Fair Pay Act just before recess because Equal Pay Day, when we would have introduced it, occurred when Congress was out of session. Equal Pay Day is a day that women in the year, usually four months, earn about what men earn during the entire prior year.

Thereafter we had a meeting at the White House with the Chief of Staff, John Podesta. At that meeting I asked that the President use Equal Pay Day to do an event to raise the profile of pay issues because they already high with the people of the United States, and to his credit the President and the First Lady had an event attended by several hundred women leaders on April 7 where, interestingly, they did not lecture us but invited in women, four women, to tell their own pay stories.

Why does pay carry so much weight today? Even women who live in two-parent families, two-thirds of them work. In year-round wages you have women up to somewhere in the 70s. It has bounced between 70 and 75 percent during this decade. The source of the progress we have made in the last 20 years has been largely a thin slice of women at the highly-trained level, and sadly, because of the decline in mens' wages, women are catching up.

There are a number of bills, and I support them all, but I wanted to say just a word about the Fair Pay Act, because if you want to meet the problem of the average woman today who works, it will not even be an equal pay, as much as we still have to do in that. It will be an equivalent pay for equivalent jobs in traditional women's occupations. It is the mainstream women's occupations that are undervalued.

Regardless of their education, the women now get more bachelors degrees, and women finish high school more often than men, women cannot catch up, and it is largely because even when they have working jobs where they have the same skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions as men, they are not paid the same so that if a woman is an emergency services operator and a man is a fire dispatcher, he is going to earn more money even though they both may have 2 years of community college.

The Fair Pay Act therefore says that discrimination in jobs that are equivalent in skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions should be paid the same, and it would add that to the law. Equivalent pay for equivalent jobs is going to be the issue of the next decade, just as the issue of the 1960's when we got the Equal Pay Act was equal pay for equal jobs. The Fair Pay Act does not tamper with the market system because the woman has to show that the reason for the disparity is not market factors but discrimination.

I would like to go through and talk about the women who appeared at the White House on April 7, but in deference to the woman who still may want to speak during this special order, I would like to conclude by saying that I think we are off to a good start and we ought to keep before the House this entire term the importance of women's issues.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) who organized this special order, and I congratulate her strong partner, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for her work in a bipartisan manner with the gentlewoman from her own home state.

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make sure that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) had completed her sharing with us over the pay equity, which is so

important for the full House to understand, so I want to, if I may, yield additional time as she may want to conclude that statement. She was so gracious.

Ms. NORTON. That is very kind of the gentlewoman and very typical of her.

Unless the gentlewoman from New York needs that time, I do think it would greatly illustrate my point to have some examples.

Mrs. KELLY. If the gentlewoman will just manage to fit it in, I think like in 2½ minutes, it is fine. I personally would like to hear the examples, Mr. Speaker, and I would be delighted to have her take that time if she would like to have it.

Ms. NORTON. I very much appreciate it. It will take just a couple of minutes.

These are the women that came. One my colleagues may have read about, a woman from Massachusetts Institute of Technology who is a molecular biologist who is at the top, who never dreamed of herself as a victim of discrimination, at the top at MIT of a tenured professor, the top of the scale. Then she found out that she was making 20 percent less than men who had come at the same time, had done the same amount of work, and she talked to other women, found 14 other tenured women had precisely the same circumstance. To MIT's credit, instead of becoming defensive, MIT said, ''Let us do a study. We're scientists, let us study,'' and have been decided to bring up the women's pay. That is the example, it seems to me, that we want to put forward.

Sanya Tyler who is the head women's coach, basketball coach, at Howard University sued Howard University. She now compliments Howard University because our university has now moved forward to rectify a situation where the only team that was winning was the girls' basketball team, and yet they had disparities in everything from facilities to her own pay. Her pay was brought up, and again the employer has moved forward instead of becoming defensive.

Patricia Higgins, a nurse from Cleveland, Ohio, who testified that her daughter wanted to be a nurse, but the fact is she is a pharmacist. People who are not doing the same job, had no more training, did not work in the high-pressured nursing and high-skilled nursing that she did and yet earned more money, and she expects that she is now in a union organizing drive, and she thinks that AFSCME is simply going to be able to negotiate up the salaries of the nurses so that they are equivalent to the salaries of the pharmacists.

These were three of the most salient examples, and I think when America hears those examples, America wants to do something about it.

I very much thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I particularly thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON); however I would like to retain 1 minute for myself.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) as well as the gentlewoman who is also from New York, our colleague (Mrs. MALONEY), in holding this special order and allowing me to participate and to thank them for raising issues that are important to women in our communities and in our Nation. I particularly am interested in supporting the effort of encouraging women to take leadership roles in emerging countries. I was pleased to be voting on the bill that allowed that to happen.

I encourage also the whole enterprise effort of women who are now becoming the growing percentage of small business people, so those issues that would allow our families not only to be viable, but also to be businesswomen and to be striving as businesswomen, not just existing.

I just want to bring up one issue, and I will conclude. That is the issue of child care. If we are going to talk about ability for mothers to go out to work, they have to be concerned about child care.

I am introducing a bill where we will provide tax credit not only for child care, but also for the training of child care workers to make sure that we can assure quality child care for mothers who need that so desperately. So issues about income, issues about leadership and issues about our children and child care are very much issues about families, and I want to support that and urge my colleagues also to be ready to support those initiatives that come in.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take all of the remaining time, but I want to note that many women have spoken here this afternoon, and, as you can see, women's interests in Congress cover a vast array of legislation. One of the positive things about the House Women's Caucus is our ability to recognize that we, working together, can affect the course of legislation in the United States Congress and hopefully, therefore, make life better for all of the families, women and children in the United States.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the Women's Caucus for having this Special Order tonight and for allowing me the opportunity to speak. I would like to focus on the issue of Domestic Violence against women. The dynamics of domestic violence can be as subtle as verbal attacks or as overt as murder. Nationwide, one out of every four women of all women has been battered at some point in their lives.

Violence against women destroys families, takes the lives of women and their children, and it traumatizes the young people who witness it. It is a well documented fact that children who witness violence in the home grow up to repeat the same patterns as adults.

The tragedy of violence against women is not just a personal problem, it is a community crisis. It is up to the community to get involved to address this issue.

Domstic violence affects women of all races and socio-economic backgrounds. A high percentage of these victims are women of color. African-American women account for 16% of the women who have been physically abused by a husband or partner in the last five years.

According to the Houston Area Women's Center, over 1100 women in Houston called for counseling services in 1997 for family violence. This counseling included services for women with children and teenagers who have also survived violence.

This figure only accounts for the women who have sought help. There are others who continue to suffer in silence. There were also 102 women in Houston who were killed by their partners in 1997.

We all have heard the stories of women who have suffered abuse. In my district I have heard the personal stories of domestic abuse survivors and I have also heard the tragic accounts of women who lost their lives at the hands of their partners.

One of my staff members recounted for me a story from her days at Legal Aid. A young woman with three children came in for assistance to get permanent custody of her three small children. She had suffered from years of abuse from her husband and she had finally decided to leave him.

Although her husband continued to harass and threaten her, this brave young women came to seek help in defiance of his threats. She declared that she was better off poor and alone than dead. This woman's story is inspiring because she made the decision to speak out about her situation. This means that we must continue our efforts to get domestic violence out in the open.

I hope that domestic violence will continue to be viewed as a serious public health issue that deserves our attention. We must encourage women to speak out and to seek help. As a community, we must provide support, encouragement and compassion.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my Colleague from New York—SUE KELLY for her leadership—and the other Members of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues in the special order. As the senior woman in the House, by virtue of seniority, I have been laboring in these vineyards for many years. I am always pleased to have fresh recruits. So I welcome all the Congresswomen to this special order today.

ALL ISSUES ARE WOMEN'S ISSUES

When I first ran for Congress, my experience was that every interview with every reporter started off with the same set of question: ''What is your position on the 'women's issues?''

And my response was alway the same: all issues are women's issues. And I still believe that.

But I have to tell you, when I got to Washington, I found that some of the ''women's issues—the ''family issues''—weren't being addressed by the men in power. Things like child

support enforcement and women's health issues and family safety issues. It wasn't that the men were opposed to these issues—they just didn't get it. They were not sufficiently aware of them.

So I realized, in many important areas—if we women in government don't take action, no one else will.

NEED MORE WOMEN

That's why we need more women in Congress.

That's why we need more women State legislators.

That's why we need more women Governors.

That's why we need more women in the County Courthouses, the Township Municipal buildings and the City Halls.

Of course, there are countless issues that have been thrust into the national spotlight due in large part to the efforts of women in Congress—health care, equal pay, family and medical leave, education to name just a few.

I would like to take a moment to examine one issue upon which women lead.

Child support enforcement

The first issue stems from the national epidemic of child support neglect. This epidemic of shame affects over 20 million families where parents ignore both the financial and psychological needs of their children

I have a long history of standing up for child support enforcement, having been a pioneer on child support reforms and having served on the U.S. Commission for Inter-State Child Support Enforcement. It's a national disgrace that our child support enforcement system continues to allow so many parents who can afford to provide for their children's support—both financially and psychologically—to shirk these obligations.

Among those due support, about 50% received the full amount, about a 25% received partial payment and about 25% received NOTHING. In 1991, of the total $17.7 billion owed for child support, $5.8 billion was not paid! This figure is unconscionable!!

Through the years, Congress has taken many concrete steps to crack down on child support deadbeats. The most recent major reform was contained in the landmark welfare reform legislation we passed in 1996—beacuse after all, child support enforcement reform is welfare prevention.

Now we have another opportunity to strengthen the child support enforcement network.

One of the major unfinished items of business from the last Congress is bankruptcy reform. Indeed the Leadership has indicate that bankruptcy reform will considered in the House in the next few weeks.

I am very pleased that the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999, H.R. 833, introduced by Representative GEKAS, strengthens child support enforcement in a bankruptcy proceeding. H.R. 833 does the following: (1) Makes child support payments number one when determining which debts are paid first in a bankruptcy case (2) confirmation and discharge of Chapter 13 plans are made conditional upon the Debtor's complete payment of child support (3) provides that the automatic stay DOES NOT apply to a state child support collection agency trying to recover child support payments.

I will be working with Chairman GEKAS and Representative CLAY SHAW to further refine and improve the language that will eventually be included in the final bill.

It is important to remember that failure to pay child support is not a victimless crime. The children are the first and most important victims. We must ensure that these children are taken care of and I will continue my relentless effort in this pursuit.

Remember, All issues are women's issues", nevertheless, women and children are sometimes victims because of indifference or lack of sensitivity. We pledge here today to give them the sensitivity they need.

Ms. SANCHEZ. What a century this has been for the advancement of women's rights in America. Women vote, we own businesses, we explore outer space. We fight in our nation's armed services, we represent our fellow citizens in our legislature, courts and state houses, and we have a greater role in U.S. public policy than ever before. But first and foremost among these accomplishments is the ability to control our own economic destinies.

I am here tonight to salute women business owners who have helped this remarkable change grow. And in particular, I praise the Women's Economic Summit, one of the first gatherings of its kind. It is planting the seeds for even greater future successes, and I am proud to be a part of that progress.

Women everywhere build their success on that of the women who have gone before them. Tonight I salute women business owners for their work in making the American dream available to our friends and daughters.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. MURRAY, be the conferees on the part of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 68) ''A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009.''

OVERWHELMING NEGLECT: THE ARITHMETIC OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clearly label my discussion this evening with a topic. I want to call it ''Overwhelming Neglect: The Arithmetic of Federal Aid to Education.''

Overwhelming Neglect: The Arithmetic of Federal Aid to Education, and I am pleased that this special order has fallen in a period when there may be large numbers of school-going youngsters, students in high school and elementary school and junior high school, awake, and maybe a few will be listening.

□ 1715

I want to address a large part of my remarks to those students, and I assure them that what I have to say will not be complicated. I am not going to talk in terms of complex and abstract ideas. I am going to talk about the simple arithmetic of Federal aid to education, no higher mathematics, no logarithms, no differential equations and calculus, nothing complicated, just simple arithmetic.

I want the students of America out there attending school to join me in trying to educate my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and in the whole Washington decision-making arena. There is something wrong with decision-making in Washington at this point about education, something radically wrong.

I think we need the children, the students, younger minds, to come to the aid of the decision-making circles here. We have some decision-making circles with closed minds. We are hemmed in and smothered by some conventional thinking and we need a breakthrough, and I am going to call on the children of America to help us make this breakthrough.

There is some simple arithmetic we should start with. The arithmetic begins with an allocation of priorities here in terms of time and attention and money based on the priorities that are established by the American people. In other words, we live and die by opinion polls here in Washington. Public opinion polls are very important to the Republicans, they are important to the Democrats, they are important to the White House. Everybody is concerned about what the public thinks and we spend a lot of time and energy discussing public opinion polls.

There are a large amount of resources committed to finding out what is it that the public thinks. The impact of public opinion polls, of course, can be tremendous on public policy. We saw the impact of public opinion on the impeachment proceedings which the Republican Party insisted on going ahead with despite the fact that common sense, as reflected by public opinion, the common sense of the American people dictated that it was a wasteful venture, kind of a silly venture and that is what it turned out to be. So public opinion can sometimes be ignored by powerful forces here that refuse to listen.

Right now we have a war in Kosovo which public opinion, I think, will play a great role in determining what else do we do, where do we go in terms of United States policy.

For good or ill, sometimes public opinion is not so desirable in terms of the results that I think we need. I did

not agree with public opinion when we had a dictator, self-imposed Army dictator, in Haiti for 3 years. They got rid of the lawful government and they sat there and they would not move, and negotiations went on and on and on.

I wanted to go in and restore the rightful president of Haiti, elected leader of Haiti, and if it took troops to do that, armed intervention, then I was in favor of that. Two-thirds of the American people said no. Two-thirds of the Congress said no. I am glad that the President did not listen to public opinion in that case. I am glad that he went ahead and took some decisive action and it all worked out in the interest of not only the people of Haiti but in the interest of democracy in this hemisphere.

I am glad that Abraham Lincoln did not listen to the opinion of his cabinet when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation. All the votes were against the Emancipation Proclamation which set the slaves free, but he went ahead and signed it anyhow.

So there are times when public opinion, I admit, I may not agree with it but we do listen to it. We do listen to it.

I want to call upon the decision-makers in this Congress and in the whole Washington arena to listen to public opinion on the issue of education. Public opinion has been speaking not sporadically but consistently over a long period of time about the priority it assigns to education.

The great majority of the American people say that government assistance to education ranks highest on their list of priorities, and it has been among the top priorities in the last 5 years.

Education consistently, the American people say, needs help. We need government at every level to do more for education and certainly we need the Federal Government to do more because the Federal Government really does very little in terms of dollar value. The Federal Government is responsible for less than 8 percent of the total budget for education in general. That includes college education, where most of the money goes. So the Federal Government should do more. The public keeps saying that.

Just to refresh everyone's memory, let me cite the polls generally. Whether taken by Republicans or Democrats, they are saying that education ranks number one. Seventy-four percent of the American people consider education as a number one priority. We might think it is Social Security because we hear more talk about saving Social Security. Among the elected officials and political leaders of both parties, Social Security is on everybody's lips. So Social Security is important. However, it is the second highest concern. Seventy-one percent rank Social Security as the highest priority.

Crime reduction is the third. Health care reform is the fourth. Eliminating poverty is the fifth. Tax cuts are the sixth. Jobs, number seven; getting rid of the national debt, number eight; campaign finance reform, number nine. Here is a list of priorities with education at the very top.

By the way, I have not mentioned defense. Defense expenditures and increases in government aid for defense does not even score. It is not on the chart. It is not on the chart. It is not ranked. So one would think that the priorities that we set here in Washington would have some relationship to the priorities which public opinion has set. One would think that there would be a correlation between what the American people say they want government to do and what we are actually proceeding to do here in Washington, in the Congress and in the White House.

Is there a priority? Is there a correlation? Well, on the surface, it may seem so because on the surface we have a lot of talk about education. Both Republicans and Democrats have all seized the issue in terms of public relations and spin, in terms of getting out press releases, in terms of posturing. Everybody wants to make it appear that they are concerned with education.

However, when we look at the budget, when we look at the arithmetic, we find that there is a very shallow commitment. When we look at the arithmetic, we will find that education is not a priority. The arithmetic of the budget, the allocation of resources, of dollars, it places education way down on the list of priorities. Defense, which is not even in the top ten, defense is the highest priority for both Democrats and Republicans, if we measure priorities according to the amount of money they are willing to appropriate.

Now, defense we often say is the business of the national government; the Federal Government is defense, so it is natural that defense should be the very highest priority. But why a big increase in defense at a time like this? Why do we have to have a tremendous increase proposed for defense before the arms intervention in Kosovo?

We have to pay separately for that. Most people do not know it, but the defense budget is for something else besides fighting wars. When we went into the Gulf War, we had to have a special appropriation for that. Any special armed intervention, any deployment of our forces in large measure, we have special appropriations. So we are going to have to have a special appropriation for Kosovo. We are already in Yugoslavia, to the tune of $8 billion. Our armed forces are in Yugoslavia, in Bosnia, and part of Croatia and carrying out a peace plan. So we have spent up to $8 billion already. All of that money is appropriated on top of the defense budget.

So let us leave out Kosovo for a moment, although I think that Kosovo is certainly important to what I have to say today, and I am going to mention Kosovo because I think Kosovo is an example of how the military strength of the United States is very important in the present world.

We are the last superpower and Kosovo certainly would not be possible if it were not for the participation of this American superpower in that intervention.

What do I think of that intervention? I think it is very important that the American people support the intervention into Kosovo, just as I thought it was important to intervene in Haiti and to follow up a long list of various efforts that were made to resolve the problem peacefully. We negotiated and we negotiated and we negotiated but the predators in Haiti, the vicious, savage people who were killing people every day and killed nearly 5,000 of their own people, they were not about to back down just via negotiations.

Slobodan Milosevic in Yugoslavia, Serbia, is the same breed of character. He is a sovereign predator. He and his gang are in control of the tanks. They have control of the machine guns. They have control of the arms might of the Nation and they are not about to stop the genocidal destruction of Kosovo. They are not about to stop it via peaceful negotiations.

I want to pause and comment on Kosovo because a strong nation must be strong across the board, and our military strength is very important for now and for the future. Even our military strength is weakened and jeopardized by the fact that we are blind to the need for a greater investment in education. We are blind to the need to make the investment now in order to guarantee that we will not have shortages in the future anywhere, shortages in our military personnel who are capable of running a high tech military operation or shortages in the civilian sector, in any area of the civilian sector, information technology, teachers.

We have a lot of shortages that have been projected as a result of the fact that not enough people are being educated in this country. Not enough people are in the colleges now in various fields that are threatened with great numbers of vacancies. To be specific about the military, the aircraft carrier that we launched recently, the super aircraft carrier like none other in the world, was short of personnel. Almost 300 staff members that they needed for that aircraft carrier, they could not find them. They were short of personnel. They could not fully staff the last great aircraft carrier that was launched by the United States Navy.

Why could they not staff it? We have a Nation of almost 260 million people. In a nation of 260 million people, we cannot find enough people to staff an aircraft carrier? It is because we are not talking about simple bodies. We do

not need just a physical body, a man or a woman to stand there and staff the aircraft carrier. We need people who have some orientation, some orientation toward a computerized world and can be trained to run a high tech aircraft carrier. They need a certain kind of people. They still need certain kinds of people.

There are other shortages. Already I mentioned in Kosovo, we have got shortages of fuel tank pilots, tanker pilots. One might have picked that up if they were listening to the news, because it came out in the regular news. One does not have to listen to C–SPAN to get serious things like that. I think I heard it twice. I think I heard it again on C–SPAN, but certainly I heard it on the regular news. Tanker pilots in shortage. They are going to find other shortages soon. In a high tech world where we cannot just take a body, an individual and throw them into an activity and expect them to perform, we need educated people.

So it does not matter where we look. Economic security or military security, whatever, it is threatened by the fact that we are not measuring up to the economic challenge.

□ 1730

Now, back to Kosovo, do I think we should be in Kosovo? Do I think that should be a challenge that the American superpower should take on, the so-called, what I like to call, in agreement with President Clinton, the indispensable Nation?

We are the indispensable Nation in terms of certain kinds of activities in the world. In this particular instance, I do not think we would be in Kosovo if this indispensable Nation did not play an indispensable role.

I was going to make a statement on the Floor earlier, but did not get a chance today, so I am going to make my statement on Kosovo right here, because I do think it relates to education. It relates to the need for the indispensable Nation to have the most educated population, not only military, but we need more diplomats, we need more people who are able to deal with the details. We need all kinds of specialists to take care of the various kinds of problems of the world which require people who have a great deal of technical competence.

On Kosovo, I call Kosovo a campaign of compassion. It is a campaign of compassion, and this Nation should be proud of the fact that it has provided a leadership role in this campaign of compassion. The U.S.-NATO military intervention in Kosovo is not driven by any vested interests, any financial interests, or any strategic hidden agenda. That is not the case.

There are some cynics who say, well, we would not be over there if it was not for something. Tell me, I would like to know. Are we in Kosovo because we are afraid that the price of oil or gasoline will go up? They used to say that about the Gulf War, that we had to protect our supply of oil, and we had a vested interest. But Kosovo does not have any oil. Yugoslavia does not have any oil or minerals of any great importance to us.

Somebody said in a joke the other day that we are in Yugoslavia to lessen the competition to Ford and General Motors for the building of autos. They were making fun of the Yugoslavian automobile industry. The Yugoslavian automobiles have not caught on in the world.

We have to search very hard to find some vested interest we could pinpoint of the United States in Yugoslavia. We would have to search pretty hard to find a vested interest we could pinpoint with respect to most of the NATO countries. We are not in this by ourselves. It is the NATO countries, including Great Britain and France. France has provided a great deal of moral leadership. I understand the people of France are clearly articulating the reason why they think this is an important intervention.

The NATO nations, the United States and the other nations, are motivated by great moral interests and high standards which require that civilized people never again should tolerate any rationalization for genocide.

I would like to repeat, these NATO nations and the United States are motivated by great moral interests and high standards which require that civilized people never again should tolerate any rationalization for genocide.

Our Nation's generous commitment of resources and the large-scale risks of American lives, and they are already being risked, those pilots are risking their lives. With people over there in the fervor of just getting ready, just loading material and so forth, many people can die by accident in that kind of atmosphere. But certainly people who fly those missions are risking their lives. Even before we move to the level of ground troops, large numbers of lives are being risked. We are doing that already.

The large-scale risk of American lives, not in the pursuit of the usual narrow vital interests, but to protect the sacred lives of human beings that we will never know personally, this action represents a laudable and noble national action.

The Roman empire only dispatched its legions to achieve greater conquest. This American indispensable Nation has deployed its armies in an unprecedented campaign of compassion. This is a campaign of compassion.

Adolph Hitler, Josef Stalin, Saddam Hussein, Idi Amin, the Hutu generals of Rwanda, Slobodan Milosevic, we can call the roll of sovereign predators who have used murderous ethnic scapegoating to seize, to hold, and to expand their powers.

The oldest trick in the world is to scapegoat. Scapegoating even existed where there were no ethnic groups involved. Scapegoating, in fact, the whole description of it is an actual goat. The dead and dried carcass of a goat was used in some villages when there were plagues or hunger and famine, and people were so downtrodden and angry and bitter and hopeless that they would pull together the dead carcass of a goat and they would heap all of their rubbish and stuff, and the symbolism would be that all the evil and all the disease and everything in the town and in the village would be heaped on this thing, and it would be driven out of town or dragged out of town. Scapegoating was done even without having another ethnic group.

But in the history of humankind, scapegoating has become a very convenient vehicle for demagogues. Demagogues throughout time find it easy to come to power. The easiest way to power is to brand somebody as the enemy, and to set yourself up as the savior of your group against that enemy. It has been done repeatedly, and any group that happens to find itself in a minority is likely to be victimized.

It is not because the minority has something wrong with it. African Americans have often absorbed a whole lot of self-hate, and they think that there was something wrong with them, that they allowed themselves to be enslaved for so long, and that it is because of some curse in the Bible, it is because of some genetic inferiority. They believe the white folks who say that African-Americans are inferior. They have taken in a whole lot of guilt and inferiority feelings, and they said, this is the reason why we are persecuted.

No, there have been minorities in history who have been superior, who have been acknowledged as being superior. It does not matter whether you are accused of being inferior or of being superior, but when they are ready, the demagogues are ready to take advantage of a situation and they need scapegoats, they will seize upon and utilize the weakest element of the population. Just being the minority guarantees that you are going to be in the line of victimization.

The Jews in Germany, they were too rich, they were too educated, they were too accomplished in the arts, too accomplished in the sciences, they were despised because they had achieved too much. It did not matter, if it had been just the opposite they would use another kind of excuse. This is the process that demagogues use to come to power.

The most recent demagogue, of course, that we are dealing with is Slobodan Milosevic. People say, well, they have been fighting in the Baltic for years and we cannot do anything

about that, because they are going to do that. It is ancient hatreds.

Well, there was a period of several decades where Kosovo was given its autonomy, and the Serbs and the ethnic Albanians lived together in peace. In fact, all of Yugoslavia has been falling apart for the last 15 years, but all of Yugoslavia was united under one banner for several decades.

The answer to that, they say is Tito. Tito was a Communist. He made them do it. I do not pretend to know how it all happened. I am not a historian. I am not a sociologist. I think there ought to be a study made of how did they hold it all together. Even under communism, there are no magic formulas.

But nevertheless, these people, they say, cannot live together in the Balkans. They are always going to fight each other. But they did live together. In Kosovo there was a solution. Slobodan Milosevic wrecked the solution. He took away the autonomy. He started the problem.

We have been negotiating with him for 8 years. How long do you negotiate before you realize that there is no profit to this so-called peaceful negotiation? Slobodan Milosevic is a sovereign predator. He is in the vein of Hitler, Stalin, the Hutu generals, Hutu leaders of Rwanda who massacred the Tutsis. They needed to come to power fast, and they just used the hatred of people to scapegoat and come to power.

From ancient Egypt to Kosovo, the demagogues repeatedly have used the same methods and found a willing mass of supporters. The United States-led resistence to genocide in Kosovo shows that finally we have not only learned a vital lesson in history, but now that knowledge has also provided us with an imperative for painful but effective action.

We are not just looking back at what happened when Hitler killed 6 million Jews and the world stood by and did nothing. We are not just regretting that that happened, but in this particular instance we have been forced to come to grips with a decision.

As a Nation, I am proud of the fact that public opinion in this case is behind the President, who has made a very difficult political decision and moved forward on this venture that becomes more complex and violent every day.

The U.S.-led resistance to genocide in Kosovo shows that finally we have not only learned a vital lesson of history, but now that knowledge also provides an imperative for painful but effective action.

Slobodan Milosevic should have been declared a war criminal 8 years ago. Diplomatic patience has been cleverly manipulated by this sovereign predator. Better late than never, however. We must now declare Slobodan Milosevic a war criminal, and send a clear message to all of his confused civilian followers, now mobilizing in their neighborhoods under misplaced banners of nationalism and patriotism.

For more than 8 years the citizens of Serbia and Yugoslavia have failed to marshal internal sovereign resistance to the genocidal policies of their dictator. Their popular will, majority complicity with evil, is the true cause of the present conflagration in the Balkans. It is not the designs of NATO, it is not the vested interests of the United States, it is not some kind of outside desire to humiliate the people of Yugoslavia and Serbia. It is the majority complicity with evil that has allowed Slobodan Milosevic to stay in power that has led to this conflagration in the Balkans at present.

War is hell, and we extend our prayers to innocent victims on all sides. War is hell. We need to pray for all those people who have been caught up in this.

Most people are innocent, because only a handful control the power, the tanks, the machine guns. But the refusal to watch the repeat of Hitler's death pageant is our duty. It is our duty to refuse to watch a repeat of Hitler's death pageant.

There are some who say that because we cannot stop genocide everywhere, we should refuse to stand against genocide anywhere. People are saying, well, you are not doing anything about Tibet, you were not doing anything about genocide against the Kurds in Iraq, you did not do anything to help the Tutsis in Rwanda, so why are you in Kosovo? Because we cannot stop genocide everywhere, we should refuse to stand against genocide anywhere. That is the logic they have.

We reject that logic. We cannot save them all. We could not save the Tutsis in Rwanda. We cannot save the Kurds in Iraq at this point, the Tibetans in China. But the world can take united action now in Kosovo.

In this clear and present instance, a portion of the civilized world has both the capability and the will to stop genocide. I am certain that the angels in heaven are applauding these bold and brave actions. Since the civilian electorate of Serb-Yugoslavia has not been willing or not been able to save itself from totalitarian disease, and because a minority of military monsters with tanks and machine guns can hold the majority of a Nation hostage, outside intervention is sometimes the only antidote to a spreading poison.

Decades of autonomy was the peaceful solution that Milosevic eradicated. Let the Kosovo campaign of compassion send a message to sovereign predators everywhere. Sovereign predators will not be allowed to savagely devour human rights. Diplomatic condemnation of genocide will always be a certainty, and sometimes military confrontation will also be possible.

I appeal to progressive thinkers everywhere to lay aside their fuzzy-minded analyses and remember the Hitler syndrome. Remember the Hitler syndrome. ''Never again'' must not be an abstract slogan. Each one of us has a duty to take a forceful position.

We should all be proud of the fact that this indispensable Nation has both the will and the power to reinforce the foundation of a compassionate civilization.

I make this statement in the midst of my discussion of education because I think that, as the indispensable Nation, the last remaining superpower assuming great responsibilities in the world, our citizenry, the people out there, including the students who are still awake and attending high school and grammar school and listening, they certainly ought to understand and know or be stimulated by my remarks to go and do more research, if you wish.

We need to move on all fronts. We need a peace academy in this country that is as big as West Point. We have a peace academy, by the way. Look it up on the Internet, or do some research on the peace academy. We have a budget for a peace academy, a very tiny budget. I know, because it was under the jurisdiction of one of the subcommittees that I served on at one time.

The peace academy is very important, and understanding how to make peace, how to negotiate. What shall we do about the world court at the Hague, which is responsible for trying war criminals, or how significant should that be? It should be given a greater role in the present situation and in our present modern day society.

As we go toward the future, we need to have as much energy and effort put into studying how to make peace as we have in the process of making war.

□ 1745

Education. The Peace Academy would have a big education budget, not as big as West Point maybe, but it needs a big education budget.

So back to my major topic, overwhelming neglect, the arithmetic of federal aid for education. What I am trying to say tonight is we are on the verge of making a great mistake in America. We can act with great nobility and great bravery and courage in emergency situations, and we have done that.

In the case of Kosovo, it is an emergency which the machinery of our government, starting at the White House with the leadership of President Clinton, the machinery of our government has gone into motion to provide support for the foundations of a compassionate civilization. This is a great compassionate crusade to stop genocide in Kosovo.

So while I am applauding the expression of the American people, which is

what such an action is, I would also like to caution us and warn our Nation at this point. The way we are responding to the education crisis, there is a crisis, we are not educating the kinds of people, the numbers that we need for the future. We are not educating at a quality level to deal with a complex future.

I think we are going toward a cyber civilization, a cyber civilization, which is very complex. We need not fear it because it has already created miracles. It will continue to create miracles.

There is a future out there which is possible where some of the most difficult problems and burdens that mankind faces will be able to be resolved because of the nature of this cyber civilization that we are going into.

So, as we prepare for that, we have to understand that an investment in education is the one thing we must do. We do not know all of the pitfalls. We cannot project and predict everything that is going to happen. But one thing is clear, we need the most educated population possible, and we need more people educated. We need better education.

Right now we are failing to do that, to respond to the need for that kind of investment. We are failing to respond to the clear clarion call of our own people.

The common sense of America is amazing sometimes, the common sense of American people. They sense, they understand, they feel that education is very important. Across this country, most people have never graduated from college.

But in this Congress, 99 percent of the people have graduated from college. In Washington, all of the decision makers and the bureaucracies, the White House, everyone, they are all graduates from college. They have all benefited from our great education system. Yet they are blind, they are blind to the need to follow the lead of the American people and make education our number one priority.

There are some of my colleagues listening to me who would say, what are we talking about? It is our number one priority. We talked about it in the Democratic Caucus all the time. We talk about it in the Republican Caucus all the time. We have made great statements to our party about how important education is.

It is all a bit strange when this talk adds up to peanuts in the budget. The arithmetic of the budget does not show that we understand that education is important.

Let me give my colleagues a little of that arithmetic. As I said before, it does not take a genius to figure these figures out. The billions and the millions might confuse us sometimes, but this is simple arithmetic.

Defense is not on the list of the American priorities. Highways and transportation are not on the list of American priorities. Remember that as I talk.

Right now the budget for public schools, elementary and secondary schools in America, this Federal Government is giving $22.6 billion in assistance. This is probably less than 5 percent of the total budget for elementary and secondary education assistance because the States and the localities provide most of the money for the education.

The Constitution does not require the Federal Government to assume the responsibility for education. People are always repeating that. Since the Constitution does not require the federal government to assume the responsibility for education, why should we make a great investment at the Federal level in education?

Well, the Constitution does not require the Federal Government to assume responsibility for highways and roads. That really has always been traditionally a State and local function. But we are spending $22.6 billion for public schools, elementary and secondary education, $22.6 billion right now. The budget for highways and transportation, most of which is highways, is $51.3 billion.

Where did we take on the responsibility of roads and highways from the local and State governments? Somewhere down the line, because it was important. I think it is important.

Last year we passed a bill which authorized $218 billion over a 6-year period for highways and transportation, mostly highways again, $218 billion in 6 years. What we are proposing in terms of school construction, however, is $3.7 billion over 5 years.

Listen. Make the comparisons. $22.6 billion is our total education contribution from the Federal Government at this point. But $51.3 billion, more than twice the amount, goes for highways and transportation across the country. Why are we investing more in highways? I have no problem. Let us invest in highways. Let us understand how minuscule our investment is in education.

The President, who is in the leadership on education, and I applaud the White House leadership on education, the White House has proposed to increase the education budget by $697 million this year. The annual increase is $697 million, which is more than the Republicans are proposing. They are proposing $500 million this year although both parties say that they are very concerned about education.

The increases in the case of the Democrats or the President's budget is 5.1 percent. The increase in the case of the Republicans is 3.7 percent. The increase for the highway budget was 12 percent. The increase for the defense budget is staggering. They are proposing $110 billion at the White House, $110 billion or $112 billion, I forget, $120 billion, but no less than the $110 billion, it has sort of been fluctuating, $110 billion for defense when the American people did not say we need anything in terms of increase for defense. Remember, we have got to pay for Kosovo and any emergencies on the side with additional funding anyhow.

Let us take a look at what we are getting per student. The number of enrolled public school students in America is 54.4 million students, 54.4 million students. That means that the Federal expenditure per enrolled student at this point is $415 in annual yearly expenditure for each student enrolled in public school across America is merely $415.

If we take a look at the proposed increase this year on a per-student basis, the President has proposed to increase the budget by $12.80 per student. The Republicans are proposing to increase the budget by $9.20 per student.

When one looks at the number of students we have in the schools out there and one looks at the amount of money being appropriated, one wonders where is the response to the American public opinion polls which said that education is a priority. Think about it.

I have proposed an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act, title XI, I have proposed to increase the education budget just for construction, school construction, including modernization, repairs, and basic technology, wiring of the schools for the Internet, et cetera. I am proposing increasing it by $22 billion a year over the next 5 years. I want to get close to the defense budget, $110 billion over 5 years.

Twenty-two billion dollars a year would be an appropriate response to the fact that education is in great need of Federal assistance. It would be an appropriate response to do it in construction because that is the simplest way for the Federal Government to help education.

It would be an appropriate need because that is where we have a need for larger amounts of capital expenditures. It would be an appropriate place for the President and the Federal Government to intervene because it does not involve the Federal Government getting involved in running the schools on an operational basis.

We do not have to get involved in determining what the curriculum should be. We do not have to interfere with the internal workings of the school that is basically the responsibility of the State and the local government.

So to appropriate, and I do not propose doing it in any way except straight appropriation, a straight appropriation of $22 billion a year for the next 5 years would not bring schools equal to highways. Remember, I just said highways get $218 billion over 6 years. So school construction would

not come anywhere near the capital outlays for highways.

If we divide the 54.4 million students into the amount of money I propose to spend per year per student, we are talking about school construction expenditures by the Federal Government would be $416 per student.

If there are young people listening, they are going to go to school tomorrow. Talk to your teacher about why is it that the Federal Government cannot spend $416 for each student going to elementary and secondary education schools. Why can we not spend $416 per student?

Why do we say we care about education, that the federal government wants to help, while the Republicans are out peddling their education agenda, saying that they are all for education and want to do something great for education, while the Democrats out there are pushing hard, the President is certainly stressing education in his program, why do they do so little?

The President is out way ahead of the Republicans. He is proposing $3.7 billion for construction. He is not proposing to do it the way I want to do it, that is a direct appropriation, put it in the budget and appropriate it, he is proposing to do it via a tax credit. The Committee on Ways and Means has to approve a tax credit for school construction.

Over a 5-year period, he proposes to make $25 billion available; that is, he allows the States and the local governments to borrow $25 billion. They have to borrow that. In New York, we have to have a bond issue on the ballot. Voters would have to vote to borrow some money in order to qualify for that Federal program because it only provides the interest on the $25 billion. Over a 5-year period, he proposes to pay the interest on $25 billion worth of bonds that local governments and State governments would borrow.

That comes out to $3.7 billion over 5 years, roughly, depending on what the interest rate is. And $3.7 billion over 5 years is the only commitment we have to the school construction, but we have $110 billion over 5 years committed to defense in increases I am talking about, increases.

The defense budget is already $280 billion. We are going to increase it over a 5-year period by an additional $110 billion.

Highways are going to be spending, over a 6-year period, $218 billion. Yet, we propose to spend only $3.7 billion for school construction over a 5-year period.

So take out a pencil and paper and do the addition and the subtraction and the comparison. I am not really going to leave here with my colleagues believing that the President is not trying. He assumes this is all he can pass. I say we need to, from the White House, state the case more clearly and call for what is needed.

The Republican proposed budget for school construction is zero. Zero. Nothing. They do not propose anything for school construction whatsoever over a 1-year period, over a 5-year period, nothing.

If we look at the President's construction budget, the only one on the agenda, the only one on the table, nobody else has it, we must praise him for having a proposal on the table for school construction, but if we look at it closely and we divide the number of students in elementary, secondary education institutions, in schools, the President is proposing $68.50 over a 5-year period for school construction per student, $68.50 per student.

The Republican construction per student of course is zero because if we start with zero, we end up with zero. I am sorry, that is per year, $68.50 per year, per student. My proposal is of course, as I said before, $415 per student, $416 per student when we look at all the students.

My colleagues might say how are we going to evaluate those costs? Is that a lot of money, $416 per student times 54 million students, which comes to about $22 billion a year. Is that a lot of money?

□ 1800

Well, $416 per student, compare that with the cost of one combat rifle. One modern rifle used in our Army costs how much? $835. Twice as much as we are willing to spend, as I propose to spend, per year per student on construction. I mean look at it closely.

Look at this figure, also. The average annual cost per prison inmate in the United States. For each person we put in prison we are spending $24,000. The average is around $24,000 to keep a person in prison, and yet we cannot spend $416 per student for school construction.

The average annual cost of a student in school, in terms of operating cost, is probably somewhere between $8,000 and $10,000. The annual cost per student in our schools, operating costs, ongoing costs, the average, when we take the rich and the poor districts, is between $8,000 and $10,000.

I ask my colleagues to do the arithmetic and take a look at it. Is it in harmony with what we hear being said about the importance of education?

The governors say education is very important. They have all kinds of nickel and dime experiments ongoing that they parade at conferences, and parade around about what they are doing about education, but they are not willing to spend the money. The governor of New York had a $2 billion surplus but he would not spend any money for school construction. The Mayor of New York had a $2 million surplus last year and he would not spend any money for construction in New York City, although New York City has a very serious situation.

In New York City they have large numbers of schools that are overcrowded, where students have to eat lunch at 10 o'clock in the morning because they have three shifts of lunchroom sittings, but also it has 250 schools that are burning coal in their furnaces still, jeopardizing the immediate health of students with pollution, and yet they would not move. Why are all these people talking about education?

One of the programs we hear a lot about is the 21st Century Learning Centers. Now, that is a worthy program. It is an after-school center program, and already we have $200 million committed to that and we are going to raise that over the next 5 years to $600 million. When we have it funded at $600 million, we will serve about 1.2 million students. 1.2 million students will be served by this program.

It is a great program because it deals with the fact that we want to end social promotion and have students move on through school but we will not dump them. We will give them some kind of after-school help, tutorial programs, some summer help. Well, $600 million will only provide help for 1.2 million students at best.

There are 54 million children in elementary and secondary education institutions. About a quarter of them, at least one-fourth of them need help in this area. How will we provide help for one-fourth of the students if all we are willing to appropriate is $600 million?

It is a great program, but it is a very minuscule program. If we did 10 percent, one-tenth of the total students, the 54 million, can we help that many? Even one-tenth? I think my colleagues can understand the dilemma we are facing.

We need to understand that we are the richest country in the history of the world, and at this moment in history we are probably more rich than we have ever been. The country is richer than it has ever been. The government itself has a surplus. The surplus can be used partially to invest in education. We do not have to submit to the stampede to put it all into Social Security.

Again, they are playing the American intellect and the American common sense cheap. They are trying to take advantage of people's concern about Social Security, to whip us all into a frenzy and say that every penny we get in the surplus should go into Social Security.

Well, the President proposed that we use 60 percent of the money we have in surplus for Social Security. That sounds reasonable to me. He proposed to use another part of it for Medicare. That sounds reasonable to me, because Medicare is health security for elderly people. But then we have some left over. We still have a percentage that they are proposing no use for at this point, but we know that most of it will

go into defense expenditures if we do not say that we ought to have some for education.

Education is the key to our future's defense. Our national security is all bound up in the educated populace we produce. Education is the key to Social Security. How? Because we want a populace that is working. We want young people who are working, and they must be able to qualify for the high-tech jobs being created every day more and more.

And if we do not have workers, young people who can qualify for those jobs, they will not come out and take the jobs. What we will do is contract with overseas corporations. We will send the work overseas and companies will do the work overseas who do not pay into the Social Security System. The best way to rob the Social Security System is to deny the work force the opportunity to earn the money and pay into the Social Security fund.

There are some other ways we can save Social Security, too, but the present time-honored way we fund Social Security is through the wages of working people. If we have fewer people working, and they have already projected that, we cannot avoid the demographics, we are going to have fewer people working. But how few? Can we avoid wiping out the whole work force because they cannot qualify for high-tech jobs? So many will not be able to qualify for high-tech jobs. We have a real dilemma here.

The kind of greatness and the kind of vision and courage being shown in Kosovo by our national leaders now we need to apply in the sector of education, looking down the road. If we do not do it, we will have a great deficit in major areas. This great indispensable Nation is going to stumble and fall if we do not have as many people educated as possible. Every person that can be educated must be educated.

It is likely that our posterity will pity us. They may even spit on us in the future as they evaluate and analyze our great lack of vision at this critical moment when we have maximum opportunity to go forward in the revision of our education system. We are in danger of becoming the victim of midget minds and tiny spirits. Too much of the planning at the Department of Education is being undertaken by midget minds and tiny spirits.

Too many tiny spirits are guiding our caucuses, both the Republican and the Democratic Caucus. We are not willing to take hold of where we are in modern America and deal with education the way we dealt with the GI bill after World War II. We understood the implications of the need for a more educated population and we had a massive education program in the GI bill.

A Congressman named Morrill, many years ago in the 1800s, around the time of the Civil War, had the vision to see that every State in America needed a land grant university. We dealt with it. A big mind and a big spirit seized the problem.

Thomas Jefferson, who created the first State university, the University of Virginia, had a vision. The model he established inspired Morrill to go on to create land grant colleges and universities all across the country.

The vision of a transcontinental railroad, the Federal Government financed the transcontinental railroad. We had the people in Congress who had the vision to take hold and to do things in a big way.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BUD SHUSTER) is my hero here in Congress. He is a Republican, but he had the vision to take hold of the highway problem, the transportation infrastructure problem, and with a lot of criticism. He was called a big spender, and still called a big spender, but he had the initiative and he used the available power that he had to pass a highway transportation infrastructure bill that is meaningful. We need it. We need it. We need it far more than we need some of the weapon systems that are being proposed. We need it far more than we need some of the other wasteful expenditures taking place presently.

We are in danger of becoming, as I said before, the victims of midget minds and tiny spirits. We seem to possess the cerebral alertness, the statistical understanding that a crisis looms ahead if we do not meet the education emergency at the moment. We understand the trends, the projections, the inevitability of continued inadequacy in our school systems. We comprehend with our heads, but we seem incapable of engaging with our backbones and moving forward with our decision-making feet. In the education arena we need giant minds and great spirits. We need to end the overwhelming neglect of education.

In the minds of our citizens, the concerns related to national defense do not compete with the overwhelming mandate to improve our schools. Nothing in the minds of our citizens, the American electorate, the people who have common sense out there, nothing in their minds competes with education. It is number one. ''It is education, stupid.'' It is education.

Look at the polls, but do not look at the polls and let your eyes blink. Here in Washington, in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, we need to act on appropriating and vesting real dollars in an education system which will take us into a cyber civilization in the future where everybody needs to be educated.

The dollars that we are willing to appropriate in response to the American people's stated concern about education are minuscule. We are throwing pennies at a problem which requires billions of dollars. We must change our minds.

If the American people are listening, they might help open the eyes and the ears of their own Congressman or Congresswoman. Have them make a survey. Even in the richest districts there are often schools that need help.

I challenge every Member of Congress to make a survey and select a few schools in their districts and go take a look at what they need. There are some places where they need money for wiring for the Internet; there are other places where they need money to fix the roof; there are some places where they need money to tear down old buildings and construct new schools. All over New York City we have schools that need money to put in a new furnace and get rid of the pollution and the asthma-generating coal-burning furnaces.

We need to address these issues in our Education Task Force and the Democratic Caucus, as well as the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce were on the floor before, and I want to applaud what they had to say. They understand the problem, but I do not think that the solutions that are being proposed have yet come to grips with the magnitude of the need.

We need to spend many billions on school construction. School construction is just at the center of the problem, but that is a place to start. If we do not meet the need for adequate buildings, safe buildings, across America, the Congressional Budget Office says we need about $147 billion to just stay even, if we do not meet that need or begin to step forward to move toward meeting that need, then everything else we propose to do in Washington at any level is fraudulent, everything else we propose to do about education.

We are feeding the people a spin on the problem without coming to grips with the reality and the substance. We must go forward and invest in education in order to prepare our education system to take us forward into a new cyber civilization.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. DAN MILLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Laura Griffin, staff member of the Honorable DAN MILLER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1999.

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 that I received a subpoena for

documents and testimony issued by the Circuit Court of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Florida In and For Manatee County, Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is consistent with Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

LAURA GRIFFIN,
Case Manager.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House at this hour to discuss primarily the issue of illegal narcotics and its effects on our young people and our country, but I could not help but hear some of the words of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who just spoke here and talked about education.

I want to say to my colleagues and to the American people that I too support education. I support anything this Congress can do, anything our Nation can do to enhance educational opportunities for each and every American. However, I do have some differences with the previous speaker.

The previous speaker represents 40 years of trying to get more education power, more education decisions, more education regulation in Washington, D.C.

□ 1815

And I think I represent a new wave of thinking that has come here in the last few years that education decisions, education of our children, and decisions about education policy are best decided at the local level with parents, with local school boards, and through local initiatives.

Then I think we also heard the argument that we are spending money on military defense and others, and this money could be converted into education. I might remind my colleagues in the House that the number one reason that we came together as a Nation to allow us to live a free life in a free society is in fact the principal reason for the formation of the United States, and that is the question of national security.

Without national security, without the ability to defend ourselves, without the ability to have a defense of this Nation, all other things are impossible. And under the Constitution, if we care to look at that document, that is our prime responsibility and all things flow from that level.

So we cannot discard our military, particularly with an administration and folks what want to send our troops to every corner of the Earth and every conflict, at great expense, stretching our limited Federal dollars, and also spend additional funds or take away funds from education. So we cannot have both, but we try to do our best in meeting our Federal obligation.

I might say, and I did not really want to get into this too much tonight, but I just had the opportunity to meet with a couple from Florida, and they were here and heard some of the debate about education in the Congress, and one of these individuals, the wife, was a teacher and she was delighted to hear the philosophy of the new majority relating to education, that the power and the ability to teach and the funds go to the classroom, to the teacher and the student, not to the education bureaucracy in Washington, Atlanta, and is forced at different layers of the education bureaucracy even within the State and in particular in my State of Florida.

Our discussion was quite interesting because we did not identify the problems the way the previous speaker did; we identified the problems I think the way parents do, the way teachers do and local citizens who examine education. And we do not need a Harvard Education Ph.D. to look at American education today and see that teachers are not allowed to teach.

We asked the simple question in our conversation a few minutes ago off the floor with this couple from Florida, ''How can you teach, how can you have order in a classroom when you cannot have discipline in a classroom?'' And the same well-intended liberal policies from the other side of the aisle have amassed laws and regulations, which, combined with liberal judicial decisions, have handcuffed our teachers so that it is almost impossible to have discipline in the classroom through this maze of Federal regulations, mandates, and court orders. So we have said we want the teacher to have the ability to teach in the classroom.

Now, we also have a unique approach to education because we do not think that the money needs to be in Washington and again the power and the regulations all coming from Washington, but we think that those resources, that those abilities, should be at the local level with the teacher, with the parent, with the local school board, again reversing this trend where everything has come to Washington at a very heavy expense.

Now, let us also for a minute, before I get into this drug discussion, talk about funding of education. My friends and my colleagues, the Federal Government only provides between 4 and 5 cents of every dollar on education, 4 and 5 cents. Now, of course we can provide more. The problem is we provide about 90 percent of the Federal regulations in education. So we provide very little money, but all of the constraints and mandates and regulations that cause teachers instead of teaching, not allowing them to teach, to be filling out papers, to be complying with Federal regulations, and to report to a maze of bureaucracy that now starts at the local level, goes to the State level, goes to the regional level, and ends up at the Federal level.

I was chairman during the past 4 years of the Subcommittee on Civil Service. One thing I learned as chairman of that Subcommittee on Civil Service is where the bodies in the Federal bureaucracy are buried. The first 5,000, if my colleagues ever care to go down to the Department of Education, now imagine, there are 3,000 of 5,000 Federal education employees in the Department of Education here in Washington D.C., or in the close environs, 3,000 people.

Now, we also got into the discussion of changes in education. And we have, as a new majority in the Congress, tried to shift again this responsibility from Washington, the authority, the regulation, and do away with some of the bureaucracy. We started out with some 760 to 780 Federal education programs, all well-intended, but each with its own administrative level, 760 to 780 of those. We have got it pared down to 700.

Quite frankly, we have only begun the paring process. But every one of these programs has turned into lobbying organizations, into special interest activities; and they justify their existence by lobbying the Congress, by telling what a good job they have done. And what, in fact, we have again are 3,000 bureaucrats in Washington D.C., most of them making between $70,000 and $100,000 if we look at the pay schedules.

Now, I am not saying that we should abolish the Department of Education, but I think we could do it with 10 to 20 percent of the personnel that we have just by consolidating the programs.

In fact, there are proposals and there will be proposals before this Congress very shortly to go to a Super EdFlex, where we take the amount of money, we divide it by the student population and other criteria and we send it to the States. This Congress, under this new Republican majority, has tried to reverse the trend in that 80 to 90 percent of the Federal dollars do not get into the classroom, do not get to the teacher. Now, is that what people want with their Federal money, that 80 to 90 percent of this Federal money does not get to the classroom, to the teacher?

Again, we have to allow the teacher to teach and discipline in the classroom, authority, the responsibility, the ability to teach in the classroom. We have to give that first. And secondly, we have to give the Federal money to the student and to the teacher, a unique approach, not to the 700-plus Federal programs, not to the 700-plus administrators.

If we have only three administrators for each program at the Federal level,

there are 2,100 that help account for the 3,000 just in Washington, D.C., in the Federal Department of Education. So we have to ask ourselves where we want our dollars to go? Into the classroom? To the teacher?

This Congress, this new Republican majority, said we want those funds to go to the classroom and to the teacher. Then what are we teaching? Again, in my discussion with this couple from Florida, the wife again taught school. My wife was an elementary school teacher. I have a degree in education, although I have never taught other than my school required certification internship.

But we have to ask the question, what is a teacher doing in the classroom? Does she have authority to control the classroom, first of all? Does she have the funds, Federal funds and other funds, coming to the classroom? Then the next question is, what is the teacher teaching?

The answer is, today Federal money goes on everything but basic education. Now, show me a student that has basic education, is able to read, is able to write, is able to conduct basic mathematics, and I will show my colleagues a successful student. But almost all of our Federal education programs go for everything except those basic education fundamental programs.

And what is interesting is that the individuals who suffer the most from this deficit in a Federal approach to education that again has been adopted and culled and now culminates in this bureaucracy from Washington and this sad approach to education as the ones who suffer the most are our most disadvantaged students.

So our disadvantaged students are not learning the basic skills. Those disadvantaged students, because they do not have these opportunities to learn basic educational skills, I will tell my colleagues what has happened. They are our first problem in the classroom. Ask any teacher. They are our discipline problem. And the teacher does not have the right to discipline or have control of her classroom because of the Federal regulations and the bureaucracy that has been created to make certain that a teacher does not have control of the classroom.

So here we have the most disadvantaged, not able to learn the most basic skills that are necessary. They become discipline problems. Then next they become dropout problems. After they are dropout problems, they become societal problems. They do not have a job. Sometimes they get into drugs and into other illegal activities. Just look at the statistics for unemployment among our minority youth. Look at the statistics about dropouts among our minority youth.

So if we really care about education, if we really care about those disadvantaged children, if we really care about getting dollars into the classroom for our students, for our teachers, for basic education, why not adopt a different approach? And that is the EdFlex approach that we have talked about. And we may want to look at Super EdFlex.

As chairman of an oversight subcommittee on education, I intend to conduct hearings in the future on this subject and see why we cannot get more Federal dollars into the classroom, to students, to teachers, to do away with the mass of bureaucracy.

It is interesting now this concept of charter schools. And what does a charter school do? A charter school basically lets a teacher teach, go back to basic education without the mass of regulations, whether they are locally imposed, State imposed, or federally imposed.

So I did not intend to get off on this subject of education, but when I hear those who have helped develop a system that has helped ruin public education, and I am a strong advocate of public education. Again, my wife taught in public schools; I was educated to teach in public schools.

The public schools helped make this country great. The greatest minds of this country, some of them were taught in a one-room public school, and I think we can still achieve greatness in our public schools. And public education has helped make America great, and our public teachers deserve practically a little award of merit, the survivors, those who have managed to survive the mass of bureaucracy passed down from Washington, the mass of regulations that do not allow them to do what they went to an education university or college for, and that is to teach students in a disciplined atmosphere basic and fundamental education and to help develop that policy of working with parents and working with local school board members rather than edicts from some bureaucrat at some level who causes them to do everything but what their original mission was.

So I take great exception when I hear those who have helped create the disaster talk about criticism about this approach to get back to the basics that made American education and public education so great in this Nation. And again, I commend our public teachers, those survivors of this mass of bureaucracy we sent them from Washington and regulations that they must try to deal with every day.

My purpose tonight also is to talk about another issue, an issue that is not on the front page like Kosovo and is not an issue like Iraq. It is an issue that I feel is one of the most critical social issues facing this Congress, this Nation, our young people, and every American in every walk of life now.

□ 1830

It is a social problem that for many years was limited to folks who were the unfortunate victims of illicit narcotics, illicit drugs, sometimes lived in urban areas and became drug junkies or drug addicts and were the castasides of our society. But, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, there exists in our Nation tonight and today a drug problem that is of serious dimensions and proportions. Last year, over 14,000 Americans lost their lives because of drug-related problems, drug-related deaths; 14,000. Since President Clinton has taken office in 1993, 100,000 Americans have lost their lives. In many instances young people, some of those in the prime of their life, have become victims to illegal narcotics.

Now, this problem is so serious that I want to try to bring it into some understanding to those individuals who represent various locales here in the Congress. But if we took Hattiesburg, Mississippi and we wiped it off the map and its population of approximately 100,000, that would be equal to the number of individuals who have died because of drug-related deaths. If we destroyed Gadsden, Alabama, again close to 100,000 people would vanish from the face of the planet. Iowa City, Iowa would be wiped out, 100,000 died. If we had everyone die now in Iowa City, everyone would be alarmed. In Elmira, New York, again a population approaching 100,000, 95,000 Americans have died, more than 95,000, because of illegal narcotics in this country during this administration. Bangor, Maine would be wiped out. Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the population of that city would be wiped from the face of this country. Cheyenne, Wyoming. I could give a long list of others that are equal in population to those individuals who have lost their lives in this social problem of illegal narcotics, in this criminal enterprise now that is affecting every corner of America.

The cost of illegal narcotics in this country is approaching a quarter of a trillion dollars. In addition to lives that I mentioned, 100,000 over 6 or 7 years, we had 14,000-plus last year, we have a cost to this country estimated at over a quarter of a trillion dollars.

This Congress in our budget debate is debating a number of measures to deal with illegal narcotics just in this next fiscal year. The estimate is somewhere around $18 billion will be expended. We now have in the United States of America 13.9 million Americans who are users of illegal narcotics. Drug use by 12 to 17-year-olds in this period since President Clinton has taken office to now has doubled, has doubled since 1992, drug use by our teenage population. More than 6 percent of Americans have used illegal narcotics in the past 30 days.

What is another dimension of the illegal narcotics problem in this country is the change in the pattern of usage. When I came to Congress, crack and cocaine were the big problem. Today, heroin is a major, major problem, not only

in our urban areas but in suburban areas across this land, including my own area, central Florida, from Orlando to Daytona Beach, one of the highest income, highest educated, one of the most prosperous areas in America, and we have experienced an incredible heroin epidemic and particularly again among our young people.

In the United States of America, first-time heroin use surged 875 percent from 1991 to 1996, again under the charge of this administration. Heroin-related emergency room admissions increased from 1989 to 1995 some 80 percent. In Florida, I want to talk about the problem that we have been experiencing again with heroin. Recently, a number of our newspapers featured headlines that said that heroin deaths increased 51 percent in the State of Florida from 1997 to 1998, a 51 percent increase in heroin deaths. Two hundred six deaths in Florida in 1997. Fortunately no Americans have been killed in Kosovo, no Americans have lost their life in the current Iraq crises. Even in the Gulf War, we had fewer than that number of casualties. But just in the State of Florida, we had 206 heroin deaths in 1997, a 51 percent increase from 1997 to 1998.

In Orlando and again central Florida, a very prosperous area that I represent part of, we had 36 deaths, heroin deaths, and we had the highest death rate, we had 3.6 per 100,000 population die from heroin overdoses or heroin-related deaths. Additionally, our cocaine problem still is with us in Florida. We had 1,128 cocaine deaths in Florida in 1998, up from 1,039 in 1997. So we are seeing an incredible epidemic of heroin deaths, particularly among our young people, and even an increase in cocaine deaths.

Now, you might say, how did we get into this situation? Let me review, if I may, for the Congress and for the American people the history of how this administration got us in this situation with these statistics, with an epidemic of heroin, with the continued problems with cocaine, with methamphetamine and designer drugs at epidemic levels in other parts of our Nation.

The first thing this President and this Congress did when it was under the control of the Democrat Party, and I do not mean to say this in a partisan way, it is a matter of fact, but their policy was to eliminate much of the war on drugs. Their policy was to try to just deal with treatment of those who had drug abuse or illegal narcotics problems and put our resources in that area. The first thing this President did as President was to cut the positions in the drug czar's office, and they were slashed dramatically, practically closed down the drug czar's office. This was the very first action, as we may recall.

The second action was to appoint a surgeon general who really said ''just say maybe'' to the use of illegal narcotics. Now, if you do not think that the chief health officer of the United States, who gives a mixed message to our young population, does not influence that young population in that important position, if you do not think the President of the United States, if he would say that ''I didn't inhale'' or ''if I had it to do over again I would,'' if you do not think that influences young people, then I think you have another thought coming, particularly when you see the statistics of the dramatic increase in illegal narcotic use from 1993 to today.

Additionally, when the Democrats and the Democratic majority controlled the other body, the Senate, the House of Representatives and the White House, some of their first actions in the Congress in 1993 and 1994 when they controlled the entire governmental operation was to start to slash the efforts of stopping drugs at their source. These are source country programs. We know where 100 percent of the cocaine is coming from in the world. Every bit of it is coming into the United States, or was coming from and comes from today Bolivia, Peru and Colombia. That is it. There are no other locales. We knew where heroin was coming from, and this administration with this majority on the other side slashed the eradication programs, slashed the interdiction.

Now, the most cost-effective way to stop illegal narcotics is at its source, where they are grown, where the supply comes from. The next line of defense is interdiction. What did the administration and this majority in Congress, this past majority in Congress, do? They cut interdiction. They slashed the programs for source countries, to stop drugs at their source cost effectively. Then they stopped interdiction programs. They also stopped the use of the military. They stopped, at least temporarily, the sharing of information with some of the countries in shoot-down policies. Only after a great ruckus in Congress were we able to reinstitute the information sharing policy that allowed us to give assistance and aid to other countries that had shoot-down policies, these principal producing countries, so that they could take action to stop those illegal narcotics from leaving their borders.

So we have seen what this administration has done as far as the military, interdiction, eradication. Another thing that folks do not realize is that the Coast Guard is a great line of defense, particularly for Florida, around Puerto Rico. The Coast Guard has been the first line of defense around Puerto Rico. It stopped under the Bush and Reagan administration most of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States. Puerto Rico is part of the United States and once you get into Puerto Rico, you are into the United States, and the Coast Guard provided that shield.

This Congress under the previous Democrat majority and under the Clinton administration slashed dramatically the budgets of the Coast Guard and particularly the defenses and ability to interdict drugs around Puerto Rico were eliminated.

So this is what this administration had done. We know what the other administration had done. The Bush administration, the previous Reagan administration had put into place programs that cost effectively stopped drugs from coming into our borders, stopped our young people from using drugs, and we actually saw decreases in use of illegal narcotics and drugs coming into our Nation.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on how this administration lost the War on Drugs and how under the control of the previous majority this country lost the effort to interdict drugs cost-effectively at its source. In fact, under this administration and under the previous Democratic majority, they slashed stopping these efforts by funding a percentage that went from 33 percent of all the funds we expended in the drug war down to 12 percent. So basically what they did was gutted by two-thirds the programs to stop drugs at their source. Again, their emphasis was solely on those wounded in battle, treatment of those victims of illegal narcotics.

This administration also decided to have the Department of Defense rank counter-narcotics efforts at the bottom of its priority list. If we look at a priority list developed by this administration in its priorities, previously under again the Reagan and Bush administrations this was a high priority. With DOD, the Department of Defense, it is now a low priority. The President, not learning from experiences of the past, proposed to this Congress through the Office of Drug Control Policy and the Drug Czar a budget to the Congress that is $100 million less this year than last year, and again in the areas that are most important to stop drugs cost effectively at their source, the President also failed to provide adequate proposals for funding of these programs, including again the Coast Guard which plays such a vital role, including the source country interdiction programs, including the use of the military.

In fact, if my colleagues want to look at the budget, in addition to being $100 million less, there is $73 million that is being currently used to relocate our forward drug interdiction efforts in Central and South America. We have previously been stationed at Howard Air Force Base for these efforts, the advanced surveillance activities in our illegal narcotics efforts over the South

American region, again where these drugs come from, again the source of production, the source of transshipment of these drugs. Our eyes and ears and our frontline defense in the War on Drugs is located in Panama at Howard Air Force Base, and $73 million in this budget is to move our operations to locations that will not under any circumstances be as good because this administration, and it is not widely publicized, but basically they blew the negotiating with the Panamanians, and the United States of America is being kicked out lock, stock and barrel from Panama as I speak here.

We have lost $10 billion in assets, lost every one of them. They negotiated without success. We have lost every asset. There we have lost 5,000 buildings, over 5,000 buildings, and we will not be conducting one advanced forward drug surveillance operation there. In fact, we will be paying $73 million out of this budget that has been proposed by the President to make up for the failed negotiations which got us totally kicked out of Panama and giving these assets to the Panamanians is a disastrous consequences, I predict, not to mention that the Panamanians, through a corrupt tender, have given one of the ports to a Chinese group that basically is run by the Chinese Army. So the Chinese will control one of the ports through a corrupt tender, and this is the situation we find ourselves in, and again part of this President's budget is being expended. Even though he has $100 million less than we proposed last year and appropriated last year, additional funds will be paid to correct mistakes by this administration.

So this is the situation we find ourselves in today. We have a very serious drug problem, and I want to, if I may, to put this chart up here and show the drug problem that we have in the United States, and again, as a result of the inactions or lack of proper actions by this administration in the 1990's we see this new pattern of illegal narcotics coming from South America. Again, production of cocaine through Columbia, Peru and Bolivia, and that was the pattern we saw at the beginning, it is the pattern we still see, but we see the drugs now coming through Mexico, and we see them coming from Columbia into the United States, some through Puerto Rico into the northeast United States and other routes, but the two major sources of illegal narcotics coming into the United States are Columbia and Mexico.

Now let us examine, if we can for the record, how we got into the situation where again Peru and Bolivia were the primary producers of cocaine. I could not possibly believe this would be true if someone told me it 5 years ago, but this administration managed to make Columbia the biggest cocaine producer in the world, and they have done that because in the past 5 or 6 years of this administration they have fought every effort by Congress, they have fought every request of Members of Congress, they have fought requests of the Drug Task Force of Congress to get resources to Columbia to stop the production, to stop the trafficking of illegal narcotics from Columbia. This administration has done everything possible to make sure that those resources did not go to Columbia. They stopped helicopters, they stopped ammunition, they stopped resources. Now we have Columbia as the number one producer. It has outstripped Peru and Bolivia and is the number one producer of cocaine.

What is even more incredible is 5 years ago Columbia produced almost no heroin, almost no heroin. Today Columbia is the source of most of the heroin coming into the United States of America.

While this administration blocked equipment and supplies, resources, military and police aid going in to stop the production and transiting, when they blocked this, what happened? The drug dealers began producing, and of course we heard cocaine. Now they are the major producers, but in Columbia they are also now producing heroin, and it is not like the heroin of the 1980's. This is tough stuff. This is high purity, not 10, 12, 15 percent pure; this is 70, 80 percent. This is the heroin that is killing our young people on the streets of Florida and across this Nation.

So again, through the inaction or improper actions or inadequate steps that this administration failed to take, Columbia is now the biggest drug producer on the globe. It is my hope, it is my prayer, it is the intent of almost everyone in the Congress who serves on the subcommittees of jurisdiction, that this administration now will allow helicopters, equipment, resources to get to Columbia.

I met several times with the President of Columbia, President Pastrana. He is committed to the war on drugs. He has a very difficult civil war on his hands. Thousands and thousands of police and military have lost their lives at the hands of drug dealers and narco terrorists and Marxist terrorists in Columbia. We have a very difficult situation, but hopefully now this administration, with the urging again of Congress, will get the resources to stop drugs at their source, which the source is Columbia.

Now the other major source area and problem that we have today is Mexico. Mexico has become the primary source of hard narcotics and marijuana coming into the United States of America. It is the primary source. Some of this is heroin and cocaine being produced in Columbia, but now in concert with the drug dealers in Mexico, and with the cooperation and with the consent in many instances of almost every level of government, corrupt government in Mexico, we see the drugs coming through Mexico into the United States. They are coming into the United States through the largess of this Congress which voted NAFTA, which voted almost an open commercial border between Mexico and the United States of America through again a policy that allowed us to give trade benefits.

Now we have to stop and think. This Congress gave great trade benefits. They are not really an equal trading partner, not when they pay people 25, 35 cents, even $1 an hour. These are not equal trading partners as we did with Canada, which is a very equal trading partner. We gave them a great trade advantage. And what did they give us in return? An unprecedented supply of illegal narcotics transiting across our border. This is a fact; this is incontrovertible.

The DEA administrator, who testified before my subcommittee and on the other side of the Congress, said the corruption among Mexican anti-drug authorities was, and let me quote him, ''unparalleled with anything I have seen in 39 years of police work.'' This is one of the most professional, most dedicated capable administrators we have ever had. He does not buy the administration line even though he is a member of this administration, and he tells it like it is. He has said that the level of corruption in Mexico is absolutely unparalleled.

Now this administration has certified Mexico. Under Federal law we have a certification law that says that every year the President must certify whether countries who deal in illegal narcotics or are the source of illegal narcotics coming into the United States, that the State Department and the President must certify under this Federal law that they are fully cooperating with eliminating both the production and trafficking of drugs under this 1986 law. And this administration has the past several years certified that Mexico is fully cooperating and did so just a few weeks ago.

How can an administration certify that Mexico is cooperating when even this Congress asked 2 years ago, this House of Representatives, simple steps for the Mexicans to take? First, to extradite those who are convicted of illegal narcotics trafficking, and to date I believe they extradited one individual, and that is only under the pressure of decertification, only under the pressure of so many people, from the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), by a bipartisan majority saying that Mexico must take some steps to show that they are cooperating. But they fail to extradite major drug traffickers, they fail to install radar in the south, they fail to allow our DEA agents to arm themselves,

they fail to raise the level, the number of DEA agents in their country that would be adequate to deal with the severe problem that they have, and they fail to enforce laws that they put on the books and have made a mockery of those laws, including the most egregious incident I have ever seen a country take, which was last year in an operation called ''Casablanca'' in which our Custom officials identified millions and millions, hundreds of millions, of illegal drug dollars going through Mexican banks and some into the United States, and when it was uncovered, the Mexican officials threatened to indict the United States Customs officials rather than cooperate with our officials. What we got in return was a threat against our agents, and only again until we came to the issue of possibly decertifying them through a step of Congress, the House of Representatives and the other body, not this administration who certified them.

The President went a few months ago down and met with President Zedillo, and he met there in the Yucatan Peninsula, this little point here.

□ 1900

We are told by our DEA officials and others in hearings that I conducted that the entire Yucatan Peninsula is corrupt, that it is run by drug lords. It is corrupt from the officer on the street to the governor.

In fact, we knew it was corrupt. We are told the entire Baja Peninsula is corrupt. We are told that entire other regions and states in Mexico are corrupt from the bottom to the top.

We had testimony at a recent hearing, which I conducted as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, that in fact this corruption may go even to the highest offices in Mexico. There were indications that there was as much as a billion dollars that one Mexican official was trying to place from his proceeds of dealing in illegal narcotics.

Now, President Clinton went with President Zedillo and met in the Yucatan Peninsula, one of the, again, centers of corruption, one of the centers of illegal narcotics. We knew that the governor of this state was corrupt. We knew that he was involved in narcotics, but they have a quirk in Mexican law that is interesting, that when you are in office you cannot be charged.

So they were waiting until a few weeks ago when this Mexican governor, we were told, would leave office so they could indict him. That is what we were told.

Then what happened? Under investigation, this is The Washington Post, April 1, April Fool's Day, this would almost be funny if it was not the truth, but this Mexican governor of the Yucatan Peninsula, Quintana Roo is the name of the area, under investigation the headline says, ''Mexican disappears; governor may have fled to avoid expected arrest.''

Now, that should tickle the conscience of everyone in the Congress to see that the Mexican official that we were told was going to be arrested when he left office fled.

Now, to really rub salt in the wound, this is the Miami Herald story of just a few days ago, missing governor fled to Cuba, paper reports. So here is where the President of the United States, the President of Mexico met. Here is where we were told it was corrupt from the bottom to the top, and now we are told that that official, who was supposed to be arrested, has fled the country and possibly may be in Cuba.

Do they think the Members of Congress are going to ignore this? Do they think the American people are going to be fooled by the actions of this government to fail to take actions against one of the most corrupt officials? Do they believe, in fact, that this Congress will certify that Mexico is fully cooperating when they turn a blind eye on the escape of one of the major drug traffickers and one of the major officials in the Mexican Government?

So this is where we are today. This is the history of the supposed war on drugs by this administration; again, an administration that has almost dissolved the Drug Czar's office; again, an administration that appointed a Surgeon General that sent a mixed message to our children; again, an administration, and the previous majority, the Democrat majority that slashed the programs that stopped drugs cost effectively at their source.

These are, again, the results that we see when we certify that a country is fully cooperating and they make a mockery of the entire process of cooperation, a country that we help with trade, a country that we help with financial assistance. When it was going down the tubes, the United States Government held back the financial instability, that we still back through the International Monetary Fund, through world financial organizations and through the corporations of America.

So I ask tonight, where is the outrage? There is outrage about Kosovo. There is outrage about Saddam Hussein in Iraq. But these folks from Mexico, these corrupt individuals, these illegal narcotics dealers, have killed 100,000 Americans in the last 6 or 7 years of this administration; 14,000 young people, young adults and Americans who lost their lives, a cost of a quarter of a trillion dollars to the American people. Where is the outrage?

If it takes every week, if it takes every night, I will be here on the floor. If it takes 100 more committee meetings to bring this to the attention of the Congress that we need to make certain that we get this effort back on track, we need to make certain that we seek the cooperation and that we seek working with our allies, such as Mexico, to see that the flow of illegal narcotics, the production of illegal narcotics, hard drugs like heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, that are killing our young people are stopped at their source before they ever reach our border, before they ever imprison our young people and destroy the lives of so many Americans and destroy the lives of their families. So whatever it takes, I will be here.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), on the floor. The Speaker has appointed myself, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) from Ohio, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is in charge of working on the demand side and has done a tremendous job in trying to put together community programs which, again, this administration has not adequately funded, to educate our young people, to work in our communities, to work with local organizations. He has done an outstanding job.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the Speaker has appointed him another cochair with me to the Speaker's Working Task Force on the Drug Problem for the House of Representatives.

Both have done an excellent job. I commend them. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) chairs the Subcommittee on Crime and works on criminal justice legislation.

So with those comments, I am pleased to conclude my remarks tonight, but I will be back as many times as it takes, as many hearings as it takes, and as much attention as we must give this problem that, again, I believe is the most important social problem facing our Nation, our Congress and the future of all Americans.

VICTIMS OF TORNADOS IN OHIO GET SUPPORT FROM NEIGHBORS AND OTHERS

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the previous speaker for being willing to offer me some time, as well as our next speaker, and also to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who just gave an explanation of some of the tremendous problems we face fighting drugs in this country and in our hemisphere, for his hard work on this effort.

He chairs the subcommittee and committee that deals with this issue, not only in terms of reducing the supply of drugs into our country but also the demand, which is, as he said, where I focus more. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has taken a strong and

balanced approach on this that is going to lead, over time, I think, to a much more effective policy to save our young people from the scourge of drugs.

I want to thank him for what he does every day. He could be out enjoying dinner tonight, maybe be with his family. Instead, he is here on the floor, as he is so many evenings, talking about this issue as he does in his committee constantly.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about something else. It has to do with a natural disaster. Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, a tornado ripped through the very heart of my district near where I live, near where my office is. The cities of Blue Ash, Ohio, Montgomery, Ohio, Loveland, Ohio, Symmes and Sycamore Townships were some of the communities hardest hit in Hamilton County where I live; also Deerfield Township and several other townships, Hamilton, Salem and others in Warren County, Addysten in Western Hamilton County, were hit by these high winds and devastating storm.

The damage is extensive. I have spent the last few days visiting the area and meeting with victims and local officials trying to help out. Four people were killed, many injured. It is a miracle that more were not killed when one looks at the devastation.

Hundreds of southwest Ohio residents are tonight without homes. In some areas, entire neighborhoods were virtually wiped out. In other areas, individual houses have been destroyed and then the house right next to it stands unscathed.

Although the damage estimates are still under way, we know that there are about 900 homes that have been damaged by the storm; 200 of them have been so severely damaged that they probably will not be able to be rebuilt or they have been totally destroyed. Another couple of hundred have sustained very extensive damage. Dozens of businesses were damaged or destroyed.

Tonight our hearts go out to those families who are trying to put their lives back together. There are some people who lost everything. We have seen from other natural disasters in our area, particularly the flooding in 1997, how difficult it can be for a community to rebuild after a natural disaster; and our thoughts and prayers are with everyone in these hard-hit communities.

The good news is that the response to this storm has been decisive and quick. Truly, I have been overwhelmed by it. Victims are getting help. Neighbors are helping, friends are helping, total strangers are pitching in, all to get people back on their feet.

I spent the last few days working with local, State and Federal officials, working alongside Red Cross and so many other volunteers, police, fire fighters from every neighborhood in our region. It has been truly heartwarming to see people throughout southwest Ohio rally around these communities.

I had occasion on Saturday to tour some of the areas with the Federal Small Business Administration personnel who were sent in to evaluate the damage, and I asked them after some of our visits what they thought about this disaster and how they would compare it to the many others that they have seen around the country, earthquakes, floods, fires and so on.

They said, well, the big difference we see here is the fact that your community, Congressman, really has pulled together and people are helping in every way they possibly can, businesses, individuals and so on. That, again, was heartwarming for me to hear that in the area where I live, folks have come together in a way that is so effective at helping their fellow persons.

There are too many people to thank, so many people have done this, the police and fire departments in Blue Ash, Montgomery, Loveland; Sycamore and Symmes Townships, Deerfield Township, all the affected areas have been fantastic. I think they have done an outstanding job. The sheriffs' departments in Hamilton and Warren Counties provided rapid response. Emergency management throughout southwest Ohio were well prepared and well organized. Our Governor, Bob Taft, came down to the area immediately. His emergency management agency officials have been excellent, and I want to thank the Governor personally for his interest and personal concern for our area.

The Hamilton County Urban Search and Rescue Task Force, so-called USAR team, has been great. They have been working along with elements of FEMA's Ohio Task Force One and they have really been a Godsend to the communities. They searched about 70 homes the morning of the tornado to make sure there was indeed an accurate count of those damaged and injured and those killed.

They also searched numerous businesses to look for survivors, and they have helped since then to be sure that as the clean-up is proceeding, people are entering these homes and businesses in a safe way. Dozens of other agencies throughout the area have lent their mutual support and assistance to these devastated communities.

The Red Cross, of course, and the Salvation Army have been on the scene since the start, offering help to victims and their families; and all of us owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to untold hundreds of volunteers, people who have come out to these communities, some neighbors again, some friends, some total strangers who have taken time and energy to help these folks who are in distress.

□ 1915

Our prayers go out to the families, and our thanks and appreciation go to all the hardworking volunteers and emergency management personnel and local officials who I think have done an outstanding job at a difficult time.

This clean-up process is going to be long and hard. There is still more we need to do to help families get back on their feet. One area where we have made some progress is getting relief from the April 15th tax filing deadline for tornado victims. Victims have much too much to worry about on their minds right now to worry about whether or not they get their taxes in and to worry about the IRS.

We have worked with the IRS here 2 days before the April 15 deadline to get some relief, to get extensions. The IRS has had officials at my office on Montgomery Road to answer questions and help tornado victims right through April 15. People can stop by my office in Kenwood, or call us at 791–0381 to get filing extension information, to get expedited refund checks from the IRS, or to expedite the process of their tax returns.

We have forms to be able to help people extend their tax filings and also to get expedited refunds. The IRS has also agreed to set up a special phone number for tornado-related problems in Cincinnati. That number is 241–2929, and after hours you can call the IRS Helpline at 1–800–829–1040.

We are making some progress, but we still need a lot more help. The Federal Small Business Administration had a disaster relief team again I joined in the district last week. FEMA officials arrived at the disaster scene to conduct a disaster assessment.

I understand from local and State and Federal officials that the area is likely to meet the threshold to be declared a Federal disaster area, and I urge President Clinton to give prompt consideration to a request that may come from Ohio Governor Bob Taft shortly.

I would also like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, many of whom have come up to me to express their condolences and support as the area I represent recovers from this devastating storm. Now it is time for all of us to do all we can do to help these victims pull their lives back together.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Rules, I am submitting a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary adopted February 4, 1999.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, 106TH CONGRESS, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 1999

Rule I. The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE II. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Tuesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session) before each scheduled Committee or subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) The Chairman, with such notice to the ranking Minority Member as is practicable, may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(e) Committee and subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, except that a full majority of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation from the Committee or subcommittee, closing a meeting to the public, or authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) The Committee Chairman or any subcommittee chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(c) For purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the Committee or any subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such times as each Member who so desires has an opportunity to question the witness.

RULE IV. BROADCASTING

Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio and still photography except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Committee Rules of Procedure.

RULE V. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The full Committee shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: antitrust law, tort liability, including medical malpractice and product liability, legal reform generally, and such other matters as determined by the Chairman.

(b) There shall be five standing subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property: copyright, patent and trademark law, administration of U.S. courts, Federal Rules of Evidence, Civil and Appellate Procedure, judicial ethics, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(2) Subcommittee on the Constitution: constitutional amendments, constitutional rights, federal civil rights laws, ethics in government, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(3) Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law: bankruptcy and commercial law, bankruptcy judgeships, administrative law, independent counsel, state taxation affecting interstate commerce, interstate compacts, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(4) Subcommittee on Crime: Federal Criminal Code, drug enforcement, sentencing, parole and pardons, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prisons, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(5) Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims: immigration and naturalization, admission of refugees, treaties, conventions and international agreements, claims against the United States, federal charters of incorporation, private immigration and claims bills, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each subcommittee which such Chairman or ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such subcommittee.

RULE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE VIII. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

KOSOVO AND THE INVOLVEMENT OF U.S. TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the entire hour, but I do want to continue a discussion that I started last evening, a discussion regarding the situation in Kosovo and the involvement of our troops in the air campaign, as well as the potential involvement of our troops in a ground campaign.

I thought it was especially important to continue this this evening, Mr. Speaker, because, as we both know, there are a number of our colleagues who are this evening sitting in their offices signing mail and responding to constituent concerns and at the same time keeping one eye and perhaps one ear on the discussions taking place here.

I think it is important that we look at all the parameters associated with the status of our military today as we hear increased discussions in the city about committing significantly larger amounts of American troops to Kosovo, and committing a significant amount of American resources to the situation and the ultimate defeat of Milosevic.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, I focused on the need to bring Russia in and to basically have Russia, which is on an ongoing basis a significant beneficiary of American tax dollars, to play a vital and direct role in helping to bring

Milosevic to the table and to agree to negotiated terms to settle the ethnic unrest that has occurred in Serbia, especially with the Kosovars.

As I said last night, we spend between $6 hundred million and $1 billion of taxpayer money on programs to assist Russia. From economic development to stabilization of their nuclear programs to assistance with environmental issues, we are actively engaged in Russia, and I am in the middle of many of those issues as the chairman of the Interparliamentary Commission with the Russian Duma.

Now is the time for us, Mr. Speaker, to let Russia know that we expect, for the assistance that we give them, that they play a significant and vital role in bringing Milosevic, an ally and close confidante of the Russian government and certain Russian leaders, to the table to help us resolve this conflict peacefully.

As I said last evening, I have had discussions with Russian Duma deputies and with leaders in Russia who want to pursue such a course. Make no mistake about it, I think these negotiations should be on our terms, not Russia's. We should set the policy based on the negotiations that we have had with the Contact Group in the past, but Russia has to be part of the process.

I think in the 3 weeks or so that we have been bombing Serbia it is evident that we have not seen Milosevic move, in terms of coming our way in acquiring a peaceful settlement. What we can in fact do is, in continuing to apply pressure on the government there for the NATO alliance, is bring Russia in and give Russia a more prominent role, and basically allow Russia to play I think the kind of middle position they should be playing in bringing Milosevic and his people to somber discussions about how to resolve this situation peacefully.

I encourage the administration to do that. I am heartened that some feedback I have gotten today is that the administration in fact is looking at these options. I think that is critically important for Republicans and Democrats to continue to press the administration and our allies to look at ways that we can solve this problem to our satisfaction, to the satisfaction of NATO, to the satisfaction of the stability of the Kosovars and Kosovo as a Nation, where people can live freely without ethnic intimidation, but we should do that also without having to resort to inserting ground troops and potentially involving ourselves in a major conflict that could involve the world's two major superpowers as opponents.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to use this opportunity to talk about some other factors that Members must consider as we prepare to either support or not support the administration's policy on moving additional troops and operations and personnel and platforms into Kosovo and the surrounding theater.

Before I do that, however, I want to reiterate two important points that I made last evening. The first is that Milosevic understand in no uncertain terms that all of us in this body are united with the President in demanding that he end his reign of terror on the Kosovars, and that he stop and be held accountable for the atrocities that are now unfolding in Kosovo and Serbia, and that we as Americans will follow through in holding him accountable personally. Let there be no mistake about that.

The second key point I want to make and reemphasize from last evening is that we are solidly behind our military; that we in the Congress are doing everything in our power to give them the tools and the resources they need to allow them to continue the operations that have been outlined for them by the Commander in Chief.

But let me get into the meat of what I would like to discuss this evening, Mr. Speaker. That deals with the need for Members of this body and the other body to understand that deploying our troops in Kosovo, sending our pilots in to conduct aerial campaigns, sending our helicopters, our Apaches in to provide safe ways, is not the same as sending inanimate robots into an area.

These are human beings, and these human beings have need, they have wants. We have not been as supportive as a Nation in providing the backup and financial resources to protect the quality of life and stability of these troops as we should be.

This is an appropriate time for us to outline these concerns, and to use this as part of our discussions as we decide whether or not to move into a phase where ground troops are entered into Kosovo.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people in America have been convinced that for some reason we are spending so much more money today on our military than at any point in time in the past. The facts just do not bear that out.

When I talk to my constituents back in Pennsylvania, I use a simple analogy. I do not compare what we are spending on defense to Ronald Reagan, as some would perhaps do. Rather, I go back to the time of John Kennedy.

When John Kennedy was president in the sixties, Mr. Speaker, we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar coming into Washington on the military. Yet, it was a time of peace. It was after Korea and before Vietnam. Fifty-two cents of every tax dollar was spent on the military. Nine percent of our gross national product was spent on defense back then.

In today's budget, we are spending 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on defense. We are spending 2.6 percent of our gross national product on the military. The numbers have dropped dramatically. In fact, by any accounting standard, we are spending a significantly smaller portion of our Federal allocation that is available on defense and security than we were back when John Kennedy was the President, even though I would argue that was a more stable time and a time of peace throughout the world.

But some other factors have changed. Back when John Kennedy was president we had the draft. Young people were brought into the military. They served a period of 2 years or more. Then they went on with their lives. They were paid next to nothing.

Today we have an all volunteer force. They are well educated. Many are married, they have children, so we have added health care costs, housing costs, travel costs, so a much larger portion of our smaller defense budget is being spent on the quality of life to get those troops, to get those people, to serve in the military and to keep those troops involved and to stay on beyond one tour of duty.

In fact, quality of life is the overriding driving factor of our defense budget process today, to make sure our troops are happy, that they have the best possible quality of life to raise their families and to continue to serve America.

That was not the case back in the sixties. With the draft, we paid the troops a meager amount of money. Most were not married. We did not have all the associated costs with housing, education, health care, and so forth.

Some other things have changed. Back in John Kennedy's era when we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on the military, we were not spending a significant portion of our defense budget on environmental mitigation. In this year's defense budget, $11 billion of the defense budget will go for what we call environmental mitigation. That is money that is not going to provide support for our troops. That is money that is not going to buy new equipment or to replace old equipment, or to repair equipment.

Now $11 billion out of today's budget for defense environmental mitigation, and zero dollars spent during John Kennedy's era for the similar type of situation, a further change from the nineties as compared to the sixties.

But there is even a more fundamental difference that gets at the heart of our problem in sustaining the readiness of our troops today. That is the issue that I also talked about last evening. This issue, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to drive home to Americans and to our colleagues on a daily basis.

During the time from World War II's ending until 1990 and 1991, under the administration of all the presidents

that served during that period, starting with Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower and Richard Nixon and going on through John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and going on through Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford, and even including Ronald Reagan and George Bush, during all of that time the total amount of deployments by those Commander in Chiefs was 10, 10 deployments in 40 years.

Our troops were only inserted into hostile environments as a measure of last resort by our Republican and Democrat Commander in Chief.

Let us look at the past 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Since 1991, 1990 and 1991, we have had 33 deployments. I had to cross them out, because Kosovo is now the 33rd. There have been 33 deployments of our troops into hostile situations. Each of these 33 deployments, 33 in 8 years, versus 10 in 40 years, each of these deployments cost hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. None of these 33 deployments were budgeted for, not one. None of these deployments were paid for with an up or down vote on the Congress in advance of the deployment of the troops.

The payment of the costs associated with these deployments was made by taking dollars out of an already decreasing defense budget, out of programs of modernizing our aircraft, modernizing our naval fleet, modernizing our platforms, and giving the soldiers, sailors, marines, and corpsmen the kinds of quality of life that they deserve in an era where we have all volunteers.

In fact, the Comptroller of the Pentagon has given us a figure that these 33 deployments cost us $19 billion of unanticipated expenditures. Many of them were paid with supplementals to provide the funding to pay for these operations.

In fact, the irony of these 33 deployments, Mr. Speaker, is that we in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, joining together each year for the past 4 years, plussed up more money to try to replenish some of these funds that were being eaten away for this rapidly increasing deployment rate.

In fact, 4 years ago we gave the Pentagon $10 billion more than what the President asked for. Three years ago we gave the Pentagon $6 billion more than what the Pentagon asked for. Two years ago we gave the Pentagon $3 billion more than what the President asked for.

In each of those years, as we in the Congress tried to replenish the funds to replace money that was being used for these deployments, the President and the administration criticized the Congress for giving the Pentagon more money than they asked for.

□ 1930

Finally this year, the Pentagon leaders have spoken up and said, ''We can take this no longer. The funding problem is so severe in the Pentagon that we have to tell you candidly that we need more money in next year's budget.''

The service chiefs came in and testified before the House committees and the Senate committees and said, at a minimum, they need $19 billion more than what President Clinton asked for in the fiscal year 2000 budget.

The President said he would make $11 billion of new funding available. It was a great speech. But when we cut away all of the rhetoric, the actual new money put in by the President in his budget for the next fiscal year is $3 billion. In fact, one of the gimmicks they used was to take $3 billion out of R&D for defense, shift it into acquisition, and call that a $3 billion plus-up in defense spending.

The problem we have today is that the readiness of our troops, the capability to perform in Kosovo, is directly dependent on how much we support our troops. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have undermined the capability of our military.

Because of the rapidly increasing level of deploying our troops around the world and because of the rapidly decreasing defense budget, we have unfortunately encountered a mismatch that is affecting the quality of life for our troops, that is affecting the ability for our troops to serve this Nation well in Kosovo, let alone the possibility of asking ground troops to go in to fight what could be a massive war.

Mr. Speaker, let me give my colleagues some examples that are very specific. One of our national defense technical media outlets is running a series of stories that, to me, are embarrassing. They have documents, one of which I will enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These are internal memos of the Army where the Army is discussing the need to replace the survival radio gear that we provide the pilots and crew members on aircraft flying over hostile environments.

This gear and equipment is essential because, if a plane is downed, as we saw with the F–117A, those pilots and those crew members have got to have a way to get a signal back so that we can go in and rescue them.

These documents refer to those systems. Unfortunately in the internal memos of the Army, in discussing the availability of these devices to provide for our planes that are flying, not just over Kosovo, but also over Iraq in the peacekeeping role there and protecting the no-fly zone, this is what the Army is saying to those who are asking for these devices to put on these planes to protect our pilots, and I quote: ''We do not have any radios available to fill shortages.'' We do not have any radios available to fill shortages, referring to these devices that are so critically important for pilots that may be downed in either Iraq or in Kosovo from enemy fire.

They go on to discuss the fact that we need to have some kind of protection for the pilots. So further on in the same memo, these are internal Army memos that I have been given by the medial outlets running these stories, this is a directive that has been issued by the Army, ''The pilot in command'' of the aircraft ''will continue to ensure that not less than one fully operational survival radio is on board the aircraft. This does not preclude crew members from carrying additional radios on board the aircraft as assets become available. In addition, the'' pilot in charge ''will ensure that crew members without radios have other means of signaling'', now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, either a ''foliage penetration flare kit and/or a signal mirror.''

Can we imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we are sending pilots and crew members into a hostile environment, whether it is over Iraq or Kosovo, and we are telling them, because we do not have enough equipment, that they should make sure that they have a signal mirror; that that is the method they are going to use to tell our rescue crews that they have been downed.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there was another story that ran a week or so ago where one of our Maryland units, I believe it is the 104th Air Reserve Squadron out of neighboring Maryland who is currently flying the missions over Iraq at this very moment, that the commanding officer has been quoted as saying that that unit had to go to local Radio Shack stores and buy GPS devices to give their pilots to carry on board these planes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not some pie-in-the-sky make-believe threatening scenario. This is what is happening today with our military. How can we as the world's most powerful Nation there to provide security and leadership for NATO allow our pilots and their crews to fly combat missions without the appropriate equipment to guarantee the safety of their lives?

Is it no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the retention rate for our pilots in the Navy and the Air Force is the lowest rate today since World War II? The retention rate for Air Force and Navy pilots flying planes today over Kosovo and Iraq is below 20 percent. In one case, it is 15 percent.

We wonder why these young pilots who we have invested so much money to train do not want to stay in. It is because we are not giving them the equipment they need. It is because their morale is suffering and because they are sick and tired of going from one deployment to the next.

Instead of having time to come back to visit with our families, to visit with our children, they are being dispatched to Haiti, from Haiti to Somalia, from Somalia to Macedonia, from Macedonia to Bosnia, from Bosnia to Kosovo.

The morale is suffering in a dramatic way, and we are seeing the result of that in a level of retention for pilots that we have not seen in the last 50 years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing it in the ability to recruit new young people in the services.

The Secretary of the Army just 1 month ago, because of shortages in the Army's ability to bring the new recruits, has proposed that we lower the standard of acceptance, that we now take young people in the Army who do not have high school diplomas.

Here is the irony of that, Mr. Speaker, the Army's number one priority right now, which I fully support, is the digitized battlefield, to give the Army warrior of the 21st century an information technology capability second to none, a computer in the backpack so they have visual imaging, a GPS capability so in their goggles they can see what the pilots in our helicopters and our planes and our radar surveillance planes are seeing.

At a time when we are making our soldiers digitized, able to be operating computers, we are having to lower the standard of acceptance in the Army to well below a high school diploma because we cannot fill the billets, because the morale in the services are suffering unlike any time, including 1970s, since World War II.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have ships going out to sea, aircraft carriers short of 600 to 700 sailors from what the required rate of deployment and billets should be for a mission, 600 to 700 sailors short because we cannot provide the number of sailors to man the ships to do the functions that they are required to do in hostile environments.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts. These are not ideas. These are not maybes. These are dependables. These things are happening today. We have a severe problem with our military. We are stretching it to the bone.

Our military was not designed to become the world's police department where every time a conflict occurs, we send in the American troops. These are not robots. These are human beings with families, with loved ones. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect.

I appreciate President Clinton today or yesterday going down and speaking to the pilots who are flying our B–52s, real heroes for America and real heroes for the world that we are trying to protect. But I wish the President would have addressed one other thing when he spoke to them.

I wish he would have told those pilots what we all know, that those B–52 bombers are going to be 75 years old before we can retire them, 75 years old and flying because we have undermined the base of financial support to provide new aircraft.

That is what is critical to those pilots in those B–52s and those crews. It is not just enough to say they are American heroes. It also requires us to give them the new equipment, the training, the repairs, the kinds of support they need to do the job they are being asked to do.

We are not doing that, Mr. Speaker. We are not modernizing the military because, over the past 6 years, we have cut program after program to put the money in to paying for these deployments because we do not have the dollars necessary to fund these deployments up front.

This means that marines flying in the CH–46 workhorse helicopter that was built during the Vietnam War will be flying those helicopters when they are 55 years old. Those helicopters were designed to be flown for 20 to 25 years.

The marines will have to fly the 46 when it is 55 years old because we have not replaced the 46 with the aircraft that is designed to take it out of service, because we have taken the money from that program and used it to fund these escapades around the world; and that is what they are, escapades.

Critics would say to me, ''Well, wait a minute, Congressman Weldon, you are being critical of this President and this administration for all of these deployments. What about President Bush? Wasn't it President Bush back in 1991 in this 33 deployment rate who sent our troops to Desert Storm, a very large conflict?''

The answer is, yes, it was President Bush who sent our troops into Desert Storm. We did have a full and open debate in this body and the other body before those troops were committed to combat.

We did one other thing, Mr. Speaker, or I should not say ''we did''. The President did. President Bush felt so strongly about the allied commitment in Desert Storm that he personally went to the major world leaders around the world, and he said something very simple to them. ''If you cannot send troops, then you must support this operation financially. But if you can send troops, we want your troops involved.''

Desert Storm was the largest multinational force that we have seen certainly in this decade. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Desert Storm cost the American taxpayer $51 billion, a huge sum of money. But, Mr. Speaker, President Bush got our allies to reimburse us $52 billion. There was no net cost to our defense budget.

Each of these deployments, the reverse has occurred. Not only are the allies not reimbursing us for our costs, in places like Haiti, we are subsidizing the cost of other nations sending their troops in along with us. In fact, we are using American defense dollars to fund the support, the housing, the food, and the subsidization of other nations to bring their militaries into these deployments that we have become involved with.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is getting grave. We on the Committee on Armed Services are getting ready to mark up our defense authorization bill. We have very serious problems. The Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need $19 billion more than what the President has in fact allocated.

That does not include a pay raise for all the service personnel. That does not include service-wide adjustments to the retirement system that are needed. That does not include missile defenses, which are one of the fastest growing threats that we see emerging in the 21st Century.

The estimate we have come up with is that we are short approximately $25 billion in the next fiscal year just to take care of our ongoing commitments. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because Kosovo has already cost us $2 billion. Where did that money come from? It came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Every major operation in the country has had to put dollars on the table to help fund the Kosovo deployment.

We are going to have to pass a massive supplemental. I saw the report today where the long-term projected cost of Kosovo could exceed $10 billion to $15 billion alone. Mr. Speaker, I ask the question of our colleagues, where is that money going to come from? Where are we going to find that additional $10 billion to $15 billion when we cannot even fund the $19 billion to $25 billion shortfall that has been identified before Kosovo became an issue.

□ 1945

We are in a massive crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I have spoken around the country, I have made the statement that this period of time, the 1990s, will go down in history as the worst decade in undermining our national security because of our increasing rate of deployment and our massive decreases in defense allocations. The two run in a diametrically opposite way, and we are feeling the crunch today.

With all of these deployments, the Navy is being asked to do more and more assignments around the world. We are now dispatching another carrier over to the Kosovo theater; to the Balkan theater. The Navy at one time had 585 ships. If we listen to our Navy experts today, we are having trouble keeping our Navy at 300 ships, in spite of these massive increases in deployments around the world.

Our fighter squadrons. We have fighter squadrons today, Mr. Speaker, where up to one-third of the planes are grounded because we are using them as spare parts to keep the other two-thirds in the air flying.

Mr. Speaker, how long can this go on before the American people sense that something is terribly wrong? Is it going to take a massive loss of life?

Are we going to have to see another case where soldiers are killed, as we saw 28 young Americans killed in 1991 when that low-complexity SCUD missile hit the barracks in Saudi Arabia that we could not defend against and we brought them home in body bags?

It is a real fact, Mr. Speaker, that 8 years after that attack on our soldiers in Saudi Arabia with that SCUD missile that we have no highly effective system today to deal with the medium-range missiles that Iran and Iraq both now have, that North Korea has now deployed that threatens our troops in South Korea and threatens our troops in Japan. The growth of missile proliferation is providing threats to our troops that we do not have the money to build systems to defend against.

The threat of weapons of mass destruction has caused the President to ask for billions of dollars of additional money to deal with the threats of the potential use of chemical, biological and small nuclear weapons, and I agree with his assessment of the threat. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the money.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest threat, the threat of cyber terrorism, the use by a rogue nation or rogue group with high-performance computers to compromise our smart weapons and our civilian information systems, is requiring a massive increase in new dollars to deal with information warfare, and we do not have the money to put into that process.

Mr. Speaker, I recite these facts because as we, my colleagues and I, are being asked to assess whether or not our troops should be deployed, both our helicopters which are already there and the troops that support them that are already there, and the potential follow-on of a larger group of troops going into Kosovo, we had better consider one very important thing: We had better be prepared to provide every ounce of support for those men and women that they need.

That is going to require a significant new investment of money. That is going to require an effort that breaks the budget caps. It is going to require us to significantly increase the support to replace the Tomahawk cruise missiles, the guns and ammunition, the fuel, the lodging costs, and all those other associated costs that currently are in excess of $2 billion for the Kosovo deployment.

Mr. Speaker, we better be prepared for one other debate as well. If we cannot sustain the level of our troop strength that we need, if we cannot reverse the decline in the retention of our pilots, especially Navy and Air Force pilots, if we cannot turn around the Army's problem of recruitment, the Navy's problem of filling its billets, if we cannot solve those problems, Mr. Speaker, I believe all my colleagues know what that means we will have to debate. That means we have to debate whether or not to consider reinstating the draft. Boy, all of a sudden does that raise eyebrows across the country.

It is easy to say put the troops in. It is easy to say put American kids in harm's way. It is easy to say send planes over. But, Mr. Speaker, we need men and women to fly those planes, to fly those helicopters, to feed those troops. And if morale becomes such a problem because of our lack of support financially for our troops, what then do we do?

If we cannot convince young people to voluntarily serve their country, and that is where we are heading, then, unfortunately, if we are going to see the administration keep this level of deployment up, we have got to find a way to get young people to fill those billets, to sail those ships, to man those helicopters, to fly those B–52s, to fly those F–117As. And if we cannot do that voluntarily, Mr. Speaker, that means we have to force people to serve our Nation to complete these operations that our commander-in-chief has gotten us into.

These are not easy decisions. These are not easy circumstances where we can, sitting in our armchair, decide to send more robots into a theater and risk their lives. We have a problem with our military because we have not funded readiness, we have not funded modernization, we are not even giving the pilots the remote sensing gear they need if they are shot down.

And if we cannot provide the support to keep those volunteers serving our country, then those Members of Congress who are standing before the national media, who are talking about putting our troops in harm's way, who are talking about sending tens of thousands of new troops into Kosovo, they better be prepared to address the issue of where do these young people come from. Because if we cannot provide the bodies, then we have to force young Americans to do what they did prior to the Vietnam War, and that is serve their country as a part of a national conscription effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to do that. I do not think we should be thinking about restoring the draft, but I also understand the reality of the situation we are in. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot deploy our troops 33 times, we cannot keep young people in Haiti, Macedonia, Somalia, the Balkans, in Bosnia, and put them in Kosovo, and have them handle floods and tornadoes and earthquakes and unrest in Central America, and rebuilding in Central America, and at the same time not have the bodies to fill those slots. It does not work that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have never heard this President deal with these issues. He has not talked about the need to provide additional support for our troops. He does not want to break the budget caps. He does not want to put the kind of money in that the Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need this year. And he is not willing to talk about the morale problems in the military. These are issues that we in the Congress cannot run away from.

Defense is not a partisan issue. I am the first to admit publicly, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats in this body have been as supportive of defense as have Republicans, and some of our leading supporters of the military are Members of the Democrat party. An overwhelming number of our Republicans are strong supporters of our military.

I want to speak to those other Members of the Congress who want to put our troops in harm's way but who want to cut the defense budget even further than what it is now. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let that happen. Every one of those Members of Congress who goes on national TV, who stands in the well of this body and talks about committing our troops, talks about humanitarian efforts, talks about saving lives and taking people out of wheelbarrows to give them homes, they better be prepared to vote for the money and the support to deal with the morale problems, the readiness problems, the modernization problems that we have in the military today. Because that is what this debate needs to focus on. This is not about undermining the leadership of our country. This is about giving those men and women asked to go into harm's way the tools they need to do their job.

We need to have this debate across America, and I hope, as we get closer to a decision on how to proceed with Kosovo, we continue to understand that every day we are there is costing us, by one estimate I saw, $30 million an hour. Thirty million dollars an hour of U.S. tax money that we do not know where it is coming from. Thirty million dollars an hour that the U.S. is putting up, that we are shouldering the bulk of the responsibility for.

These costs have to come from someplace, and this body needs to find a way to provide the additional resources to pay for those operational costs and not rob other accounts that force us to fly aircraft well beyond their life expectancy, that forces morale to continue to drop, that forces our pilots to want to get out and make money in the private sector, and that forces those people flying those bombing missions and those security missions over Iraq and Kosovo at this very hour to not have the necessary equipment so that if they are shot down they can alert our rescue crews to come in and know where they are to get them out quickly and safely.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges before us are great. This country needs to understand all the dimensions of the Kosovo deployment. This country needs to understand that we cannot afford to be

fair weather friends of the brave men and women who serve this country. It is not just enough to stand up and wave the flag and say ''I am behind the troops.'' We must be prepared to take care of all the extra costs that are associated with these 33 deployments, many of which our troops are still involved with around the world today.

I ask my colleagues to consider these facts as we move further into a very nasty and dangerous situation far away from the homes and the towns where these brave Americans live.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0018

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. KASICH submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–91)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, do pass with the following, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.
Sec. 105. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Safe deposit box for social security surpluses.
Sec. 202. Reserve fund for retirement security.
Sec. 203. Reserve fund for medicare.
Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 205. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
Sec. 206. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 207. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 208. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 209. Establishment of levels for fiscal year 1999.
Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities in the Senate.
Sec. 211. Reserve fund for fiscal year 2000 surplus.
Sec. 212. Reserve fund for education in the Senate.
Sec. 213. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

Sec. 301. Sense of Congress on the protection of the social security surpluses.
Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.
Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.
Sec. 304. Sense of Congress on child nutrition.
Sec. 305. Sense of Congress concerning funding for special education.

Subtitle B—Sense of the House Provisions

Sec. 311. Sense of the House on the Commission on International Religious Freedom.
Sec. 312. Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate Provisions

Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not invest the social security trust funds in private financial markets.
Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program.
Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate on education.
Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to Americans by returning the non-social security surplus to taxpayers.
Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate on access to medicare services.
Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate on law enforcement.
Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.
Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.
Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.
Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.
Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate that the one hundred sixth Congress, first session should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.
Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on the importance of social security for individuals who become disabled.
Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on reporting of on-budget trust fund levels.
Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.
Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on funding for natural disasters.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,434,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,454,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,531,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,584,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,648,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,681,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,735,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,805,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,868,515,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$7,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$53,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$31,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$49,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$62,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$109,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$135,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$150,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$177,195,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,455,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,486,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,559,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,612,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,666,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,698,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,753,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,814,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,874,778,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,434,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,454,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,531,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,583,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,639,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,667,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,717,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,781,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,841,858,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS OR SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits or surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $0.
Fiscal year 2003: $0.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $8,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $18,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $23,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $26,657,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,628,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,708,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,793,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,877,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,956,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,024,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $6,084,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $6,136,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $6,173,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $6,203,400,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $468,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $487,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $506,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $527,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $549,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $576,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $601,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $628,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $654,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $681,313,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $327,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $339,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $350,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $362,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $375,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $389,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $404,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $420,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $438,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $459,496,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $308,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $318,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $327,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $328,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $329,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $330,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $332,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,040,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,560,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$84,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,067,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $23,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $23,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $23,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,238,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $10,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $10,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $10,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $10,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,223,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,529,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $12,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $13,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,824,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $50,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $52,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $52,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $52,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $52,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $52,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,082,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $3,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $3,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,483,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $66,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $66,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $66,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $70,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $73,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $74,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $74,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $75,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $76,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $76,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,688,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $156,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $164,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $173,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $184,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $197,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $212,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $228,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $246,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $265,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $285,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,941,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $208,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $230,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $250,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $268,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $306,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $337,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $365,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $394,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,249,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $244,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $250,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $276,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $286,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $298,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $304,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $310,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $323,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $334,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,604,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $18,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,215,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $45,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $46,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $48,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $47,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $47,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $48,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $49,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,671,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,368,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $12,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $12,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,931,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $275,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $271,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $265,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $263,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $261,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $258,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $257,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $255,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $252,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,968,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$12,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$19,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,889,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,039,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than July 23, 1999, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $142,315,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $777,868,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Not later than July 16, 1999, the Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House of Representatives a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $142,315,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $777,868,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed $137 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(B) in setting forth the deficit level pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform.

(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the deficit for a fiscal year results solely from legislation enacted pursuant to section 202.

(4) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year shall be determined

on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) in the Senate, adjust the levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207; and

(3) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that implements structural medicare reform and significantly extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House or the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agriculture producers that complies with paragraph (2), the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority or outlays for fiscal year 2000 and does not cause a net increase in budget authority that is greater than $2,000,000,000 for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed—

(1) $6,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(2) $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 205. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 206. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are whether it is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this subsection may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.—Subsection (b) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.

(h) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on the adoption of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 207. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the three following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first five fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the five fiscal years following the first five fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct-spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, then it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A).

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget

authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 202 of House Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress) is repealed.

(g) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2000 and the total for fiscal year 2000 and the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

SEC. 209. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The levels submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5 of the 106th Congress or S. Res. 312 of the 105th Congress, and any revisions authorized by such resolutions, shall be considered to be the levels and revisions of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that finances disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent if, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR A FISCAL YEAR 2000 SURPLUS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2000 by July 1, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000, the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the following adjustments in an amount equal to the on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 as estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for fiscal year 2000;

(2) increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207; and

(3) adjust the instruction in sections 104 and 105 of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, upon reporting of a bill, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon that allows local educational agencies to use appropriated funds to carry out activities under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act that complies with subsection (b), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may—

(1) increase the outlay aggregate and allocation for fiscal year 2000 by not more than $360,000,000; and

(2) adjust the levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207.

(b) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this subsection if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority or outlays for the periods of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 213. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PROTECTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Congress and the President should balance the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds;

(2) reducing the Federal debt held by the public is a top national priority, strongly supported on a bipartisan basis, as evidenced by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's comment that debt reduction ''is a very important element in sustaining economic growth'', as well as President Clinton's comments that it ''is very, very important that we get the Government debt down'' when referencing his own plans to use the budget surplus to reduce Federal debt held by the public;

(3) according to the Congressional Budget Office, balancing the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds will reduce debt held by the public by a total of $1,723,000,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2009, $417,000,000,000, or 32 percent, more than it would be reduced under the President's fiscal year 2000 budget submission;

(4) further, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that the President's budget would actually spend $40,000,000,000 of the social security surpluses in fiscal year 2000 on new spending programs, and spend $158,000,000,000 of the social security surpluses on new spending programs from fiscal year 2000 through 2004; and

(5) social security surpluses should be used for social security reform, retirement security, or to reduce the debt held by the public and should not be used for other purposes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall pass legislation which—

(1) reaffirms the provisions of section 13301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 that provides that the receipts and disbursements of the social security trust funds shall not be counted for the purposes of the budget submitted by the President, the congressional budget, or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and provides for a point of order within the Senate against any concurrent resolution on the budget, an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that violates that section;

(2) mandates that the social security surpluses are used only for the payment of social security benefits, retirement security, social security reform, or to reduce the Federal debt held by the public and such mandate shall be implemented by establishing a supermajority point of order in the Senate against limits established on the level of debt held by the public;

(3) provides for a Senate super-majority point of order against any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that would use social security surpluses on anything other than the payment of social security benefits, social security reform, retirement security, or the reduction of the Federal debt held by the public;

(4) ensures that all social security benefits are paid on time; and

(5) accommodates social security reform legislation.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) working with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) education initiatives should boost academic achievement for all students; and excellence in American classrooms means having high expectations for all students, teachers, and administrators, and holding schools accountable to the children and parents served by such schools;

(5) successful schools and school systems are characterized by parental involvement in the education of their children, local control, emphasis on basic academics, emphasis on fundamental skills and exceptional teachers in the classroom;

(6) the one-size-fits-all approach to education often creates barriers to innovation and reform initiatives at the local level; America's rural schools face challenges quite different from their urban counterparts; and parents, teachers and State and local officials should have the freedom to tailor their education plans and reforms according to the unique educational needs of their children;

(7) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(8) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs;

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms;

(3) increased funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts; and

(4) decision making authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local educational challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets.

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children.

(3) In order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established.

(4) Across the Nation, numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers.

(5) Middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets.

(6) The Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) both Republicans and Democrats understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being;

(2) the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school;

(3) the Government currently plays a role in funding school nutrition programs; and

(4) there is a bipartisan commitment to helping children learn.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in the House the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture and in the Senate the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

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

(1) In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the ''Act''), Congress found that improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.

(2) In the Act, the Secretary of Education is instructed to make grants to States to assist them in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

(3) The Act represents a commitment by the Federal Government to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

(4) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 ignores the commitment by the Federal Government under the Act to fund special education and instead proposes the creation of new programs that limit the manner in which States may spend the limited Federal education dollars received.

(5) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 fails to increase funding for special education, and leaves States and localities with an enormous unfunded mandate to pay for growing special education costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs.

Subtitle B—Sense of the House Provisions

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized $3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes that $3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) REPORT.—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate Provisions

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT INVEST THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS IN PRIVATE FINANCIAL MARKETS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should not directly invest contributions made to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) in private financial markets.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the

following 4 key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The Federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and ''is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the medicare program''.

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the depletion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) The recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EDUCATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that—

(A) increased Federal funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts;

(B) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs;

(C) decisionmaking authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local education challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations; and

(D) the Department of Education, the States, and local education agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms; and

(2) within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for function 500 that to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) the Federal Pell Grant maximum award should be increased;

(B) funding for the Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants Program should be increased;

(C) funding for the Federal capital contributions under the Federal Perkins Loan Program should be increased;

(D) funding for the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program should be increased;

(E) funding for the Federal Work-Study Program should be increased; and

(F) funding for the Federal TRIO Programs should be increased.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO AMERICANS BY RETURNING THE NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this concurrent resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting social security and medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on tax reductions for working families in the form of family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation and economic growth;

(2) such tax relief could include an expansion of the 15-percent bracket, marginal rate reductions, a significant reduction or elimination of the marriage penalty, retirement savings incentives, estate tax relief, an above-the-line income tax deduction for social security payroll taxes, tax incentives for education savings, parity between the self-employed and corporations with respect to the tax treatment of health insurance premiums, and capital gains tax fairness for family farmers;

(3) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform, and Congress should move expeditiously to consider comprehensive tax reform and simplification proposals; and

(4) Congress should reject the President's proposed tax increase on investment income of associations as defined under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ACCESS TO MEDICARE SERVICES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume Congress should review payment levels in the medicare program to ensure beneficiaries have a range of choices available under the Medicare+Choice program and have access to high quality skilled nursing services, home health care services, and inpatient and outpatient hospital services in rural areas.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) significant resources should be provided for strong law enforcement and aggressive crimefighting programs and that funding in fiscal year 2000 for critical programs should be equal to or greater than funding for these programs in 1999;

(2) critical programs include—

(A) State and local law enforcement assistance, especially with respect to the development and integration of anticrime technology systems and upgrading forensic laboratories and the information and communications infrastructures upon which they rely;

(B) continuing efforts to reduce violent crime; and

(C) significant expansion of intensive Federal firearms prosecutions projects such as the ongoing programs in Richmond and Philadelphia into America's most crime plagued cities; and

(3) the existence of a strong Federal drug control policy is essential in order to reduce the supplies of illegal drugs internationally and to reduce the number of children who are exposed to or addicted to illegal drugs and this can be furthered by—

(A) investments in programs authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and the proposed Drug Free Century Act; and

(B) securing adequate resources and authority for the United States Customs Service in any legislation reauthorizing the Service.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPROVING SECURITY FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) there is an urgent and ongoing requirement to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad; and

(2) additional budgetary resources should be devoted to programs within function 150 to enable successful international leadership by the United States.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that—

(1) there shall be a continuation of the pattern of budgetary increases for biomedical research; and

(2) additional resources should be targeted towards autism research.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR KYOTO PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION.

It is the sense of Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Protocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and consistent with previous Administration assurances to Congress.

SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TEA–21 FUNDING AND THE STATES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and any legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President's fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to change the manner in which any excess Federal gasoline tax revenues are distributed to the States will not be implemented, but rather any of these funds will be distributed to the States pursuant to section 1105 of TEA–21.

SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO BECOME DISABLED.

It is the sense of the Senate that levels in the resolution assume that—

(1) social security plays a vital role in providing adequate income for individuals who become disabled; and

(2) Congress and the President should take this fact into account when considering proposals to reform the social security program.

SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPORTING OF ON-BUDGET TRUST FUND LEVELS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume, effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 should include an itemization of the on-budget trust funds for the budget year, including receipts, outlays, and balances.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SOUTH KOREA'S INTERNATIONAL TRADE PRACTICES ON PORK AND BEEF.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate—

(1) believes strongly that while a stable global marketplace is in the best interest of America's farmers and ranchers, the United States should seek a mutually beneficial relationship without hindering the competitiveness of American agriculture;

(2) calls on South Korea to abide by its trade commitments;

(3) calls on the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to promote vigorously policies that encourage the opening of markets for beef and pork products by requiring South Korea to abide by its existing international trade commitments and to reduce trade barriers, tariffs, and export subsidies;

(4) calls on the President and the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture to monitor and report to Congress that resources will not be used to stabilize the South Korean market at the expense of United States agricultural goods or services; and

(5) requests the United States Trade Representative and the United States Department of Agriculture to pursue the settlement of disputes with the Government of South Korea on its failure to abide by its international trade commitments on beef market access, to consider whether Korea's reported plans for subsidizing its pork industry would violate any of its international trade commitments, and to determine what impact Korea's subsidy plans would have on United States agricultural interests, especially in Japan.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR NATURAL DISASTERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, given that emergency spending for natural disasters continues to have an unpredictable yet substantial impact on the Federal budget and that consequently budgeting for disasters remains difficult, the Administration and Congress should review procedures for funding emergencies, including natural disasters, in any budget process reform legislation that comes before the Congress.

And the Senate agree to the same.

From the Committee on the Budget:

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
SLADE GORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 68), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all out of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

DISPLAYS AND AMOUNTS

The contents of concurrent budget resolutions are set forth in section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

House Resolution.—The House budget resolution includes all of the items required as part of a concurrent budget resolution under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act other than the spending and revenue levels for Social Security (which is used to enforce a point of order applicable only in the Senate).

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment includes all of the items required under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. As permitted under section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, Section 102 of the Senate amendment includes advisory levels on debt held by the public.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement includes all of the items required by section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

AGGREGATES AND FUNCTION LEVELS

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
Summary															
Total Spending		BA...	1,749.1	1,753.6	1,795.6	1,836.8	1,920.5	1,987.0	2,055.1	2,101.7	2,172.7	2,251.9	2,333.9	9,293.5	20,208.8
		O...	1,703.9	1,735.1	1,774.8	1,804.6	1,894.7	1,959.2	2,028.1	2,071.1	2,136.4	2,219.3	2,300.8	9,168.4	19,924.1
	On-Budget	BA...	1,432.8	1,426.6	1,456.1	1,487.3	1,558.3	1,611.7	1,665.6	1,697.0	1,752.2	1,813.8	1,874.4	7,540.0	16,343.0
		O...	1,387.6	1,408.1	1,435.3	1,455.1	1,532.5	1,583.9	1,638.6	1,666.4	1,715.9	1,781.2	1,841.3	7,414.9	16,058.3
	Off-Budget	BA...	316.3	327.0	339.5	349.5	362.2	375.3	389.5	404.7	420.5	438.1	459.5	1,753.5	3,865.8
		O...	316.3	327.0	339.5	349.5	362.2	375.3	389.5	404.7	420.5	438.1	459.5	1,753.5	3,865.8
Revenues	Total		1,816.1	1,876.5	1,923.0	1,962.6	2,059.9	2,134.0	2,227.8	2,286.2	2,361.5	2,457.2	2,548.8	9,956.0	21,837.5
	On-Budget		1,369.9	1,408.5	1,435.3	1,456.3	1,532.6	1,584.1	1,651.0	1,684.4	1,733.2	1,802.8	1,867.5	7,416.8	16,155.7
	Off-Budget		446.2	468.0	487.7	506.3	527.3	549.9	576.8	601.8	628.3	654.4	681.3	2,539.2	5,681.8
Surplus/Deficit (-)	Total		112.2	141.4	148.2	158.0	165.2	174.8	199.7	215.1	225.1	237.9	248.0	787.6	1,913.4
	On-Budget		-17.7	0.4	0	1.2	0.1	0.2	12.4	18.0	17.3	21.6	26.2	1.9	97.4
	Off-Budget		129.9	141.0	148.2	156.8	165.1	174.6	187.3	197.1	207.8	216.3	221.8	785.7	1,816.0
Debt Held by the Public (end of year)			3,626.8	3,501.8	3,369.3	3,227.4	3,076.2	2,918.6	2,733.1	2,531.5	2,319.0	2,092.4	1,855.7	na	na
Debt Subject to Limit (end of year)			5,543.6	5,627.7	5,707.7	5,791.5	5,875.0	5,954.8	6,019.6	6,075.4	6,128.7	6,168.1	6,198.1	na	na
By Function															
National Defense (050)		BA...	279.0	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1,546.1	3,200.7
		O...	273.1	276.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1,471.3	3,051.9
International Affairs (150)		BA...	34.4	11.2	10.6	9.8	11.6	13.5	13.7	13.9	13.9	14.0	14.0	56.7	126.2
		O...	14.8	14.5	15.1	14.4	13.6	13.3	12.9	12.6	12.4	12.2	12.1	70.9	133.1
General Science, Space,		BA...	18.8	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.1
and Technology (250)		O...	18.2	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.6
Energy (270)		BA...	1.1	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.7
		O...	0.7	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Natural Resources and		BA...	24.2	22.8	22.5	22.4	22.5	23.5	23.5	23.6	23.7	23.7	24.0	113.7	232.2
Environment (300)		O...	23.4	22.6	22.0	21.4	22.6	23.5	23.4	23.5	23.4	23.4	23.7	112.1	229.5
Agriculture (350)		BA...	22.5	14.3	13.5	11.8	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.3
		O...	20.4	13.2	11.3	10.0	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.8
Commerce and Housing		BA...	1.9	9.7	10.3	13.9	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.3	126.3
Credit (370)		O...	0.8	4.3	5.5	9.6	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.7	85.4
	On-budget	BA...	1.9	9.9	10.6	14.5	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	63.4	127.4
		O...	0.8	4.5	5.8	10.2	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	41.8	86.5
	Off-budget	BA...	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.1	-1.1
		O...	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.1	-1.1

4/13/99 2:43 PM

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
Transportation (400)	BA...	51.3	51.8	51.0	50.8	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.4	52.4	52.4	258.2	520.0
	O...	44.0	45.8	47.7	47.3	46.8	46.3	46.1	46.0	46.0	46.1	46.1	233.9	464.2
Community and Regional	BA...	10.2	7.4	5.3	5.3	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	29.3	57.3
Development (450)	O...	11.4	10.7	9.1	7.0	6.1	5.5	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	38.4	60.7
Elementary and Secondary	BA...	16.8	22.0	24.1	24.5	25.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	123.4	257.9
Education (501)	O...	17.8	20.1	21.9	22.7	24.5	25.6	26.6	26.8	26.9	26.9	26.9	114.8	248.9
Training, Employment and	BA...	44.2	43.3	41.4	41.2	42.7	43.0	43.9	44.6	45.5	46.5	46.5	211.6	438.6
Social Services (502-506)	O...	42.0	43.5	41.9	40.9	41.9	42.3	42.9	43.7	44.5	45.5	45.5	210.5	432.6
Health (550)	BA...	147.5	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2,114.4
	O...	140.7	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	873.0	2,108.7
Medicare (570)	BA...	195.2	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1,180.7	2,880.4
	O...	194.6	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1,180.8	2,880.1
Income Security (600)	BA...	235.2	244.4	250.5	262.7	277.0	286.2	298.5	304.8	310.6	323.9	334.2	1,320.8	2,892.8
	O...	238.2	248.1	257.4	267.0	276.8	286.0	298.7	305.2	311.5	325.4	335.7	1,335.3	2,911.8
Social Security (650)	BA...	390.6	407.2	426.1	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2,236.0	5,092.8
	O...	390.8	407.3	426.1	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.5	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2,236.1	5,092.8
On-budget	BA...	14.5	14.2	13.8	15.6	16.3	17.1	18.0	18.9	19.9	21.0	22.2	77.0	177.0
	O...	14.7	14.3	13.8	15.6	16.3	17.1	17.9	18.9	19.9	21.0	22.2	77.1	177.0
Off-budget	BA...	376.1	393.0	412.3	430.3	450.7	472.7	496.6	522.0	548.8	578.0	611.4	2,159.0	4,915.8
	O...	376.1	393.0	412.3	430.3	450.7	472.7	496.6	522.0	548.8	578.0	611.4	2,159.0	4,915.8
Veterans Benefits and	BA...	43.0	44.7	44.3	44.7	45.9	46.2	48.8	47.3	47.8	48.5	49.1	225.8	467.3
Services (700)	O...	42.9	45.1	45.0	45.1	46.4	46.7	49.3	47.8	46.2	49.0	49.7	228.3	470.3
Administration of Justice (750)	BA...	26.7	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	26.2	26.3	26.4	26.4	26.5	26.5	123.6	255.7
	O...	25.1	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	26.1	26.2	26.2	26.3	26.3	26.4	125.8	257.2
General Government (800)	BA...	17.2	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.3
	O...	15.7	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.8	122.4
Net Interest (900)	BA...	229.4	217.7	207.0	196.3	186.4	176.5	165.2	153.3	141.5	128.5	115.4	983.9	1,687.8
	O...	229.4	217.7	207.0	196.3	186.4	176.5	165.2	153.3	141.5	128.5	115.4	983.9	1,687.8
On-budget	BA...	281.8	275.5	271.0	267.4	265.1	263.4	261.0	258.6	257.0	254.7	252.7	1,342.4	2,626.4
	O...	281.8	275.5	271.0	267.4	265.1	263.4	261.0	258.6	257.0	254.7	252.7	1,342.4	2,626.4
Off-budget	BA...	-52.4	-57.8	-64.0	-71.1	-78.7	-86.9	-95.8	-105.3	-115.5	-126.2	-137.3	-358.5	-938.6
	O...	-52.4	-57.8	-64.0	-71.1	-78.7	-86.9	-95.8	-105.3	-115.5	-126.2	-137.3	-358.5	-938.6
Allowances (920)	BA...	0.0	-8.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-31.8	-56.7
	O...	0.0	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.7

4/13/99 2:43 PM

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
Undistributed Offsetting		BA...	-40.1	-42.3	-45.4	-52.7	-46.8	-47.6	-49.4	-50.8	-52.9	-54.6	-56.4	-234.8	-498.9
Receipts (950)		O...	-40.1	-42.3	-45.4	-52.7	-46.8	-47.6	-49.4	-50.8	-52.9	-54.6	-56.4	-234.8	-498.9
	On-budget	BA...	-32.7	-34.3	-36.9	-43.6	-37.0	-37.1	-38.1	-38.8	-40.1	-40.9	-41.8	-188.9	-388.6
		O...	-32.7	-34.3	-36.9	-43.6	-37.0	-37.1	-38.1	-38.8	-40.1	-40.9	-41.8	-188.9	-388.6
	Off-budget	BA...	-7.4	-8.0	-8.5	-9.1	-9.8	-10.5	-11.3	-12.0	-12.8	-13.7	-14.6	-45.9	-110.3
		O...	-7.4	-8.0	-8.5	-9.1	-9.8	-10.5	-11.3	-12.0	-12.8	-13.7	-14.6	-45.9	-110.3

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION
($ billions)

Function		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-04	2000-09
050	BA	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1546.0	3200.5
	OT	274.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1469.3	3049.9
Discr.	BA	290.0	304.8	309.3	319.4	328.1	329.3	330.5	331.8	333.1	334.3	1551.5	3210.5
	OT	275.8	287.1	292.8	304.7	314.4	317.6	316.0	314.6	318.0	318.9	1474.8	3060.0
Mand.	BA	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
	OT	-1.2	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
150	BA	12.5	12.7	12.0	13.6	14.5	14.7	14.8	14.9	15.0	15.0	65.3	139.7
	OT	14.9	15.4	14.8	14.4	14.1	13.8	13.5	13.4	13.2	13.1	73.5	140.4
Discr.	BA	17.7	17.5	17.2	17.0	16.9	16.8	16.7	16.5	16.4	16.3	86.3	169.0
	OT	18.5	19.0	18.2	17.7	17.3	16.9	16.6	16.5	16.3	16.2	90.6	173.1
Mand.	BA	-5.2	-4.7	-5.2	-3.5	-2.4	-2.1	-1.8	-1.6	-1.4	-1.3	-21.0	-29.3
	OT	-3.7	-3.6	-3.4	-3.3	-3.2	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-17.1	-32.7
250	BA	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.2
	OT	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.4
Discr.	BA	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.4	178.8
	OT	18.2	17.8	17.8	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	89.3	178.0
Mand.	BA	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4
	OT	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4
270	BA	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.6
	OT	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Discr.	BA	1.8	0.5	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	8.0	17.5
	OT	2.6	0.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	9.3	18.9
Mand.	BA	-1.8	-1.9	-2.1	-2.0	-2.2	-2.3	-2.4	-2.4	-2.1	-2.0	-10.0	-21.2
	OT	-3.2	-3.9	-3.2	-3.2	-3.3	-3.4	-3.4	-3.4	-3.1	-3.0	-16.8	-33.0
300	BA	21.7	21.2	20.7	22.5	22.5	22.5	22.6	22.7	22.7	23.0	108.6	222.1
	OT	22.4	21.7	21.0	22.6	22.5	22.4	22.5	22.4	22.4	22.7	110.3	222.7
Discr.	BA	20.9	20.7	20.3	22.0	22.0	22.1	22.1	22.2	22.2	22.2	105.9	216.7
	OT	21.7	21.1	20.6	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.0	22.0	22.1	107.6	217.9
Mand.	BA	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	5.4
	OT	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	2.7	4.8
350	BA	14.8	13.5	11.3	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.2
	OT	13.7	11.3	9.5	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.8
Discr.	BA	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.6	36.8
	OT	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.7	36.7
Mand.	BA	10.9	9.8	7.6	8.3	8.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	45.1	80.4
	OT	9.6	7.5	5.8	6.7	6.9	6.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	36.5	65.0
370	BA	9.5	10.3	13.8	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.0	126.0

	OT	4.1	5.4	9.5	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.4	85.1
Discr.	BA	3.5	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.8	11.0	20.9
	OT	3.7	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.7	11.2	20.7
Mand.	BA	6.0	8.1	12.1	12.7	12.1	10.9	10.8	10.9	10.8	10.7	51.0	105.1
	OT	0.4	3.2	7.8	9.1	8.7	7.7	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.2	29.2	64.4
400	BA	51.3	51.1	51.5	52.5	52.6	52.6	52.6	52.7	52.7	52.7	259.1	522.4
	OT	45.3	47.7	47.8	46.7	46.2	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	233.7	463.8
Discr.	BA	12.2	11.9	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	57.9	113.9
	OT	43.4	45.4	45.8	44.9	44.5	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	223.9	445.4
Mand.	BA	39.1	39.2	40.2	41.3	41.4	41.4	41.4	41.5	41.5	41.5	201.2	408.5
	OT	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	9.8	18.4
450	BA	5.3	2.7	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	14.0	24.1
	OT	10.3	7.5	4.7	3.0	2.1	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	27.5	31.9
Discr.	BA	5.3	2.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	14.1	24.1
	OT	10.7	8.0	5.2	3.5	2.6	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	30.1	37.4
Mand.	BA	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
	OT	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-2.5	-5.4
500	BA	67.4	66.5	67.3	73.3	76.6	77.5	78.2	79.1	80.1	80.1	351.2	746.2
	OT	64.0	65.4	66.0	68.5	72.5	75.9	77.2	78.1	79.1	79.1	336.4	725.7
Discr.	BA	52.2	51.2	52.2	56.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	58.6	271.8	569.0
	OT	48.7	49.6	50.9	52.3	55.9	58.7	59.2	59.3	59.3	58.3	257.3	552.2
Mand.	BA	15.2	15.4	15.1	16.7	17.0	17.8	18.6	19.5	20.5	21.4	79.4	177.2
	OT	15.3	15.8	15.1	16.3	16.6	17.2	18.0	18.8	19.8	20.7	79.0	173.6
550	BA	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2114.4
	OT	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	872.9	2108.7
Discr.	BA	29.3	27.9	27.7	27.5	27.3	27.0	26.7	26.4	26.1	25.8	139.7	271.7
	OT	28.3	27.4	27.3	27.2	26.9	26.6	26.3	26.0	25.7	25.4	137.1	267.1
Mand.	BA	126.9	136.2	145.6	157.2	170.6	185.8	201.7	219.9	239.1	259.7	736.5	1842.7
	OT	124.7	135.0	146.4	158.1	171.6	186.0	202.0	219.5	238.7	259.5	735.8	1841.6
570	BA	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1180.7	2880.3
	OT	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1180.8	2880.1
Discr.	BA	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.9
	OT	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.8
Mand.	BA	205.7	219.1	227.6	247.8	265.6	292.6	303.8	334.6	362.7	391.1	1165.7	2850.4
	OT	205.7	219.3	227.2	247.9	265.8	292.2	303.9	334.8	362.2	391.3	1165.9	2850.3
600	BA	244.4	250.9	263.6	276.4	285.6	297.9	304.2	310.0	323.3	333.6	1320.8	2889.9
	OT	248.1	257.0	266.6	276.2	285.4	298.1	304.6	310.9	324.8	335.1	1333.3	2906.8
Discr.	BA	28.7	28.3	30.9	34.6	35.2	35.7	36.2	36.7	37.2	37.9	157.6	341.4
	OT	39.4	39.4	39.4	39.3	39.4	39.7	40.0	40.4	40.9	41.4	196.9	399.3
Mand.	BA	215.7	223.6	233.7	242.8	251.4	263.2	269.4	275.3	288.1	297.7	1167.2	2561.0
	OT	208.7	218.3	228.0	237.8	247.0	259.4	266.0	272.4	285.8	295.7	1139.9	2519.1

650	BA	407.2	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.7
	OT	407.3	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.7	514.5	540.8	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.6
Discr.	BA	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	15.8	31.6
	OT	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.9	31.6
Mand.	BA	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
	OT	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
700	BA	46.7	44.3	44.7	45.5	45.9	48.3	46.8	47.4	48.0	48.6	227.1	466.2
	OT	47.1	45.0	45.1	46.0	46.3	48.8	47.4	45.8	48.5	49.2	229.5	469.2
Discr.	BA	22.2	19.1	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	98.4	193.0
	OT	22.4	19.5	19.1	19.1	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.8	99.2	193.4
Mand.	BA	24.5	25.1	25.7	26.5	26.9	29.4	27.9	28.5	29.1	29.7	128.7	273.2
	OT	24.6	25.5	26.0	26.9	27.4	29.9	28.5	27.0	29.7	30.4	130.3	275.8
750	BA	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	24.5	24.4	24.2	24.1	24.0	23.8	121.8	242.3
	OT	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	24.4	24.2	24.1	24.0	23.9	23.7	124.2	244.1
Discr.	BA	23.1	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	120.8	242.3
	OT	25.1	25.0	24.8	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	123.7	245.3
Mand.	BA	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	1.0	-0.0
	OT	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	0.5	-1.1
800	BA	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.2
	OT	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.7	122.3
Discr.	BA	11.4	11.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	55.6	111.3
	OT	12.3	11.7	11.4	11.2	11.0	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	57.5	112.0
Mand.	BA	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.9	10.0
	OT	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.0	5.2	10.3
900	BA	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
	OT	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
	OT	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
920	BA	-10.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.8	-58.8
	OT	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.6
Discr.	BA	-10.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.8	-58.8
	OT	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.6
Mand.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
950	BA	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
	OT	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
	OT	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4

Total	BA	1754.0	1795.8	1837.0	1922.7	1987.5	2055.3	2102.0	2173.2	2251.9	2333.5	9297.0	20212.8
	OT	1735.4	1774.7	1804.6	1893.2	1957.3	2027.9	2071.2	2136.5	2218.8	2300.2	9165.2	19919.9
Discr.	BA	536.3	541.3	550.4	571.8	583.8	585.0	586.2	587.0	588.2	589.6	2783.5	5719.6
	OT	570.9	571.0	567.0	592.7	603.6	608.0	606.1	603.9	607.0	607.9	2905.3	5938.2
Mand.	BA	1217.7	1255.4	1287.6	1351.9	1404.7	1471.3	1517.3	1588.2	1665.7	1745.8	6517.4	14505.7
	OT	1164.4	1204.3	1238.5	1301.5	1354.7	1420.9	1466.5	1534.4	1613.7	1694.2	6263.5	13993.3
Revenues		1870.0	1923.7	1962.3	2059.3	2135.8	2226.1	2284.6	2365.7	2461.8	2551.8	9951.1	21841.3
Surplus		134.6	149.0	157.6	166.1	178.5	198.2	213.4	229.2	243.0	251.6	785.9	1921.4
On-budget		-6.3	0.7	0.8	1.0	3.9	10.8	16.2	21.6	26.7	29.8	0.1	105.3
Off-budget		140.9	148.3	156.8	165.1	174.6	187.4	197.2	207.7	216.3	221.8	785.8	1816.1

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
($ billions)

Function		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-04	2000-09
050	BA	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1546.0	3200.5
	OT	276.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1471.3	3051.9
Discr.	BA	290.0	304.8	309.3	319.4	328.1	329.3	330.5	331.8	333.1	334.3	1551.5	3210.5
	OT	277.8	287.1	292.8	304.7	314.4	317.6	316.0	314.6	318.0	318.9	1476.8	3062.0
Mand.	BA	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
	OT	-1.2	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
150	BA	12.5	11.7	10.9	12.6	14.0	14.2	14.4	14.4	14.5	14.5	61.7	133.6
	OT	14.9	15.2	14.6	14.0	13.7	13.4	13.1	12.9	12.7	12.6	72.3	136.9
Discr.	BA	17.7	16.4	16.1	16.0	16.4	16.3	16.2	16.0	15.9	15.8	82.7	162.8
	OT	18.5	18.8	18.0	17.3	16.9	16.5	16.2	16.0	15.8	15.7	89.5	169.6
Mand.	BA	-5.2	-4.7	-5.2	-3.5	-2.4	-2.1	-1.8	-1.6	-1.4	-1.3	-21.0	-29.3
	OT	-3.7	-3.6	-3.4	-3.3	-3.2	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-17.1	-32.7
250	BA	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.2
	OT	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.4
Discr.	BA	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.4	178.8
	OT	18.2	17.8	17.8	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	89.3	178.0
Mand.	BA	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4
	OT	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4
270	BA	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.6
	OT	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Discr.	BA	1.8	0.5	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	8.0	17.5
	OT	2.6	0.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	9.3	18.9
Mand.	BA	-1.8	-1.9	-2.1	-2.0	-2.2	-2.3	-2.4	-2.4	-2.1	-2.0	-10.0	-21.2
	OT	-3.2	-3.9	-3.2	-3.2	-3.3	-3.4	-3.4	-3.4	-3.1	-3.0	-16.8	-33.0
300	BA	22.8	21.8	21.6	22.5	23.0	23.0	23.1	23.2	23.2	23.5	111.7	227.7
	OT	22.6	21.9	21.2	22.6	23.0	22.9	23.0	22.9	22.9	23.2	111.3	226.2
Discr.	BA	22.0	21.3	21.1	22.0	22.5	22.6	22.6	22.7	22.7	22.7	109.0	222.3
	OT	21.9	21.2	20.8	22.1	22.6	22.6	22.6	22.5	22.5	22.6	108.7	221.5
Mand.	BA	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	5.4
	OT	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	2.7	4.8

350	BA	14.3	13.5	11.8	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.2
	OT	13.2	11.3	10.0	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.7
Discr.	BA	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.6	36.8
	OT	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.7	36.7
Mand.	BA	10.4	9.8	8.1	8.3	8.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	45.1	80.4
	OT	9.1	7.5	6.3	6.7	6.9	6.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	36.5	65.0
370	BA	9.5	10.3	13.8	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.0	126.0
	OT	4.1	5.4	9.5	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.4	85.1
Discr.	BA	3.5	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.8	11.0	20.9
	OT	3.7	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.7	11.2	20.7
Mand.	BA	6.0	8.1	12.1	12.7	12.1	10.9	10.8	10.9	10.8	10.7	51.0	105.1
	OT	0.4	3.2	7.8	9.1	8.7	7.7	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.2	29.2	64.4
370 on-budget	*BA*	*9.7*	*10.6*	*14.5*	*14.5*	*13.9*	*12.7*	*12.6*	*12.7*	*12.6*	*13.4*	*63.1*	*127.1*
	OT	*4.3*	*5.8*	*10.2*	*10.9*	*10.4*	*9.4*	*9.1*	*8.9*	*8.5*	*8.8*	*41.5*	*86.2*
Discr.	*BA*	*3.5*	*2.1*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*2.8*	*11.0*	*20.9*
	OT	*3.7*	*2.2*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.7*	*1.7*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.7*	*2.7*	*11.2*	*20.7*
Mand.	*BA*	*6.1*	*8.5*	*12.7*	*12.7*	*12.1*	*10.9*	*10.8*	*10.9*	*10.8*	*10.7*	*52.1*	*106.2*
	OT	*0.6*	*3.5*	*8.5*	*9.1*	*8.7*	*7.7*	*7.4*	*7.1*	*6.7*	*6.2*	*30.4*	*65.6*
400	BA	51.8	51.0	50.8	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.4	52.4	52.4	258.2	520.1
	OT	45.8	47.7	47.3	46.8	46.3	46.1	46.0	46.0	46.1	46.1	233.8	464.1
Discr.	BA	12.2	11.9	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	57.9	113.9
	OT	43.4	45.4	45.8	44.9	44.5	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	223.9	445.4
Mand.	BA	39.6	39.1	39.5	41.0	41.1	41.1	41.1	41.2	41.2	41.2	200.3	406.2
	OT	2.4	2.3	1.5	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	9.9	18.7
450	BA	6.4	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	21.7	40.7
	OT	10.5	8.3	5.9	4.5	3.8	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	33.0	46.3
Discr.	BA	6.4	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	21.7	40.7
	OT	10.9	8.8	6.4	5.1	4.3	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1	35.5	51.8
Mand.	BA	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
	OT	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-2.5	-5.4
500	BA	66.3	66.0	66.5	71.0	73.3	74.1	74.9	75.8	76.8	76.7	343.1	721.3
	OT	63.8	64.6	64.8	67.5	70.2	72.7	73.8	74.7	75.7	75.7	330.8	703.5
Discr.	BA	51.1	50.6	51.3	54.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	55.2	263.7	544.1
	OT	48.5	48.8	49.7	51.2	53.6	55.5	55.9	55.9	55.9	54.9	251.8	530.0
Mand.	BA	15.2	15.4	15.1	16.7	17.0	17.8	18.6	19.5	20.5	21.4	79.4	177.2
	OT	15.3	15.8	15.1	16.3	16.6	17.2	18.0	18.8	19.8	20.7	79.0	173.6

550	BA	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2114.4
	OT	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	872.9	2108.7
Discr.	BA	29.3	27.9	27.7	27.5	27.3	27.0	26.7	26.4	26.1	25.8	139.7	271.7
	OT	28.3	27.4	27.3	27.2	26.9	26.6	26.3	26.0	25.7	25.4	137.1	267.1
Mand.	BA	126.9	136.2	145.6	157.2	170.6	185.8	201.7	219.9	239.1	259.7	736.5	1842.7
	OT	124.7	135.0	146.4	158.1	171.6	186.0	202.0	219.5	238.7	259.5	735.8	1841.6
570	BA	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1180.7	2880.3
	OT	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1180.8	2880.1
Discr.	BA	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.9
	OT	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.8
Mand.	BA	205.7	219.1	227.6	247.8	265.6	292.6	303.8	334.6	362.7	391.1	1165.7	2850.4
	OT	205.7	219.3	227.2	247.9	265.8	292.2	303.9	334.8	362.2	391.3	1165.9	2850.3
600	BA	244.4	250.5	263.0	276.4	286.1	298.4	304.7	310.5	323.8	334.1	1320.3	2891.8
	OT	248.1	257.0	266.6	276.2	285.5	298.4	305.1	311.4	325.3	335.6	1333.4	2909.2
Discr.	BA	28.7	27.9	30.3	34.6	35.2	35.7	36.2	36.7	37.2	37.9	156.6	340.3
	OT	39.4	39.4	39.4	39.3	39.4	39.7	40.0	40.4	40.9	41.4	196.9	399.3
Mand.	BA	215.7	222.6	232.7	241.8	250.9	262.7	268.4	273.8	286.6	296.2	1163.7	2551.5
	OT	208.7	217.6	227.2	236.8	246.2	258.7	265.1	271.1	284.4	294.2	1136.5	2510.0
650	BA	407.2	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.7
	OT	407.3	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.7	514.5	540.8	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.6
Discr.	BA	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	15.8	31.6
	OT	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.9	31.6
Mand.	BA	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
	OT	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
650 on-budget	*BA*	*14.2*	*13.8*	*15.6*	*16.3*	*17.1*	*18.0*	*18.9*	*19.9*	*21.0*	*22.2*	*77.0*	*177.0*
	OT	*14.3*	*13.8*	*15.6*	*16.3*	*17.1*	*17.9*	*18.9*	*19.9*	*21.0*	*22.2*	*77.0*	*176.9*
Discr.	*BA*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*15.8*	*31.6*
	OT	*3.3*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*15.9*	*31.6*
Mand.	*BA*	*11.1*	*10.6*	*12.4*	*13.1*	*13.9*	*14.8*	*15.7*	*16.7*	*17.9*	*19.1*	*61.1*	*145.4*
	OT	*11.1*	*10.6*	*12.4*	*13.1*	*13.9*	*14.8*	*15.7*	*16.7*	*17.9*	*19.1*	*61.1*	*145.4*
700	BA	45.4	44.3	44.7	45.9	46.2	48.8	47.3	47.8	48.5	49.1	226.6	468.0
	OT	45.6	45.0	45.1	46.4	46.7	49.3	47.8	46.2	49.0	49.7	228.8	470.8
Discr.	BA	20.9	19.1	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	97.1	191.7
	OT	20.9	19.5	19.1	19.1	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.8	97.7	191.9
Mand.	BA	24.5	25.1	25.7	26.9	27.3	29.8	28.3	28.9	29.6	30.2	129.4	276.3
	OT	24.6	25.5	26.0	27.3	27.7	30.4	28.9	27.4	30.2	30.9	131.1	278.9

750	BA	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	26.2	26.3	26.4	26.4	26.5	26.5	123.5	255.5
	OT	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	26.1	26.2	26.2	26.3	26.3	26.4	125.9	257.4
Discr.	BA	23.1	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	120.8	242.3
	OT	25.1	25.0	24.8	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	123.7	245.3
Mand.	BA	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.7	13.2
	OT	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	12.1
800	BA	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.2
	OT	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.7	122.3
Discr.	BA	11.4	11.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	55.6	111.3
	OT	12.3	11.7	11.4	11.2	11.0	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	57.5	112.0
Mand.	BA	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.9	10.0
	OT	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.0	5.2	10.3
900	BA	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
	OT	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
	OT	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
900 on-budget	*BA*	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
	OT	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
Discr.	*BA*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	*BA*	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
	OT	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
920	BA	-9.8	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.6	-58.6
	OT	-10.8	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-53.5	-81.3
Discr.	BA	-9.8	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.6	-58.6
	OT	-10.8	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-53.5	-81.3
Mand.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
950	BA	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
	OT	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
	OT	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1

950 on-budget	*BA*	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
	OT	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
Discr.	*BA*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	*BA*	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
	OT	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
Total	BA	1753.8	1795.2	1836.4	1921.3	1988.2	2056.1	2102.8	2173.9	2252.7	2334.3	9294.8	20214.7
	OT	1735.2	1774.3	1804.2	1893.7	1959.0	2029.1	2072.4	2137.7	2220.0	2301.4	9166.4	19926.9
Discr.	BA	536.3	541.3	550.4	570.2	582.2	583.4	584.6	585.4	586.6	588.1	2780.4	5708.5
	OT	570.9	571.0	567.0	592.8	603.1	606.6	604.6	602.3	605.4	606.4	2904.9	5930.2
Mand.	BA	1217.5	1253.9	1286.0	1351.1	1405.9	1472.7	1518.2	1588.6	1666.1	1746.2	6514.4	14506.1
	OT	1164.2	1203.2	1237.2	1300.9	1355.9	1422.5	1467.8	1535.3	1614.5	1695.0	6261.5	13996.7
Total on-budget	*BA*	*1426.7*	*1455.8*	*1486.9*	*1559.1*	*1612.9*	*1666.7*	*1698.2*	*1753.3*	*1814.5*	*1874.8*	*7541.4*	*16348.9*
	OT	*1408.1*	*1434.8*	*1454.8*	*1531.5*	*1583.8*	*1639.6*	*1667.8*	*1717.0*	*1781.9*	*1841.9*	*7412.9*	*16061.1*
Discr.	*BA*	*536.3*	*541.3*	*550.4*	*570.2*	*582.2*	*583.4*	*584.6*	*585.4*	*586.6*	*588.1*	*2780.4*	*5708.5*
	OT	*570.9*	*571.0*	*567.0*	*592.8*	*603.1*	*606.6*	*604.6*	*602.3*	*605.4*	*606.4*	*2904.9*	*5930.2*
Mand.	*BA*	*890.4*	*914.5*	*936.5*	*988.9*	*1030.7*	*1083.2*	*1113.6*	*1167.9*	*1227.9*	*1286.7*	*4761.0*	*10640.4*
	OT	*837.1*	*863.8*	*887.7*	*938.7*	*980.7*	*1033.0*	*1063.2*	*1114.7*	*1176.4*	*1235.5*	*4508.1*	*10130.9*
Revenues		1876.1	1922.6	1961.1	2058.8	2134.8	2225.1	2283.3	2363.9	2459.9	2549.8	9953.4	21835.5
On-budget		*1408.1*	*1434.8*	*1454.8*	*1531.5*	*1585.0*	*1648.3*	*1681.4*	*1735.6*	*1805.5*	*1868.5*	*7414.2*	*16153.5*
Surplus		140.9	148.3	156.8	165.1	175.8	196.0	210.8	226.3	239.9	248.5	787.0	1908.6
On-budget		--	--	--	--	*1.2*	*8.7*	*13.6*	*18.6*	*23.7*	*26.6*	*1.2*	*92.4*

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

Section 301(g)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act requires that the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution set forth the common economic assumptions upon which the joint statement and conference report are based. The conference agreement is built upon the economic forecasts developed by the Congressional Budget Office and presented in CBO's ''The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 2000–2009'' (January 1999). A modification was made to near-term real GDP growth, however, to reflect recent economic strength.

House Resolution.—The House modified CBO's economic assumptions to reflect the near-term strength of economy which became evident after CBO completed its winter forecast. The assumption for 1999 real GDP growth was increased from 2.3 percent to 2.4 percent, while the assumption for 2000 real GDP growth was boosted from 1.7 percent to 2.0 percent. In both cases, the modified GDP growth rate assumptions are well below Blue Chip's current forecasts. These changes boosted revenues slightly relative to the CBO baseline in 1999, 2000 and 2001.

Senate Amendment.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Conference Agreement.—House economic assumptions were used, with minor technical adjustments.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

[By calendar years]

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Percent change, year over year:						
Real GDP	2.4	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4
Consumer Price Index	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
GDP Price Index	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Percent, annual:						
Unemployment rate	4.6	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.7	5.7
Three-month Treasury bill rate	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Ten-Year Treasury bond rate	5.1	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4

FUNCTIONS AND REVENUES

FUNCTION 050, NATIONAL DEFENSE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 050, National Defense, totals $270.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and $268.7 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one time emergencies enacted in the 105th Congress. This budget function includes funding for the Department of Defense (95 percent of function total), defense activities of the Department of Energy (5 percent), and small amounts expended by the Selective Service, the General Services Administration, the Departments of Transportation and Justice, and other federal agencies.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $276.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.1 billion in BA and $1,471.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,051.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $274.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.0 billion in BA and $1,469.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,050.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $276.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.0 billion in BA and $1,471.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,051.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Major Programs in Function.—Function 150, International Affairs, totals about $13.7 billion in BA and $14.4 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergencies and other one-time spending increases including contributions to the International Monetary Fund and arrears to international organizations. This function includes funding for operation of the foreign affairs establishment including embassies and other diplomatic missions abroad, foreign aid loan and technical assistance activities in developing countries, security assistance to foreign governments, activities of the Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund, U.S. contributions to international financial institutions, Export-Import Bank and other trade promotion activities, and refugee assistance.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $11.2 billion in BA and $14.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $56.7 billion in BA and $70.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $126.1 billion in BA and $133.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $12.5 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $65.3 billion in BA and $73.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $139.7 billion in BA and $140.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $12.5 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $61.7 billion in BA and $72.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $133.6 billion in BA and $136.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 250, General Science, Space & Technology, totals $18.8 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) civilian space program and basic research programs of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Energy (DOE).

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Amendment.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 270, Energy, totals about $1.1 billion in BA and $677 million in outlays for 1999. This function includes civilian activities of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service, the power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Mandatory spending in this function contains large levels of offsetting receipts, resulting in net mandary spending of −$1.8 billion in BA and −$2.6 billion in outlays for 1999. Congress provided $3.0 billion in discretionary BA for 1999.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $0.0 billion in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The House resolution sets forth $0.0 billion in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $49 million in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Major Programs in Function.—function 300, Natural Resources and Environment, totals about $23.9 billion in BA and $23.3 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergency and other one-time spending items. This function includes funding for water resources, conservation and land management, recreation resources, and pollution control and abatement. Agencies with major program activities within the function include the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Army Corps of Engineers, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Forest Service (within the Department of Agriculture), and the Department of the Interior, including the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, among others.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $22.8 billion in BA and $22.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $113.7 billion in BA and $112.2 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $232.2 billion in BA and $229.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $21.7 billion in BA and $22.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $108.6 billion in BA and $110.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $222.1 billion in BA and $222.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $22.8 billion in BA and $22.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $111.7 billion in BA and $111.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $227.7 billion in BA and $226.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 350, Agriculture, totals about $16.8 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending provided for natural disasters and export market losses. This function includes funding for federal programs intended to promote the economic stability of agriculture through direct assistance and loans to food and fiber producers, provide regulatory, inspection and reporting services for agricultural markets, and promote research and education in agriculture and nutrition.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $14.3 billion in BA and $13.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $14.8 billion in BA and $13.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5

fiscal years: and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $14.3 billion in BA and $13.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 370, Commerce and Housing Credit, totals about $1.9 billion in BA and $0.8 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes funding for discretionary housing programs, such as subsidies for single and multifamily housing in rural areas and mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration; net spending by the Postal Service; discretionary funding for commerce programs, such as international trade and exports, science and technology, the census, and small business; and mandatory spending for deposit insurance activities related to banks, savings and loans, and credit unions.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $9.9 billion in BA and $4.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.3 billion in BA and $41.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.4 billion in BA and $86.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $9.7 billion in BA and $4.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.1 billion in BA and $41.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.1 billion in BA and $86.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$0.2 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; −$1.2 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$1.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.— For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement sets forth $9.7 billion in BA and $4.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.1 billion in BA and $41.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.1 billion in BA and $86.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

Major Programs in Function.—Function 400, Transportation, totals $50.8 billion in BA and $43.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending provided for the Federal Aviation Administration and the Coast Guard. This function includes ground transportation programs, such as the federal-aid highway program, mass transit, and the National Rail Passenger Corporation (Amtrak); air transportation through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport improvement program, facilities and equipment program, and operation of the air traffic control system; water transportation through the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration; the Surface Transportation Board; the National Transportation Safety Board; and related transportation safety and support activities within the Department of Transportation.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $51.8 billion in BA and $45.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $258.1 billion in BA and $233.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $520.0 billion in BA and $464.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $51.3 billion in BA and $45.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $259.1 billion in BA and $233.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $522.4 billion in BA and $463.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $51.8 billion in BA and $45.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $258.2 billion in BA and $233.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $520.1 billion in BA and $464.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 450, Community and Regional Development, totals about $8.8 billion in BA and $11.7 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergency funding and other one-time appropriations. This function includes funding for community and regional development and disaster relief. The function includes the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), non-power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Economic Development Administration (EDA) within the Commerce Department, and portions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Agriculture.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $7.4 billion in BA and $10.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $29.3 billion in BA and $38.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $57.3 billion in BA and $60.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $5.3 billion in BA and $10.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $14.0 billion in BA and $27.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $24.1 billion in BA and $31.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $6.4 billion in BA and $10.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $21.7 billion in BA and $33.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $40.7 billion in BA and $46.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 500, Education, Training, Employment and Social Services totals about $61 billion in BA and $59.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending items. This function includes funding for elementary and secondary, vocational, and higher education; job training; children and family services programs; adoption and foster care assistance; statistical analysis and research related to these areas; and funding for the arts and humanities.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $65.3 billion in BA and $63.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $335.0 billion in BA and $325.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $696.3 billion in BA and $681.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendments sets forth $67.4 billion in BA and $64.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $351.2 billion in BA and $336.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $746.2 billion in BA and $725.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $66.3 billion in BA and $63.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $343.1 billion in BA and $330.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $721.3 billion in BA and $703.5 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. The Conference agreement provides that an additional $0.5 billion is available for funding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for fiscal year 2000.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

Major Programs in Function.—Function 550, Health, totals about $147.3 billion in BA and $140.6 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending. This function covers all health spending except that for Medicare, military health, and veterans' health. The major programs include Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, health benefits for federal workers and retirees, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, Indian Health Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $873.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $872.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $872.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 570: MEDICARE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 570, Medicare, totals about $195.2 billion in BA and $194.6 billion in outlays for 1999.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 600, Income Security, totals $234.6 billion in BA and $237.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding spending which requires a cap adjustment or is for an emergency. This function contains: 1) major cash and in-kind means-tested entitlements; 2) general retirement, disability, and pension programs excluding Social Security and Veterans' compensation programs; 3) federal and military retirement programs; 4) unemployment compensation; 5) low-income housing programs; and 6) other low-income support programs. Function 600 is the third largest functional category after Social Security and defense. Mandatory programs account for 86 percent of total spending in this function.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,320.7 billion in BA and $1,335.3 billion in outlays over

5 fiscal years; and $2,892.8 billion in BA and $2,911.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,324.8 billion in BA and $1,336.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,902.4 billion in BA and $2,918.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,320.3 billion in BA and $1,333.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,891.8 billion in BA and $2,909.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. The Conference Agreement assumes $3 billion in new mandatory spending for families with children to cover child care expenditures.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 650, Social Security, totals about $14.5 billion in BA and $14.7 billion in outlays for 1999 for on-budget activities. This function includes Social Security benefits and administrative expenses.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $177.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $176.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $393.0 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; $2,158.9 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $4,915.7 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $176.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 700, Veterans Benefits, totals $43.0 billion in BA and $42.9 billion in outlays for 1999. This budget function includes income security needs of disabled veterans, indigent veterans, and survivors of deceased veterans through compensation benefits, pensions, and life insurance programs. Major education, training, and rehabilitation and readjustment programs include the Montgomery GI Bill, the Veterans Educational Assistance Program, and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling program. Veterans can also receive guarantees on home loans. Roughly half of all spending in this function is for the Veterans Health Administration, which is comprised of over 700 hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $44.7 billion in BA and $45.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $225.9 billion in BA and $228.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $467.3 billion in BA and $470.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $46.7 billion in BA and $47.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $227.1 billion in BA and $229.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $466.2 billion in BA and $469.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $45.4 billion in BA and $45.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $226.6 billion in BA and $228.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $468.0 billion in BA and $470.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 750, Administration of Justice, totals about $26.3 billion in BA and $24.8 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes funding for federal law enforcement activities, including criminal investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), border enforcement and the control of illegal immigration by the Customs Service and Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), as well as funding for prison construction, drug treatment, crime prevention programs and the federal Judiciary.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $123.5 billion in BA and $125.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $255.5 billion in BA and $257.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $121.8 billion in BA and $124.2 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $242.3 billion in BA and $244.1 billion in outlays over 10 years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $123.5 billion in BA and $125.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $255.5 billion in BA and $257.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 800, General Government, totals $15.2 billion in BA and $14.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding spending which requires a cap adjustment or is for an emergency. This function consists of the activities of the Legislative Branch, the Executive Office of the President, U.S. Treasury fiscal operations (including the Internal Revenue Service), personnel and property management, and general purpose fiscal assistance to states, localities, and U.S. territories. Discretionary spending represents 93 percent of total spending in this function. The Internal Revenue Service accounts for 62 percent of the discretionary total.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in BA and $62.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in BA and $62.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 900: NET INTEREST

Major Programs in Function.—Function 900, Net Interest, totals $229.4 billion in BA and outlays in 1999. Net interest is a mandatory payment; there are no discretionary programs in Function 900. Net interest includes interest on the public debt after deducting the interest income received by the federal government.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $275.5 in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,342.4 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,626.5 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $275.7 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,344.4 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,630.8 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement sets forth $375.5 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,342.7 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,628.4 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

DEBT LEVELS

The following table compares the levels of debt held by the public and debt subject to limit associated with the Conference Agreement, the President's Budget and the baseline.

Under the Conference Agreement, debt held by the public declines year by year, and by 2009 would be nearly $1.8 trillion below its present level. Debt held by the public under the President's Budget would decline by about $1.4 trillion over the next ten years. After ten years, debt held by the public would be $465 billion lower under the Conference Agreement than under the President's Budget.

The statutory debt limit, which now stands at $5.95 trillion, would not have to be increased until the very end of 2004 under the Conference Agreement. Under the President's Budget, the statutory debt limit would have to be raised sometime in 2001.

Clause 3 of House rule XXIII requires that the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying a budget resolution provide a statement of the effect of adoption of the concurrent resolution upon the statutory limit on the debt. This resolution will have no direct effect upon the statutory limit on the debt because the House resolution providng for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 68 suspended the automatic engrossment of an increase in the statutory limit upon the adoption of a conference report.

COMPARISON OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT WITH PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

Debt	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Conference agreement:											
Held by Public	3,627.1	3,502.4	3,370.1	3,229.3	3,080.6	2,920.1	2,738.2	2,540.6	2,326.7	2,098.3	1,861.1
Subject to limit	5,543.9	5,628.4	5,708.5	5,793.5	5,877.4	5,956.3	6,024.6	6,084.6	6,136.5	6,173.9	6,203.4

COMPARISON OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT WITH PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND BASELINE—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Debt	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
President's Budget:											
Held by Public	3,629.5	3,564.9	3,491.0	3,395.8	3,302.4	3,188.5	3,055.4	2,891.1	2,709.7	2,522.1	2,323.6
Subject to limit	5,546.3	5,778.6	5,999.8	6,243.0	6,498.4	6,765.1	7,042.9	7,337.9	7,661.1	8.018.6	8,409.0
Baseline:											
Held by Public	3,627.1	3,515.8	3,389.7	3,215.1	3,021.0	2,781.3	2,501.1	2,152.1	1,751.8	1,311.4	823.3
Subject to limit	5,543.9	5,641.7	5,728.1	5,779.2	5,817.8	5,817.6	5,787.5	5,696.1	5,561.6	5,387.0	5,165.7
Conference agreement compared to:											
President's Budget:											
Held by Public	−2.4	−62.5	−120.9	−166.5	−221.8	−268.4	−317.2	−350.5	−383.0	−423.8	−462.5
Subject to limit	−2.4	−150.2	−291.3	−449.5	−621.0	−808.8	−1,018.3	−1,253.3	−1,524.6	−1,844.7	−2,205.6
Baseline:											
Held by Public	.....	−13.3	−19.6	14.3	59.6	138.8	237.1	388.5	574.9	786.9	1,037.8
Subject to limit	.....	−13.3	−19.6	14.3	59.6	138.8	237.1	388.5	574.9	786.9	1,037.8

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 920, Allowances, usually displays the budgetary effects of proposals that cannot be easily distributed across other budget functions. In past years. Function 920 has included total savings or costs from proposals associated with emergency spending or proposals contingent on certain events that have uncertain chances of occurring, such as the President's proposal for increased discretionary spending from the Social Security Surplus contingent on Social Security reform.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth −$8.0 billion in BA and −$10.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$31.8 billion in BA and −$52.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$56.8 billion in BA and −$80.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth −10.0 billion in BA and −$10.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$33.8 billion in BA and −$52.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$58.8 billion in BA and −$80.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth −$9.8 billion in BA and −$10.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$33.6 billion in BA and −53.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$58.6 billion in BA and −$81.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Major Programs in Function.—Function 950, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts, totals about $40.1 billion in receipts (BA and outlays) for 1999. This function records offsetting receipts (receipts, not federal revenues or taxes, that the budget shows as offsets to spending programs) that are too large to record in other budget functions. Such receipts are either intrabudgetary (a payment from one federal agency to another, such as agency payments to the retirement trust funds) or proprietary (a payment from the public for some type of business transaction with the government). The main types of receipts recorded as undistributed in this function are: the payments federal agencies make to retirement trust funds for their employees, payments made by companies for the right to explore and produce oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, and payments by those who bid for the right to buy or use the public property or resources, such as the electromagnetic spectrum.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$188.9 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$388.4 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$189.8 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$391.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$8.0 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; −$45.8 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$110.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$189.2 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$392.9 billion in BA and −$392.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

REVENUES

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $1,408.5 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,416.9 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,155.8 billion over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.— For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $1,402.0 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,408.3 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,147.7 billion over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement set forth $1,408.1 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,414.2 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,153.5 billion over 10 fiscal years. The conference agreement assumes that the tax relief provided by this resolution will include tax cuts to help cover the costs of raising a child. Tax cuts for families with children—child care credits—will be no less than $3 billion.

RECONCILIATION

House Resolution.—Section 4 of the House resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to report by September 30, 1999, a reconciliation bill that reduces revenues by $142.5 billion for the total of fiscal year 2000 through 2005 and $768.5 billion for fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The House resolution does not reconcile a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt.

Senate Amendment.—Section 104 of the Senate amendment directs the Senate Committee on Finance to report by June 18, 1999, a reconciliation bill that reduced revenues by $138.485 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and $765.985 billion for the total of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The Senate amendment also instructs the Finance Committee to report a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt of $85 billion for fiscal year 2000 only. In anticipation that the budget resolution might be resolved by the adoption of amendments between the Houses, section 105 of the Senate amendment includes reconciliation instructions for the House Committee on Ways and Means to report legislation by June 11, 1999 that reduces revenues and the statutory limit on the debt by the same amounts set out in section 104.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference agreement directs the Committees on Ways and Means and Finance to report by July 16, 1999 and July 23, 1999 respectively, a reconciliation bill that reduces revenues by $0 for fiscal year 2000, $142.3 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and $777.9 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The Conference agreement does not include an instruction to reconcile a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt.

ALLOCATIONS

As required in section 302 of the Budget Act, the joint statement of the managers includes an allocation, based upon the conference report, of the levels of total budget authority, total budget outlays among each of the appropriate House and Senate committees.

The allocation for each House consist of a set of two tables for the House and the Senate. The first set of tables shows the allocation for the budget year, fiscal year 2000. The House allocates funding for each fiscal year covered by the budget resolution. The second set of tables shows the amount allocated for the totals of the first five years and the ten years covered by the budget resolution.

The allocations are as follows:

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

Appropriations Committee

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year 2000	Budget authority	Outlays
General Purpose [1]	531,771	536,700
Violent Crime Reduction [1]	4,500	5,554
Highways [1]	0	24,574
Mass Transit [1]	0	4,117
Total Discretionary Action	536,271	570,945
Current Law Mandatory	321,108	303,938

[1] Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total 2000-2004	Total 2000-2009
Agriculture Committee													
Current Law	BA	11,042	8,795	6,983	2,709	2,579	2,637	2,686	2,743	2,792	3,222	32,108	46,188
	OT	8,134	5,109	3,999	-259	-174	-160	-169	-146	-196	172	16,809	16,310
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	28,391	29,177	29,873	30,549	31,282	31,964	32,701	57,568	213,937
	OT	0	0	0	27,737	29,167	29,864	30,530	31,262	31,945	32,681	56,904	213,186
Total	BA	11,042	8,795	6,983	31,100	31,756	32,510	33,235	34,025	34,756	35,923	89,676	260,125
	OT	8,134	5,109	3,999	27,478	28,993	29,704	30,361	31,116	31,749	32,853	73,713	229,496
Armed Services Committee													
Current Law	BA	49,330	50,977	52,705	54,405	56,367	58,198	60,111	62,038	63,980	66,038	263,784	574,149
	OT	49,415	50,940	52,597	54,315	56,276	58,107	60,018	61,944	63,885	65,942	263,543	573,439
Banking and Financial Services Committee													
Current Law	BA	4,676	5,345	5,319	5,619	4,946	5,303	5,488	5,748	5,924	6,075	25,905	54,443
	OT	-1,839	-675	-169	327	-80	386	235	54	-178	-387	-2,436	-2,326
Committee on Education and the Workforce													
Current Law	BA	4,790	5,222	5,508	5,403	5,154	5,367	5,578	5,807	6,021	6,234	26,077	55,084
	OT	4,188	4,618	4,969	5,016	4,811	4,871	5,070	5,277	5,477	5,668	23,602	49,965
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	305	305	810	835	859	3,692	3,791	3,893	1,420	14,490
	OT	0	0	58	244	721	831	856	2,846	3,680	3,864	1,023	13,100
Total	BA	4,790	5,222	5,813	5,708	5,964	6,202	6,437	9,499	9,812	10,127	27,497	69,574
	OT	4,188	4,618	5,027	5,260	5,532	5,702	5,926	8,123	9,157	9,532	24,625	63,065
Commerce Committee													
Current Law	BA	10,268	12,255	15,762	16,037	16,327	17,417	17,508	18,551	18,643	18,638	70,649	161,406
	OT	8,365	10,951	16,470	16,962	17,327	17,630	17,849	18,072	18,300	18,335	70,075	160,261
International Relations Committee													
Current Law	BA	9,362	9,171	8,509	7,860	7,734	7,876	7,740	7,721	7,965	7,924	42,636	81,862
	OT	11,984	11,553	11,608	9,397	8,411	8,384	8,018	7,898	8,014	7,992	52,953	93,259
Government Reform Committee													
Current Law	BA	59,501	61,320	63,344	65,557	67,979	70,502	73,076	75,755	78,591	81,514	317,701	697,139
	OT	57,941	59,703	61,674	63,848	66,208	68,662	71,162	73,746	76,482	78,953	309,374	678,379
Committee on House Administration													
Current Law	BA	114	95	93	93	93	94	92	92	92	92	488	950
	OT	289	45	28	57	241	56	30	63	233	98	660	1,140
Resources Committee													
Current Law	BA	2,398	2,301	2,127	2,166	2,098	2,111	2,150	2,190	2,238	2,367	11,090	22,146
	OT	2,271	2,319	2,125	2,191	2,161	2,175	2,247	2,315	2,378	2,444	11,067	22,626
Judiciary Committee													
Current Law	BA	4,759	4,737	4,704	4,773	4,818	3,364	3,445	3,502	3,566	3,647	23,791	41,315
	OT	4,235	4,529	4,620	4,681	4,727	3,283	3,339	3,393	3,449	3,519	22,792	39,775

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total 2000-2004	Total 2000-2009
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee													
Current Law	BA	51,081	50,632	51,684	52,832	15,100	15,178	15,371	15,528	16,091	16,520	221,329	300,017
	OT	16,152	16,151	15,992	15,997	15,694	15,482	15,489	15,537	16,040	16,441	79,986	158,975
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	0	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	226,038
	OT	0	0	0	0	104	306	452	538	590	615	104	2,605
Discretionary Action	BA	2,475	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	12,115	24,165
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	BA	53,556	53,042	54,094	55,242	55,183	55,261	55,454	55,611	56,174	56,603	271,117	550,220
	OT	16,152	16,151	15,992	15,997	15,798	15,788	15,941	16,075	16,630	17,056	80,090	161,580
Science Committee													
Current Law	BA	92	83	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	322	567
	OT	72	80	80	58	51	49	49	49	49	49	341	586
Small Business Committee													
Current Law	BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	OT	-155	-140	-125	-110	-95	-75	-55	-35	-20	-10	-625	-820
Veterans' Affairs Committee													
Current Law	BA	1,106	1,058	1,002	1,044	887	813	746	689	629	566	5,097	8,540
	OT	1,377	1,440	1,371	1,481	1,416	1,380	1,358	1,331	1,312	1,280	7,085	13,746
Discretionary Action	BA	394	874	1,367	1,868	2,390	3,132	3,475	4,036	4,610	5,199	6,893	27,345
	OT	360	833	1,325	1,824	2,347	3,132	3,475	3,694	4,562	5,150	6,689	26,702
Total	BA	1,500	1,932	2,369	2,912	3,277	3,945	4,221	4,725	5,239	5,765	11,990	35,885
	OT	1,737	2,273	2,696	3,305	3,763	4,512	4,833	5,025	5,874	6,430	13,774	40,448
Ways and Means Committee													
Current Law	BA	668,250	685,676	697,591	702,427	724,718	754,305	765,945	796,632	822,775	848,116	3,478,662	7,466,435
	OT	663,507	681,335	693,657	701,549	723,463	752,433	764,569	795,241	820,714	846,593	3,463,511	7,443,061
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	39,084	136,794
	OT	0	0	0	17,559	18,667	19,317	19,967	20,667	21,367	22,117	36,226	139,661
Discretionary Action	BA	0	0	0	0	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	3,000
	OT	0	0	0	0	145	296	500	500	500	500	145	2,441
Total	BA	668,250	685,676	697,591	721,969	744,760	774,347	785,987	816,674	842,817	868,158	3,518,246	7,606,229
	OT	663,507	681,335	693,657	719,108	742,275	772,046	785,036	816,408	842,581	869,210	3,499,882	7,585,163

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
BUDGET YEAR TOTAL 2000
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations act	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations			0	0
General Prupose Discretionary	531,771	536,700	0	0
Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund	4,500	5,554	0	0
Highways	0	24,574		
Mass Transit	0	4,117		
Mandatory	321,502	304,297	0	0
Total	857,773	875,242	0	0
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	10,843	7,940	26,696	9,419
Armed Services	49,327	49,433	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	4,676	(1,843)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	8,420	5,774	721	717
Energy and Natural Resources	2,336	2,258	40	63
Environment and Public Works	36,532	2,041	0	0
Finance	683,333	676,384	156,910	157,096
Foreign Relations	9,354	11,976	0	0
Governmental Affairs	59,501	57,941	0	0
Judiciary	4,759	4,235	234	234
Labor and Human Resources	9,023	8,363	1,309	1,309
Rules and Administration	114	289	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	1,106	1,381	23,667	23,540
Indian Affairs	151	150	0	0
Small Business	0	(155)	0	0
Unassigned to Committee	(310,297)	(293,097)	0	0
TOTAL	1,426,931	1,408,292	209,577	192,378

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
5-YEAR TOTAL: 2000-2004
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	40,012	24,704	100,467	52,240
Armed Services	263,769	263,577	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	31,606	(2,459)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	64,653	50,445	3,887	3,868
Energy and Natural Resources	11,023	11,009	200	236
Environment and Public Works	179,132	8,214	0	0
Finance	3,569,039	3,569,977	905,958	909,007
Foreign Relations	42,596	52,913	0	0
Governmental Affairs	317,701	309,374	0	0
Judiciary	23,791	22,792	1,170	1,170
Labor and Human Resources	48,269	45,687	6,784	6,784
Rules and Administration	488	660	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	5,097	7,108	125,438	125,110
Indian Affairs	716	717	0	0
Small Business	0	(625)	0	0

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
10-YEAR TOTAL: 2000-2009
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	75,410	45,523	198,127	117,538
Armed Services	574,119	573,458	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	88,649	(2,399)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	144,512	116,013	8,558	8,519
Energy and Natural Resources	21,822	22,406	400	436
Environment and Public Works	339,303	13,501	0	0
Finance	7,754,731	7,732,409	2,237,130	2,239,681
Foreign Relations	81,782	93,179	0	0
Governmental Affairs	697,139	678,379	0	0
Judiciary	41,315	39,775	2,336	2,340
Labor and Human Resources	101,790	96,528	14,180	14,180
Rules and Administration	950	1,140	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	8,540	13,819	269,182	266,592
Indian Affairs	1,407	1,403	0	0
Small Business	0	(820)	0	0

RULEMAKING AND BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

House Resolution.—Section 5(a) of the House resolution includes findings that Social Security is, by law, off-budget; that Social Security has been running surpluses; that these surpluses have been used to balance the Federal budget; that this resolution, for the first time, balances the budget without counting such surpluses, and that the only way to present the diversion of the surpluses for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of the surpluses, and both the Congress and the Administration should take the necessary steps to ensure that future budgets are balanced exclusive of the surpluses.

Section 5(b) of the House resolution prohibits the consideration of any budget resolution that sets forth an on-budget deficit. The intent of this provision is to prevent Congresses from considering future budget resolutions that implicitly use the Social Security surplus to finance other governmental operations. Section 5 is enforced by a point of order that, if sustained, precludes further consideration of the measure. In addition to any budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, the point of order may be raised against amendments to the budget resolution and accompanying conference reports. Consistent with enforcement of key Budget Act requirements in the House and Senate, section 5 may be waived by a simple majority of those present in the House and three-fifths of those Members voting in the Senate. An exception is provided for legislation enhancing retirement security or reforming Medicare pursuant to section 6 of the House resolution.

Subsection (c)(1) provides a sense of the House that legislation should be enacted that excludes the outlays and receipts of the Social Security trust funds from official budgetary projections of the surplus or deficit. Subsection (c)(2) further provides that legislation should be considered that further safeguards the surpluses, such as modifying pay-as-you-go requirements to permit the enactment of retirement security and Medicare legislation or establishing a statutory limit on debt held by the public that would be reduced by the amount of the Social Security surpluses.

Section 6 of the House resolution establishes a reserve fund for retirement security and Medicare in the House. The Budget Committee chairman is permitted to increase the allocations and aggregates established in the budget resolution for legislation that either enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the Medicare trust funds or reforms the Medicare benefits or payment structure. The adjustments may be made for bills, amendments, and conference reports.

The sum of the adjustments for all measures considered under this section may not exceed an amount equal to an up-to-date estimate of the Social Security surplus for fiscal year 2000, the total for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and 2000 through 2009. Furthermore, the chairman is prohibited from making any adjustment if the measure, together with any other measure considered under this section, would exceed the estimated surplus for any of these periods.

For purposes of this section, the projected Social Security surpluses are the levels assumed in the joint statement or the levels set forth in CBO's midsession report. In making this projection, CBO is directed to consult with the Social Security trustees.

Section 7 of the House resolution establishes a reserve fund in the House for special education. The Budget Committee chairman is permitted to increase the budget aggregates and allocations to the Committee on Appropriations for legislation providing appropriations for special education. The adjustments may be made for bills, joint resolutions, amendments, and conference reports. Any adjustments must be made in the amount of BA provided by the measure for that purpose (and the resulting outlays) are subject to two limitations. First, the adjustments may not exceed an up-to-date estimate of the on-budget surplus. Second, the adjustments may not exceed the amount necessary to fully fund special education at its authorize levels.

Section 8 of the House resolution provides that changes in the budgetary aggregates and committee allocations permitted by the resolution shall be made while the measure is pending and upon enactment and shall be published in the Congressional Record. The section also provides that the revised aggregates and allocations shall be, for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the aggregates and allocations in this resolution.

Section 9 of the House resolution requires the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to update CBO's budgetary projections on a quarterly basis.

Senate Amendment.—In addition to setting forth budgetary levels as called for in the Budget Act, title I of the Senate amendment contains two provisions—the first, to address the fact that Congress did not adopt a fiscal year 1999 budget resolution, and the second, to focus attention on debt held by the public levels. Section 1(a)(2) of the Senate amendment contains language that incorporates the levels in the deeming resolution passed by the Senate at the end of the 105th Congress as the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Section 101(6) provides advisory debt held by the public levels in the budget resolution. These debt-held-by-the-public levels reflect the fact that the resolution devotes the entire Social Security surplus to the reduction of debt held by the public.

Title II of the Senate amendment contains ten sections that either modify budget procedures for consideration of legislation or authorize the Chairman of the Budget Committee to alter the levels in the budget resolution to accommodate Senate consideration of certain legislation.

Section 201 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Agriculture. The Senate amendment ensures that up to $6 billion is made available for legislation that addresses risk management and income assistance to agriculture producers through a reserve fund. If the Senate Agriculture Committee reports legislation that provides risk management and income assistance to agriculture producers, then the Chairman of the Budget Committee is authorized to increase the Agriculture Committee's allocation of budget authority and outlays to accommodate this additional spending. The reserve fund provides that this legislation cannot cause an on-budget deficit. The Senate amendment also permits $500 million (within the $6 billion total) in agriculture spending in fiscal year 2000, but this additional spending must be offset by reductions in direct spending in other programs.

Section 202 of the Senate amendment provides a tax reduction reserve fund which allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to adjust the spending and revenue limits for legislation that reduces revenues as long as the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit for the first fiscal year, the sum of the first five fiscal years covered by the budget resolution, and the sum of the ten fiscal years covered by the resolution.

Section 203 of the Senate amendment contains a clarification of the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule make it clear that this rule still applies until the budget is balanced excluding the transactions of the Social Security trust fund. This change would prohibit the expenditure of Social Security surpluses, but would allow on-budget surpluses to be used to offset tax reductions or direct spending increases.

Section 204 of the Senate amendment provides a majority point of order against emergency spending provisions. The Senate amendment would curb the abuse of spending the Social Security surplus on so-called emergencies. Under sections 251(1)(b)(2)(A) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if Congress and the President designate a provision of legislation an emergency, it is exempt from the statutory limits on appropriations legislation and the pay-as-you-go requirement for all other legislation. Under the Senate amendment, committee reports and any statement of managers accompanying legislation containing emergency spending must contain an analysis whether the proposed emergency spending satisfies all the criteria set out in the resolution. A point of order is available against any emergency spending provision regardless of whether the criteria are met. The Presiding Officer does not determine whether or not the criteria have been satisfied when ruling on the point of order. If a point of order was raised and sustained against an emergency spending provision then the language making the emergency designation and providing the spending would both be stricken from the measure by way of a procedure similar to the Byrd rule (see section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974).

Section 205 of the Senate amendment provides authority to the Budget Committee chairmen to provide committee allocations. Section 302 of the Budget Act requires the statement of managers accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution to include an allocation of spending authority to committees. At the time the Senate amendment was adapted there existed the possibility that this budget resolution would not go to conference. Therefore, the Senate amendment requires the Chairman of the Budget Committee to file allocations that are consistent with the budget resolution.

Section 206 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for use of Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) receipts. This section would allow committee allocations to be adjusted for legislation providing new or additional direct spending for historic preservation, recreation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation efforts to support coastal needs and activities. This reserve fund is intended to accommodate an increase in spending for these programs if the increases are offset by reductions in direct spending. It would not allow revenue increases to offset spending increases.

Section 207 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Medicare managed care plans. This section permits committee allocations to be adjusted for legislation providing new or additional direct spending for Medicare managed care plans agreeing to serve elderly patients for at least 2 years and whose reimbursement was reduced because of risk management regulations. This reserve fund is intended to accommodate an increase in spending for these programs if they are offset by spending reductions. It would not

allow revenue increases to offset spending increases.

Section 208 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Medicare and prescription drugs. This section permits committee allocations and spending aggregates to be adjusted for legislation that significantly extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund. This reserve fund is designed to accommodate legislation that reforms the Medicare program and extends the solvency of the HI trust fund. It would not allow revenue increases to offset spending increases. This reserve fund does allow committee allocations and spending aggregates to be adjusted to use an on-budget surplus to offset the additional cost of prescription drugs as part of legislation that reforms Medicare and significantly extends the solvency of the HI trust fund.

Section 209 of the Senate amendment contains language regarding the rulemaking authority of each of the Houses of Congress.

Section 210 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities so long as the legislation does not increase the deficit or reduce the surplus.

Conference Agreement.—Title II of the Conference agreement includes the rules and procedures for implementing and enforcing the budget resolution.

Section 201 of the Conference agreement creates a safe deposit box for Social Security surpluses and reflects the language in section 5 of the House resolution with modifications. The resolution contains the findings from section 5(a) and creates a majority point of order from section 5(b) with modifications in the House and Senate against a budget resolution which sets forth an on-budget deficit unless the deficit results from legislation enacted pursuant to section 202 of this resolution. The Conference agreement does not contain the sense of Congress provisions set forth in section 5(c).

Section 202 of the Conference agreement provides a reserve fund for retirement security and reflects the language of section 6 of the House resolution with modifications. The reserve fund for retirement security applies in both the House and Senate and permits the Budget Committee chairman to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform. It is the conferees' intention that retirement security includes Medicare.

Section 203 of the Conference agreement provides a reserve fund for Medicare legislation and reflects the language of section 208 of the Senate amendment with modifications. The Conference agreement applies the reserve fund to the House and Senate, requires the legislation to make structural reforms to Medicare and extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund without the use of intragovernmental transfers, and provides that it may be used for legislation which includes a prescription drug benefit. The conferees do not intend for the reserve fund to encompass legislation making incremental changes to the Medicare system.

Section 204 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 201 of the Senate amendment regarding a reserve fund which would increase the allocations by an additional $6 billion for agriculture with modifications. The Senate amendment only applied in the Senate. Although the House does not have a comparable provision, it includes $6 billion in mandatory spending over 5 years for function 350 (Agriculture), and in the allocation to the House Committee on Agriculture. The Conference agreement provides that the reserve fund applies in both the House and the Senate and may be triggered by legislation which provides risk management and/or income assistance to agricultural producers. For the purposes of this section, risk management includes crop insurance.

Section 205 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 202 of the Senate amendment regarding a tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate. The House does not have a comparable provision. The House has standing authority under section 302(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as amended by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to consider legislation reducing taxes in excess of the levels in the budget resolution, if the revenue loss is offset by spending reductions. The Conference agreement retains the Senate language with modifications and only applies in the Senate.

Section 206 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 204 of the Senate amendment regarding an emergency designation point of order with modifications. The House does not have a comparable provision. However, according to the Oversight Plan of the House Committee on the Budget, the Budget Committee will consider budget process reform during the spring of 1999 (which will include a codification of a definition of budgetary emergencies and establish a reserve fund for such emergencies). The Conference agreement provides a supermajority point of order in the Senate against language designating a provision as an emergency and includes an exemption for defense spending.

Section 207 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 203 of the Senate amendment regarding the application of the Senate's pay-go point of order with a modification. The House does not have a comparable provision (the pay-go point of order is not applicable in the House of Representatives). The Conference agreement restates the entire pay-go point of order with modifications which permit on-budget surpluses to be used for the tax reductions or spending increases. The conferees intend that the on-budget surplus be placed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard. The baseline on-budget surpluses are shown in the table below:

	Fiscal Year—										5 yr.	10 yr.
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		
Baseline on Budget surpluses	.....	8.510	54.930	33.301	52.100	72.459	123.375	154.858	174.844	204.332	148.841	878.709

Section 208 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 8 of the House resolution regarding the application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates made pursuant to the resolution with modifications. The Senate does not have a comparable provision. Subsections (a) and (b) of the Conference agreement would be applicable in both the House and Senate. Subsection (d) applies only in the House and provides that only the first fiscal year and the five fiscal year totals of the section 302 allocations will be enforced under section 302 and 311 of the Budget Act.

Section 209 of the Conference agreement clarifies the status of the interim House and Senate levels for fiscal year 1999. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. However interim budget allocations and aggregates for the House were printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to H. Res. 5. Section 1(a)(2) of the Senate amendment contains language that incorporates the levels passed by the Senate at the end of the 105th Congress as the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. The conference agreement reflects the Senate amendment with a modification which clarifies that the levels previously submitted by the House and the Senate constitute a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

Section 210 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 210 of the Senate amendment regarding a reserve fund in the Senate for legislation that finances certain programs to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities with modifications. The House does not have a comparable provision. The Conference agreement adopts the Senate language with technical amendments which conform the reserve fund to the form of other reserve funds set out in the Conference agreement.

Section 211 provides for a reserve fund for a fiscal year 2000 surplus. The Conference agreement calls upon the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to complete its update of the economic and budget forecast for the 2000 budget by July 1, 1999. If CBO's revised projection shows an on-budget surplus for 2000, this reserve fund allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to adjust the revenue aggregate, the pay-go balance, and the revenue reconciliation instructions by the amount of the on-budget surplus for 2000.

Section 212 provides for a reserve fund in the Senate for education for legislation that causes an increase in direct spending by virtue of a change in the purpose for which previously appropriated funds may be spent.

Section 213 contains the boilerplate rulemaking authority of the House and the Senate.

Section 7 of the House resolution provides a reserve fund for special education. The Senate amendment does not have a comparable provision. The House recedes to the Senate on this issue.

Section 9 of the House resolution requires the Congressional Budget Office to provide quarterly updates of its projections. The Senate amendment does not have a comparable provision. The House recedes to the Senate on this issue.

Section 205 of the Senate amendment contained authority for the Chairman of the Budget Committee in the Senate to provide committee allocations in the Congressional Record in the event that there was not a statement of managers accompanying a conference report on the budget resolution. The House resolution does not have a comparable

provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Section 206 of the Senate amendment contained a reserve fund for the use of OCS receipts. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Section 207 of the Senate amendment contained a reserve fund for managed care plans. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Miscellaneous Provisions Regarding Budget Enforcement.—Some interpret a surplus to be a negative deficit. The conferees intend that this interpretation not apply for the purposes of this resolution. More specifically, for the purposes of title II, a reduction in the on-budget surplus is not considered an increase in the on-budget deficit.

Some 301 of the Conference agreement sets forth a sense of the Congress regarding the protection of the Social Security surpluses. The conferees strongly support this language—particularly the language found in subsection (b)(1) and intend that legislation should be enacted that prevents the Social Security surpluses from being used for any purpose other than Social Security, retirement security and the reduction of the federal debt.

SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE AND SENATE PROVISIONS

House Resolution.—The House resolution included the following sense of the House or sense of Congress provisions:

Sense of Congress on the commission on international religious freedom.

Sense of the House on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of Congress on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all Medicare beneficiaries.

Sense of the House on medicare payment.

Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Sense of Congress on providing honor guard services for veterans' funerals.

Sense of Congress on child nutrition.

Senate amendment.—The Senate amendment included the following sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress provisions:

Sense of the Senate on marriage penalty.

Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.

Sense of the Senate on access to Medicare home health services.

Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance premiums of the self-employed.

Sense of the Senate that tax reductions should go to working families.

Sense of the Senate on the National Guard.

Sense of the Senate on effects of Social Security reform on women.

Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Sense of Congress on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

Sense of the Senate on Federal research and development investment.

Sense of the Senate on counter-narcotics funding.

Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

Sense of the Senate on the Social Security surplus.

Sense of the Senate on need-based student financial aid programs.

Findings; sense of Congress on the protection of the Social Security surpluses.

Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.

Sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not invest the Social Security Trust Funds in private financial markets.

Sense of the Senate concerning on-budget surplus.

Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.

Sense of the Senate that agricultural risk management programs should benefit livestock producers.

Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program.

Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to all Americans by returning non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate regarding tax incentives for education savings.

Sense of the Senate that the One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session should reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

Sense of the Senate on tax cuts for lower and middle income taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate regarding reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986

Sense of the Senate regarding Davis-Bacon.

Sense of the Senate regarding access to items and services under medicare program.

Sense of the Senate concerning autism.

Sense of the Senate on women's access to obstetric and gynecological services.

Sense of the Senate on LIHEAP.

Sense of the Senate on transportation firewalls.

Sense of the Senate on funding existing, effective public health programs before creating new programs.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for special education.

Sense of the Senate on the importance of Social Security for individuals who become disabled.

Sense of the Senate regarding funding for intensive firearms prosecution programs. Honest reporting of the deficit.

Sense of the Senate concerning fostering the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities.

Sense of the Senate regarding asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Sense of the Senate concerning exemption of agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products from unilateral economic sanctions.

Sense of the Senate regarding capital gains tax fairness for family farmers. Budgeting for the Defense Science and Technology Program.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program.

Sense of the Senate on social promotion.

Sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform.

Sense of the Congress regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.

Sense of the Senate regarding support for State and local law enforcement.

Sense of the Senate on merger enforcement by Department of Justice.

Sense of the Senate to create a task force to pursue the creation of a natural disaster reserve fund.

Sense of the Senate concerning Federal tax relief.

Sense of the Senate on eliminating the marriage penalty and across-the-board income tax rate cuts.

Sense of the Senate on important of funding for embassy security.

Sense of the Senate on funding for after school education.

Sense of the Senate concerning recovery of funds by the Federal Government in tobacco-related litigation.

Sense of the Senate on offsetting inappropriate emergency spending.

Findings; sense of Congress on the President's fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to tax association investment income.

Sense of the Senate regarding funding for counter-narcotics initiatives.

Sense of the Senate on modernizing America's schools.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for the land and water conservation fund.

Sense of the Senate regarding support for Federal, State and local law enforcement and for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

Sense of the Senate regarding Social Security notch babies.

Conference Agreements.—Title III of the resolution contains the following non-binding language that expresses the will or intent of either or both Houses of the Congress:

Subtitle A: The Sense of the Congress provisions are as follows:

Sense of the Congress on the protection of the Social Security surpluses.

Sense of the Congress on providing addition dollars to the classroom.

Sense of the Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of the Congress on child nutrition.

Sense of the Congress concerning funding for special education.

Subtitle B: The Sense of the House provisions are as follows:

Sense of the House on the commission on international religious freedoms.

Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Subtitle C: The Sense of the Senate provisions are as follows:

Sense of the Senate that the federal government should not invest the Social Security trust funds in private financial markets.

Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the Medicare program.

Sense of the Senate on education.

Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to Americans by returning the non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate on access to Medicare services.

Sense of the Senate on law enforcement.

Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.

Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Sense of the Senate on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.

Sense of the Senate that the one hundred sixth Congress, first session, should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.

Sense of the Senate on the importance of Social Security for individuals who become disabled.

Sense of the Senate on reporting of on-budget trust fund levels.

Sense of the Senate regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.

Sense of the Senate on funding for natural disasters.

From the Committee on the Budget:

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
SLADE GORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0102

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–92) on the resolution (H. Res. 137) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 472, LOCAL CENSUS QUALITY CHECK ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–93) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 472) to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the use of postcensus local review as part of each decennial census, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 37, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–94) on the resolution (H. Res. 139) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) 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.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1999

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of the death of her mother.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Tuesday, April 13 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Tuesday, April 13 on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of business in the district.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and April 14.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and April 14.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, April 14, 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:

1468. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis; Procedures for Retaining Class Free State Status [Docket No. 98–060–2] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1469. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Quinclorac; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300820; FRL–6069–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1470. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; FCS Board Compensation Limits (RIN: 3052–AB79) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1471. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Builder Warranty for High-Ratio FHA-Insured Single Family Mortgages for New Homes [Docket No. FR–4288–I–01] (RIN: 2502–AH08) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1472. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs Conforming Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4054–C–05] (RIN: 2577–AB63) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1473. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention in Certain Residential Structures-Information Collection Approval Numbers; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4444–F–02] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1474. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—FHA Single Family Mortgage Insurance; Statutory Changes for Maximum Mortgage Limit and Downpayment Requirement [Docket No. FR–4431–F–01] (RIN: 2502–AH31) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1475. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Builder Warranty for High-Ratio FHA-Insured Single Family Mortgages for New Homes [Docket No. FR–4288–C–02] (RIN: 2502–AH08) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1476. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs Conforming Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4054–C–04] (RIN: 2577–AB63) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1477. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Deposit Insurance Regulations; Joint Accounts and ''Payable-on-Death'' Accounts (RIN: 3064–AC16) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (CFDA No. 84.342) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1479. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'')—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1480. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectiviely and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

1481. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Removal of Commercial Communications Satellites and Related Items from the Department of Commerce's Commerce Control List for Retransfer to the Department of State's United States Munitions List [Docket No. 990311067–9067–01] (RIN: 0694–AB84) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1482. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Entity List: Addition of Russian Entities; and Revisions to Certain Indian and Pakistani Entities [Docket No. 970428099–9015–08] (RIN: 0694–AB60) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1483. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD–045–FOR] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1484. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ohio Regulatory Program [OH–244–FOR] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Resources.

1486. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 033199A] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1487. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 031999A] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1488. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 032399C] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1489. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 961204340–7087–02; I.D. 031599C] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1490. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Amendment 56 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska and Amendment 56 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area [I.D. 101498C] (RIN: 0648–AJ50) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1491. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's final rule—Danger Zone, Chesapeake Bay, Point Lookout to Cedar Point, Maryland—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1495. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 208. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contribution of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 928. A bill to require that the 2000 decennial census include either a general or targeted followup mailing of census questionnaires, whichever, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, will be more effective in securing the return of census information from the greatest number of households possible (Rept. 106–88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 1009. A bill to authorize the awarding of grants to cities, counties, tribal organizations, and certain other entities for the purpose of improving public participation in the 2000 decennial census; with an amendment (Rept. 106–89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1376. A bill to extend the tax benefits available with respect to services performed in a combat zone to services performed in the Federal Republic of

Yugoslavaia (Serbia/Montenegro) and certain other areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Filed on April 14 (Legislative day, April 13), 1999]

Mr. KASICH: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 68. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009 (Rept. 106–91). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution waiving points of order against a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009 (Rept. 106–92). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 472) to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the use of postcensus local review as part of each decennial census (Rept. 106–93). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations (Rept. 106–94). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to extend the tax benefits available with respect to services performed in a combat zone to services performed in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia/Montenegro) and certain other areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. EWING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. PHELPS):

H.R. 1377. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''John J. Buchanan Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out pipeline safety activities under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, to make a technical correction relating to an emergency supplemental appropriation for international narcotics control and law enforcement assistance; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. DICKEY):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's ''regular rate'' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide an exemption from overtime compensation for firefighters and rescue squad members who volunteer their services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow registered vendors to administer refunds of Federal excise taxes on kerosene used in unvented heaters for home heating purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 1384. A bill to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 1385. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the financial limitation on rehabilitation services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale of a family farming business to a family member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for Government furnished headstones or markers for the marked graves of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1388. A bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for Medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HILL of Montana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SALMON, Mr.

EWING, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the information reporting requirement relating to the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits imposed on educational institutions and certain other trades and businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rates of income tax imposed on indvidual taxpayers by 3 percentage points, to provide for a carryover basis of property acquired from a decedent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 1391. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which States may be certified to carry out voluntary environmental cleanup programs and to amend CERCLA regarding the liability of landowners and prospective purchasers; to the Committee on 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. STARK:

H.R. 1392. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into contracts with providers of services to furnish certain inpatient hospital services at an all-inclusive rate of payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1393. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense employees in Texas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1394. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal district judges in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to suspend the application of certain motor vehicle fuel requirements in areas within the State of California during certain periods in order to reduce the retail cost of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1396. A bill to save taxpayers money, reduce the deficit, cut corporate welfare, and protect and restore America's natural heritage by eliminating the fiscally wasteful and ecologically destructive commercial logging program on Federal public lands and to facilitate the economic recovery and diversification of communities dependent on the Federal logging program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EWING, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

17. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Hampshire, relative to Senate Resolution No. 4 urging the President and the Congress to fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States as promised under the IDEA to ensure that all children, regardless of disability, received a quality education and are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

18. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a memorial urging Congress and the President of the United States to take immediate action to work in unison to pass a Patient's Bill of Rights and confront this impending health care crisis in the best interest of all Americans; to the Committee on Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska introduced a bill (H.R. 1397) for the relief of Herman J. Koehler, III; which was referred 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. 14: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 25: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 36: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 40: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 45: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 49: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 53: Mr. DICKEY and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 61: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 119: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 120: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 121: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 152: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 205: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 212: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 216: Mr. WOLF and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 218: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 353: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 371: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 372: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 380: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 382: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 383: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 389: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 407: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 417: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 443: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 486: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 488: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 505: Mr. FROST, Mr. HORN, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 538: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 544: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 566: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 570: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 573: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 574: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 583: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 595: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 632: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 655: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 673: Mr. CANADY of Florida and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 681: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 691: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 716: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 721: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 732: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 740: Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 745: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 746: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 765: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 775: Mr. METCALF, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 803: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 815: Mr. BAKER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 833: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 881: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 889: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 890: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 912: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 914: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 925: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 941: Mr. CAMP and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 952: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 961: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 984: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 989: Mr. FROST, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 991: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 999: Mr. SHAW and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1029: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1040: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1046: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1050: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1051: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1053: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1063: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1070: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1080: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1082: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WU, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1084: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1085: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1086: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1112: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1115: Mr. WYNN, Mr. KLINK, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1118: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1123: Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1144: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1145: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1169: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1177: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1178: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HILL of Montana, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1180: Mr. DIXON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUINN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1187: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WU, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1193: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1195: Mr. JOHN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1199: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1221: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1227: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1244: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1283: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1285: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1288: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1291: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WISE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. WU, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1307: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1335: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1342: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1355: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HALL of Ohio and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1356: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 1371: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.J. Res. 1: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. GOODLING.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. SUNUNU.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 35: Ms. DANNER and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. LARGENT and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANKS, of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. DANNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. OXLEY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Ms. DUNN.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. MCKEON.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WISE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H. Res. 41: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEINER.

H. Res. 55: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H. Res. 80: Mr. GEKAS.

H. Res. 82: Mr. OLVER and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 89: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr.

BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 94: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 472

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 2, line 7, strike ''142'' and insert ''141''. Page 2, line 8, strike ''143'' and insert ''142''. Page 4, line 25, strike ''142'' and insert ''141''. Page 4, after line 25, strike ''143'' and insert ''142''.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REFORM THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which reflect our continued efforts to make the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) applicable to today's workforce. The FLSA is one of the most outdated workplace regulatory schemes faced by businesses and employees. As the primary statute governing the payment of wages and hours of work, the FLSA has changed little since it was enacted in 1938.

In today's business environment, employers and employees must find ways to compete and meet the challenges of an increasingly competitive and global economy. Government should be user-friendly, less confrontational, and less costly. The regulatory scheme must be designed to be flexible to accommodate different situations and future challenges. The demographics of the workforce and the characteristics of jobs have changed dramatically over the past 60 years. But, the FLSA has not kept pace with these changes and it now stands out as being rigid and inflexible for today's work styles and work arrangements.

The two bills that I am introducing today will update areas of the FLSA which regulate scheduling and compensation. Currently, the FLSA does not allow private sector employers to give their employees the choice of compensatory time off in lieu of overtime wages. The first bill, "The Working Families Flexibility Act of 1999," would give private sector employers and employees an option which Federal, State, and local governments have had for many years—the choice of "comp time" in lieu of overtime pay. The legislation is identical to that which the House passed during the 105th Congress.

The Working Families Flexibility Act answers the call of many workers for increased flexibility and choices in the workplace. Many employees are finding it increasingly difficult to find enough time for important family obligations or outside interests, which makes receiving comp time instead of cash overtime an attractive option.

Many employers who want to be family-friendly find that flexible scheduling can be extremely difficult for employees who are paid by the hour and covered by the overtime provisions in the FLSA. Suppose an employee has a terminally ill parent who lives several states away. Days off with pay can become precious for that employee when a 2-day weekend does not provide enough time to travel and spend time with that parent. When that employee works a few hours of overtime each week, he or she may prefer to be paid with time off rather than with cash wages. If the individual is employed in the public sector, then he or she would have the choice of receiving paid time off in lieu of cash wages for overtime hours worked. However, under current Federal law, if the individual is employed in the private sector then he or she cannot choose paid time off, even if that form of compensation is preferred.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would allow employers to make comp time available as an option for employees. Employees would have the choice, through an agreement with the employer, to take overtime pay in the form of paid time off. As with overtime pay, comp time hours would accrue at a rate of one and one-half hours of comp time for each hour of overtime worked. In response to concerns about employees being coerced by employers into choosing comp time over cash wages, the legislation includes numerous protections to ensure that employees cannot be pressured into one choice or the other.

Employees could accrue up to 160 hours of comp time within a 12-month period. The legislation would require the employer to annually cash-out any unused comp time accrued by the employee. Employees may withdraw from a comp time agreement at any time and request a cash-out of any or all accrued, unused comp time. The employer would have 30 days in which to comply with the request. The legislation would also require an employer to provide the employee with at least 30 days notice prior to cashing out any accrued time in excess of 80 hours or prior to discontinuing a policy of offering comp time.

Employees would be able to use their accrued comp time at anytime, so long as its use did not unduly disrupt the operations of the business (the same standard used in the public sector and under the Family and Medical Leave Act.) Employers would be prohibited from requiring employees to take accrued time solely at the convenience of the employer.

I want to emphasize that this legislation does not eliminate or change the traditional 40-hour workweek. It simply provides employees with another option in the workplace—time off instead of overtime pay. This concept may be revolutionary to some, but to America's workers, who are increasingly frustrated about coping with the demands of work and family responsibilities, it is a long overdue change.

The second bill, "The Rewarding Performance in Compensation Act," would help workers to share, financially, when their efforts help produce gains for their company in productivity, sales, fewer injuries, or other important aspects of performance.

The pressures of worldwide competition and rapid technological change have forced most employees to seek continuous improvement in productivity, quality, and other aspects of company performance. Employers often seek to encourage and reward employee efforts to improve productivity, quality, etc. through what are called "gainsharing" plans—linking additional compensation to measurable improvements in company, team, or individual performance. Employees are assigned individual or group productivity goals and the savings achieved from improved productivity, or the gains, are then shared between the company and the employees. The payouts are based directly on factors under an employee's control, such as productivity or costs, rather than on the company's profits. Thus, employees directly benefit from improvements that they help to produce by increasing their overall compensation.

Unfortunately, employers who choose to implement such programs can be burdened with unpredictable and complex requirements by the Fair Labor Standards Act, which clearly did not envision these types of "pay based upon performance" plans.

For example, if a bonus is based on production, performance or other factors, the payment must then be divided by the number of hours worked by the employee during the time period that the bonus is meant to cover, and added to the employee's regular hourly pay rate. This adjusted hourly rate must then be used to calculate the employee's overtime rate of pay. For other types of employees, such as executive, administrative, or professional employees who are exempt from minimum wage and overtime, an employer can easily give financial rewards without having to recalculate rates of pay.

The Rewarding Performance in Compensation Act would amend the FLSA to specify that an employee's regular rate of pay for the purposes of calculating overtime would not be affected by additional payments that reward or provide incentives for employees who meet productivity, quality, efficiency or sales goals. By eliminating disincentives in current law, this legislation will encourage employers to reward their employees and make it easier for employers to "share the wealth" with their employees.

I would urge my colleagues to support these two common sense reforms that will help to bring the FLSA, passed in 1938, a little closer to the needs of employees that the law is meant to benefit, as we enter the 21st century.

CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call attention to America's largest women's public policy organization, Concerned Women for America (CWA), on its 20th anniversary.

CWA is the leading voice for women across the nation embracing and promoting traditional family values.

Twenty years ago, CWA's founder and chairman, Beverly LaHaye, realized a significant number of important voices were going unheard in the massive world of public policy. A hard-working parent and active citizen, she, along with a handful of other dedicated women, recognized that merely standing against issues was inadequate. On this basis, this small group set out to promote positive change. CWA has grown from that handful of women to over half-a-million members nationwide. Now, according to CWA, those who would label themselves feminists can no longer claim to be the one and only voice for all American women.

CWA promotes values and public policies that strengthen women and promote families. The organization empowers its members to turn concern into action by working to preserve, protect, and promote biblical values through education, legislative programs and community involvement. Among other things, CWA staff and grassroots leaders have been called upon to testify before the United States Congress and various state legislatures regarding issues such as the sanctity of human life, education, pornography, religious freedom, national sovereignty and the traditional American family.

On the local level, CWA members are active in defending parental rights and involvement in education, promoting sexual abstinence among teens, and supporting crisis pregnancy centers. They also educate communities on the virtues of respecting all human life and traditional lifestyles.

In 1998, Mrs. Carmen Pate became president of CWA, where she serves as the primary media spokesman and liaison to federal and local elected officials.

Concerned Women for America's legislative department monitors federal legislation and provides a presence on Capitol Hill and internationally on behalf of concerned conservative women. CWA's field department coordinates the organization's grassroots chapters, providing leadership training, resources and issue updates. The broadcast and media department produces the syndicated daily radio talk show, "Beverly LaHaye Today." which is heard weekly by over one million listeners. CWA spokesmen are always available to local and national media to give the conservative woman's perspective on issues affecting the home and the nation. CWA's research and publications department produces a monthly magazine, Family Voice, and publishes an array of informative brochures, position papers and booklets.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend Concerned Women for America for twenty outstanding years of dedicated service to the men, women and children of our great nation.

HONORING GIL GARCIA

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an extraordinary man and friend who celebrated his 60th birthday on March 31, Gil Garcia.

Gil has spent his entire life working on and serving the Central Coast of California. His formative years were spent in the Goleta Valley, where he attended elementary and junior high schools; he then went on to graduate from Santa Barbara Catholic High School. After serving four years in the United States Air Force in Oxnard, Gil worked for Arendt, Moser and Grant Architects for fourteen years, where he received his license to practice architecture. In 1976, he founded Garcia Architects, Inc., an architectural firm that continues to thrive today. Garcia Architects has received numerous awards throughout the years, including recognition from the Santa Barbara Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

In addition to Gil's significant architectural contributions to the City of Santa Barbara and the State of California, Gil has been and will continue to be an effective, innovative and caring councilman and community leader. His work has earned him the life Time Achievement Award from the Santa Barbara News-Press, Man of the Year Award, and Volunteer of the Year from the Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce. he has also been recognized by the Santa Barbara Hispanic Achievement Council.

Mr. Speaker, Gil Garcia's dedication to the people he represents is exemplary and I believe in his vision for our community. I congratulate Gil on his 60th birthday, and I commend him for years of service to the city of Santa Barbara and to our nation.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH HONOREES

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, as Women's History Month draws to a close today, I rise to salute a woman from my Congressional District in Minnesota who has dedicated most of her life to encouraging all citizens to exercise their right to vote and play an active role in government.

Upon moving to Minneapolis from New York City, Florence Gray joined the League of Women Voters (LWV) of Minneapolis in 1948 to get more involved in her new community. The LWV of Minneapolis is a non-partisan organization which works to influence public policy through education and advocacy, providing election-related services, and sponsoring various educational forums and projects. In 1948, Gray helped create a new unit of the LWV along with a group of friends—many of them other young mothers like herself—and served as its chairperson. As the years passed, her leadership positions accumulated. During the 1960s, she was elected to the Minneapolis LWV Board as Treasurer, then became Vice President, then led the group as President from 1963 to 1965. She also served as the Minnesota vice president of the LWV.

After years of public service in the League of Women Voters, Gray went back to college in 1968 to complete her bachelor's and master's degrees at the University of Minnesota. In 1974, she was appointed Associate Director of the Epilepsy Research Center of the University of Minnesota's Neurology Department. After 17 years with the Center, she "retired," though she continued to serve as a part-time consultant for the Epilepsy Program. During this time, she rededicated herself to the LWV, heading the LWV of Minneapolis' 75th Anniversary Planning Committee. In 1994, she was presented with the LWV's esteemed Bess Mlnarik Award for her years of tireless efforts serving on the LWV.

One of Florence Gray's fellow LWV members once described her as "hard working, dedicated, tenacious, resilient, witty, wise, and wonderful. She has long since earned whatever honors we can give her." It is indeed fitting to salute Florence Gray for her lifetime of community service.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor Florence Gray in celebration of Women's History Month. I thank her for her contributions to both the state of Minnesota and to our country, and I wish her continued successes in the future.

IN MEMORY OF JOYCE CHIANG

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to mourn the loss of Immigration and Naturalization Service attorney Joyce Chiang.

Ms. Chiang was a bright young woman who was of uncompromising service to my staff on issues concerning immigration law. My staff spoke highly of Ms. Chiang, who was a knowledgeable representative of the agency, who confidently and concisely explained the intricacies of the 1996 immigration law. My district office was fortunate to benefit Ms. Chiang's expertise on implementation of the new law, as she fulfilled her trial-attorney training in the San Francisco INS office.

I am saddened by the questions concerning her death as we mourn the loss of this bright young woman and fine public servant.

RAIDERS TAKE CURTIN CALL

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD this article from the February 21, 1999 edition of the St. Paul Pioneer Press which recounts the exciting victory of Roseville High School's girls hockey team. Impressively, this is Roseville's second state championship title in four years. Amazingly enough, they have only had a womens' hockey program for four years. This is yet another example of the young people in the Fourth District of Minnesota accomplishing many special goals.

The coach of this mighty team, Rich Kuehne, will be departing now that the season is over. After 33 years of coaching hockey, including four years with Roseville's girls hockey

team, Mr. Kuehne is retiring. Additionally, their star player, Ms. Ronda Curtin will be graduating and attending the University of Minnesota where she will continue her hockey career as a member of the Gopher's team. I wish both of them continued success in their endeavors and congratulate them on an outstanding season.

The Roseville girls hockey team has demonstrated, once again with an undefeated season, that hard work and dedication always lead to success. I wish them luck in future seasons and congratulate them on their superior performance.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 21, 1999]

RAIDERS TAKE CURTIN CALL

(Tim Leighton)

Years from now, Ronda Curtin will be remembered as one of the pioneers of girls hockey in Minnesota.

Saturday night, Roseville's star left a more immediate but very lasting impression that typified her dominance of the sport the past four years.

The senior center and all-time leading scorer in state history scored four goals and assisted on one to power the top-ranked Raiders to an 8–2 victory over Bloomington Jefferson in the championship game of the state girls hockey tournament at the State Fairgrounds Coliseum.

The state championship is Roseville's second in just four years of sponsoring girls hockey. It also is the second time in four years the Raiders (27–0–1) finished a season undefeated. They were undefeated when they won the state title in 1996.

Jefferson (22–4–1) was making its second state tournament appearance and first in a championship game.

''Ronda Curtin has been an ambassador for girls hockey the past four years,'' Jefferson coach Dave Irvin said. ''There is no question she should be the Ms. Hockey award winner.

''We're glad she's leaving; she can take her sister with her.''

Curtin will play for the University of Minnesota next season. But her sister, Renee, will remain a potent scorer for the Raiders for two more seasons. And Ronda, who could be named the recipient of the Ms. Hockey award today, will leave with her name all over the Roseville record book.

''It was a wonderful way to end my career,'' Ronda Curtin said. ''I'm really fortunate. I was able to come in with a bang by winning a state title in our first year, and now I'm going out with a bang. I don't know how anyone can top that. Playing girls hockey in Minnesota has provided me with lots of memories.''

Curtin's four goals gave her seven for the tournament and 249 for her career. She finished her career with a state-best (boy or girl) 456 points.

Her pure hat trick in the second period blew open a close game and gave the Raiders a commanding 6–2 lead.

''Oh, those goals were fun to watch, weren't they?'' Roseville coach Rich Kuehne said.

Curtin showed the flair and intelligence that became indelible to Roseville's opponents.

She started her second-period spree with a power-play goal at 6:41. She streaked down the left side, sped around a defender and stuffed a shot past Jefferson goalie Dana Hergert.

''Her reach is incredible,'' Irvin said. ''We think she can stand at center ice and touch the sideboards. That is just one of the reasons why she is so tough to defend.''

Less than two minutes later, while Roseville was trying to kill a Jefferson power play, Curtin zipped around defender Chrissie Norwich and had a breakaway.

Just when it appeared Curtin would ram into Hergert, she ripped a hard shot that hit the crossbar and bounced down into the net, giving the Raiders a 4–1 lead.

''We really came ready to play,'' said Renee Curtin, who assisted on two of her sister's goals. ''We were very focused and didn't let up.''

Well, they did momentarily because Jefferson answered 34 seconds later. Bethany Petersen trimmed Roseville's lead to 4–2 with a wicked wrist shot from just inside the blue line.

Ronda Curtin restored the Raiders' three-goal advantage with a blast from the right circle that sailed past Hergert.

''We really came ready to play,'' she said.

Erika Mortenson gave Roseville a 6–2 lead with her second goal of the game with 27 seconds remaining in the second period.

Three goals were scored in just more than a minute midway through the first period. Roseville scored two of them, 31 seconds apart.

Lindsay O'Keefe gave the Raiders the lead after firing a wrist shot from the slot. Seconds earlier, Mortenson scored her first goal of the tournament, to go with four assists, on a tap-in from in close.

Jefferson opened the scoring on a goal by Emily Naslund at 6:34 after bottling up the Raiders in their zone. For about a minute, Roseville was unable to clear the puck out of its end.

The Raiders ultimately paid the price when Naslund, in heavy traffic in front of the goal, slid a short shot under the pads of Roseville goalie Jodi Winters.

''I was a little concerned in the early going,'' Kuehne said, ''Jefferson came out hard, and we looked a little tentative. I started to relax and enjoy things a little more when we perked up.''

Saturday's game ended Kuehne's 33-year hockey coaching career. He plans to retire to his cabin on Leech Lake. He compiled a 103–4–3 record in four years as Roseville's first girls hockey coach.

''That's the kids' record, though, not mine,'' he said. ''They've given me many wonderful memories.''

TRIBUTE TO TOM TROXEL

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom Troxel, the Director of the Intermountain Forest Industry Association. Mr. Troxel has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment to the timber industry and to the health and well-being of forests across the nation. His tireless efforts on issues related to forestry, forest health and timber practices have gone far to promote sound practices, to level the playing field with the federal government and to better our environment. Mr. Troxel's high regard for our forested lands and the people that rely on them resonates with dedication and enthusiasm. Mr. Speaker, I commend Tom Troxel for all his efforts, and I look forward to working with him in the future.

SAN LUIS OBISPO HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 11, a moving and important event took place in San Luis Obispo, California, which I am proud to represent.

Many of my constituents gathered at Cal Poly Theater to commemorate the 12th annual San Luis Obispo Community Holocaust Remembrance. At this yearly event, the community joins together to remember who died in the Holocaust, pay tribute to those who survived, and seek to apply the lessons of the past to the reality of the present.

More than half a century after World War II, it is still difficult to comprehend the depth of depravity which engulfed Europe. The systematic extermination of six million Jews and millions of other innocent people—simply because of who they were—stands as the most horrific example of man's inhumanity to man. Now, as fewer and fewer survivors remain to tell their stories, it is even more incumbent upon us to recall the horrors of the Nazi era and teach them to future generations.

Two distinguished speakers were scheduled to address this year's gathering. Klara Bergman was born in Poland and spent the war running and hiding from the Nazis. She is a highly successful businesswoman and a regular on the media.

Ted Johnson, a San Luis Obispo County native, has served in the Peace Corps and the State Department and is an expert on central Europe.

The choice of these two speakers is particularly appropriate this year, as our TV screens are filled with the anguish of Kosovar refugees and our hearts are with the brave American servicemen and women who are leading the NATO attacks on Slobodan Milosovic. As we remember the Holocaust, we must all recommit ourselves to the fight against modern-day genocide and oppression. We must ensure that the phrase ''Never Again'' is not simply an empty slogan.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH HONOREES

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, as Women's History Month draws to a close today, I rise to salute a woman from my Congressional District in Minnesota who, by her own example, has helped open the door for all women who choose to serve in elected public office.

Alice W. Rainville, a wife and mother of seven, was the first woman to serve on Minneapolis' Metropolitan Transit Commission. She was appointed to the post by Minnesota Governor Wendell Anderson in 1974—a rare achievement for a woman at that time in our country's history. Also in that year, Rainville

served as the chair of the Democrat-Farmer-Laborer party in Minnesota's 54th Senate District. In 1975, she sought and won the Fourth Ward seat on the Minneapolis City Council. By doing so, Rainville became the fourth woman to hold a City Council seat in the history of Minneapolis. She was re-elected every two years thereafter until she retired in January, 1998.

Although she was not Minneapolis' first female City Council member, Rainville became its first female City Council President. Becoming President in 1980, she led the Council until 1990—the longest tenure of any City Council President in Minneapolis. As President, Rainville played a major role in laying the groundwork for the new Minneapolis Convention Center, which opened in 1988. She worked with local officials and consultants on the initial plans and construction of this world-class facility, which is the largest public works project ever undertaken by the city of Minneapolis. She currently serves on the implementation team for a Convention Center expansion project and remains a valued resource for other development projects in the city.

Since Alice W. Rainville carved out her niche in Minneapolis politics in the 1970's, more and more women have entered politics and government service in Minneapolis. Today, including Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton, a majority of the Minneapolis City Council members are women. By proving to other women that they, too, can achieve success in what had once been a male-dominated political world, Alice W. Rainville is a true pioneer.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor Alice W. Rainville in celebration of Women's History Month. I thank her for her contributions to the city of Minneapolis, and I wish her continued successes in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO SAVE MEDICARE LIVES AND MONEY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the first in a series of bills to modernize Medicare for the future: the "Centers of Excellence Act of 1999." Not only will this legislation save Medicare money, it will save the lives of many of its beneficiaries.

Centers of Excellence has already been proven to decrease mortality and lower cost.

Centers of Excellence originated as a demonstration project in the early 1990's to evaluate the effect of volume on quality and mortality for coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery. The Department of Health and Human Services selected facilities on the basis of their outstanding experience, outcomes, and efficiency in performing these procedures. They found that hospitals that do large volumes of a certain type of procedure tend to have better outcomes and quality. The demonstration resulted in an 8 percent average annual decline in mortality and saved Medicare an average of 14 percent on CABG procedures. This year, CBO has scored the Centers of Excellence proposal as saving $300 million over five years and $600 million over ten years.

Since the early 1990's, numerous reports have come out documenting higher quality care and lower mortality in facilities that perform a large volume of cancer treatments, cardiac surgeries, and transplants, among others. These conditions often require highly specialized care that should only be provided by the highest-rated facilities.

Centers of Excellence is currently being used in the private sector to improve quality and decrease cost.

Many private sector employers are requiring higher quality standards from their health plans. Not only are these employer groups able to improve quality through Centers of Excellence, they are also able to negotiate deeper discounts with high-volume facilities. Medicare should be given the authority to contract with certain hospitals for quality and volume—both to save money and to deliver better health care.

Centers of Excellence has already been approved by the House in the past.

The bill we are introducing passed the House in the 1997 Budget Reconciliation bill (H.R. 2015). H.R. 2015 would have made the Centers of Excellence program a permanent part of Medicare by authorizing the Secretary to pay selected facilities a single rate for all services, potentially including post-acute services associated with a surgical procedure or hospital admission related to a medical condition. As with the CABG demonstration, selected facilities would have to meet special quality standards and would be required to implement a quality improvement plan.

The amendment was dropped in conference because of resistance from the Senate. Some Senators from States where no hospitals were designated as Centers of Excellence felt that the program tended to cast into doubt the quality or excellence of non-designated hospitals. Mr. Speaker, the name of this program is not important—what is important is that it can save money and by encouraging beneficiaries to use hospitals that have high volume, quality outcomes, it can save lives.

Like Lake Wobegon, where all the children are above average, it is human nature for all Members of Congress to want their local hospitals to be above average. But not all hospitals are above average—and this is a serious matter. In fact, it is a matter of life and death.

Indeed, good health policy in this nation would prohibit hospitals from doing sophisticated procedures if they do not have sufficient experience. This principle is applied to liver transplants, for example, and ought to be applied to other complex procedures as well. We may all have pride in our local hospitals, but the fact is: some of them are killing people because they do not do enough of certain types of procedures and therefore are not skilled in those procedures.

I regret that this important provision has been subjected to pork-barreling by previous Congresses. I hope that this body will see that it is included in the next Medicare bill that moves through Congress.

Some members of the now defunct Medicare Commission are proposing radical and unnecessary changes to Medicare. Before we cut back benefits and ask beneficiaries to pay more, we should explore every possible cost saving in the system. This bill is a step in the right direction: it saves money and improves the quality of care provided to seniors and the disabled.

The 1999 Trustees report projects that the Part A trust fund will remain viable until 2015, one of the longest periods of solvency ever projected in the history of the program. Simple changes, such as the Centers of Excellence proposal, are all that are needed to improve Medicare for its beneficiaries.

As further explanation of why this legislation makes great sense, I am including below "Extracts from the November, 1995 Research Report" on the Centers of Excellence Demonstration.

[From the November 1995 Research Report]

CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE DEMONSTRATION

Rationale for the Demonstration: Physicians operate under different payment incentives than hospitals, so hospital managers have difficulties implementing more efficient practice patterns. A global fee that includes physician services aligns incentives and encourages physicians to use institutional resources in a more cost effective manner.

Design of the Demonstration: Under the demonstration, Medicare paid each of the hospitals a single global rate for each discharge in DRGs 106 and 107, bypass with and without catheterization. This rate included all inpatient and physician services. The standard Medicare hospital passthroughs were also included, i.e., capital and direct medical education, on a prorated basis. Any related readmissions were also included in the rate. Pre- and post-discharge physician services were excluded except for the standard inclusions in the surgeon's global fee. All four hospitals agreed to forego any outlier payments for particularly expensive cases. The hospitals and physicians were free to divide up the payment any way they chose.

Medicare Savings under the Demonstration: From the start of the demonstration in May 1991 through December 1993, the Medicare program saved $15.3 million on bypass patients treated in the four original demonstration hospitals. The average discount amounted to roughly 14 percent on the $111 million in expected spending on bypass patients, including a 90-day post-discharge period.

Ninety percent of the savings came from HCFA-negotiated discounts on the Part A and B inpatient expected payments.

Eight percent came from lower-than-expected spending on post-discharge care.

Beneficiary Savings under the Demonstration: Beneficiaries (and their insurers) saved another $2.3 million in Part B coinsurance payments.

Total Savings under the Demonstration: Total Medicare savings estimated to have been $17.6 million in the 2.5 year period.

TRIBUTE TO NOU KA YANG

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD this article from the

March 21, 1999 edition of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. This article tells the extraordinary story of a St. Paul teenager who has been rewarded for her perseverance and dedication to her community.

Ms. Nou Ka Yang received the honor of being named The Boys and Girls Club Youth of the Year for the state of Minnesota. Ms. Yang has triumphed over the devastating circumstances of losing her father at the age of eight after spending time in a Laos Hmong refugee camp. She is currently a high school senior at Como Park High School where she is an honor student. She has maintained a 3.5 GPA and continues to support her community by doing activities such as translating for other Hmong residents who do not speak English.

The Boys and Girls Club Youth of the Year Award is a high honor that recently received the support of renowned talk show host Oprah Winfrey. The winners are chosen based on their leadership qualities, academic success, and ability to overcome obstacles. These are all qualities that Ms. Yang and the other candidates exhibit. Having youth in our communities with such promise allows me to feel comfortable about the future of our country.

Each state finalist receives a $25,000 scholarship and proceeds to the regional level where they compete for additional scholarship monies. I wish Ms. Yang luck as she proceeds to the next level. I know that she will represent the Fourth District and the State of Minnesota well.

[From the Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Mar. 21, 1999]

ST. PAUL TEEN-AGER AWARDED $25,000 OPRAH SCHOLARSHIP

(By Nancy Ngo)

A St. Paul high school senior has won the Boys and Girls Club Youth of the Year award, good for a $25,000 Oprah Winfrey Scholarship for college education.

Nou Ka Yang, 18, a senior at Como Park High School, took top honors in the annual state competition that started in 1947. Until the nonprofit service club joined forces with the television celebrity last year, however, no cash prize was given.

Yang was chosen Saturday after interviews with judges at the Radisson Hotel St. Paul. She competed against three candidates from the Minneapolis, Duluth and St. Cloud youth clubs.

The Oprah scholarships were established by the entertainer to help children who otherwise might not be able to afford college. The Boys and Girls Club, which emphasizes working with underprivileged youth, was chosen by Winfrey because of its national work, said Marie Grimm, communications director of the St. Paul Boys and Girls Club.

Winners from all 50 states receive a $25,000 scholarship. Yang now advances to the regional competition with prospects of winning an additional $8,000.

Yang plans to attend the University of Wisconsin-River Falls, an option she doubts would have been possible had she not won. She wants to be a computer animator.

She was chosen for her leadership qualities, academic success and abilities to overcome obstacles. Yang, a Laotian Hmong refugee, arrived in the United States from a refugee camp in Thailand when she was 8 years old. She said her father was killed after returning to Laos from the refugee camp.

Yang has four brothers and two sisters. She said she often is busy helping her mother with household chores, as well as taking care of her younger siblings.

Her demanding home life has not prevented her from becoming an excellent student. She ended her junior year with a grade point average of 3.5 Yang has been a member of the Boys and Girls Club for five years and is active at the organization's Mt. Airy public-housing complex location in St. Paul.

''She's an extremely hard worker,'' said George Latimer, former St. Paul mayor, who was one of the judges. He said he was impressed with Yang's ability to balance home and school tasks. Yang also contributes to her community in activities such as translating for Hmong residents who do not speak English, he added.

Yang sings in a church choir and is on the St. Paul Housing Authority's teen council, among other activities.

The other candidates for the youth award were Charles Adams, a senior at North High School in Minneapolis; Trena Ackerman, a sophomore at Deerfield High School in Duluth; and Tiffany Cherne, a sophomore at Apollo High School in St. Cloud.

The Boys and Girls Club is a nonprofit organization for children ages 6 to 10. There are six Boys and Girls Clubs in Minnesota: St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, St. Cloud, Mille Lacs and Detroit Lakes. The clubs have drug-and-alcohol prevention programs, sports and social activities and offer career-education information.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE ARVESCHOUG

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Steve Arveschoug, the General Manager of the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District. Mr. Arveschoug has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment to his work on behalf of the district's many water users. He has emerged as a national leader on the complex and frustrating issue of Bureau of Reclamation oversight. Mr. Arveschoug's tireless efforts have led to a Congressional initiative to examine Bureau of Reclamation practices. Moreover, his keen eye for detail and persistence in negotiations has undoubtedly saved water users and the taxpayers a significant amount of hard-earned dollars. I commend Steve Arveschoug for his solid efforts, and I look forward to working with him in the future.

HONORING DR. MARY CEDERBERG

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an extraordinary doctor and friend who was recently honored for twenty-five years of outstanding service in Santa Barbara County—Dr. Mary Cederberg.

A graduate of the University of Missouri, Mary received her M.D. from the University of Louisville, Kentucky. She then completed a Fellowship at Boston Children's Hospital and worked briefly at Harvard University. Since 1956, Mary has worked tirelessly as a pediatrician and an advocate for children.

During Mary's twenty-five years of service with the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, she has directed the California Children's Services program as well as the Children's Health and Disease Prevention (C.H.D.P.) program. It is through the C.H.D.P. program that Mary has left her mark on the entire county of Santa Barbara, by providing innovative and comprehensive preventive care to thousands of children.

Mary is a dedicated, hardworking, hands-on doctor, who does whatever it takes to help the children and families she serves. It has been an honor to have worked with her for so many years. Dr. Mary Cederberg is a role-model for our nation and her service exemplifies how we want public health care to work. I will continue to look to Mary's vision and leadership as our nation addresses health care for children.

Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate Dr. Mary Cederberg's career and I commend her for years of service to the County of Santa Barbara and to our nation.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH HONOREES

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, as Women's History Month draws to a close today, I rise to salute a woman from my Congressional District in Minnesota whose long commitment to community service has proven her to be a true leader.

Betty Benjamin has been a lifelong proponent of women's reproductive rights, playing an active role in the pro-choice movement for 31 years. A former teacher and social worker, Benjamin helped organize the Abortion Rights Council of Minnesota in 1966, in light of her concern that existing law prohibited a woman's right to choose and caused many women with unwanted pregnancies to seek illegal, dangerous abortions. Through her leadership in the ARC—today known as the Minnesota National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL)—Benjamin and the other unpaid volunteers worked countless hours in their effort to ensure that women have legal access to abortion. Their educating, lobbying, and fundraising efforts were rewarded in 1973 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade to legalize abortion.

But Benjamin's work did not end there. She has remained active in the pro-choice movement because of her concerns that the Roe v. Wade decision could be eroded. She led the Abortion Rights Council in Minnesota as president for 14 years, and has served as a board member of the National Abortion Rights Action League since 1967. She represents Minnesota NARAL as incoming chairperson of the Women Candidate Development Coalition, which recruits women across the state to serve in public office. She currently is a member of the National Organization for Women

(NOW), at both the state and national levels. Recently, Minnesota NARAL established the Betty Benjamin Leadership Development Fund to help identify, educate and train interested Minnesota college students for future leadership roles.

Benjamin's tireless efforts and many accomplishments on behalf of women's right to choose may best be explained in her own words: "My concern is that the full range of safe reproductive choices will be accessible to all our daughters and granddaughters. To make that a reality there is much each person can do." Betty Benjamin's life is a testament to her words.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor Betty Benjamin in celebration of Women's History Month. I thank her for her contributions to both the state of Minnesota and to our country, and I wish her continued successes in the future.

SUPPORT PASSAGE OF H.R. 912, THE MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 912, The Medical Use of Marijuana Act, introduced by Representative BARNEY FRANK. This bill would move marijuana from Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act to Schedule II of the Act, allowing physicians to prescribe marijuana to patients with a clear medical need for the drug.

Institute of Medicine studies have shown that components of marijuana relieve symptoms associated with terrible diseases such as AIDS, cancer, glaucoma, and epilepsy. The New England Journal of Medicine also supports the medical use of marijuana in relieving the symptoms linked with these illnesses. As an appetite stimulant, marijuana can help prevent the weight loss associated with cancer and AIDS. It can alleviate the nausea and vomiting associated with cancer chemotherapy. Marijuana has also been proven to provide some relief to patients with glaucoma and epilepsy. Additionally, marijuana can provide pain relief to millions of patients suffering from conditions ranging from post-surgery pain to chronic muscle spasms. Often the alternative pain relief options for these conditions have serious side effects such as liver and kidney damage, stomach bleeding, and ulcers. Marijuana has never been shown to cause death or serious illnesses such as these.

Opposition to medical marijuana use has often focused on the belief that legalizing the drug for medical use will lead to an increase in its recreational use. I do not condone recreational use of marijuana, nor does H.R. 912 seek to increase illicit use. This bill is simply meant to treat marijuana as we treat drugs such as morphine. It would only be available to those with a doctor's prescription.

A recent Institute of Medicine report entitled "Medicine and Health Flash," concluded that there is no convincing data to support the believe that the medical use of marijuana will lead to an increase in its illicit use. The point of making marijuana a Schedule II drug is so that it can be regulated as closely as other prescription drug with the potential for abuse. As we have learned in the failing, "War on Drugs," treating marijuana as an illicit drug in all circumstances not only fails to curb its recreational use, it eliminates a potential treatment for some of the most painful and terrible diseases. Treating marijuana as a prescription drug will give doctors more alternatives for alleviating the pain and suffering of their patients.

H.R. 912 would allow for the use and possession of marijuana by those who have been prescribed the drug by a physician. Passage of this bill will succeed in opening the door to increased research into the ways marijuana can be of a medicinal value. We must not eliminate the drug as a potential tool for alleviating the suffering of millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the Medical Use of Marijuana Act.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM ZIMMERSPITZ

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend, William Zimmerspitz, who is being honored this evening for his contributions to the community and his efforts on behalf of Judaism. Born in 1926 in Crakow, Poland, Bill survived the horrors of the Crakow-Plascow, Auschwitz, Rounienburg-Sachsenhausen and Mauthausen concentration camps during World War II.

Arriving in America in 1949, Bill lived first in Pennsylvania. He served as Vice President of Congregation Ohev Zedek, and was an active supporter of its day school, Beth Jacob, for 13 years. Oftentimes, when funds were low at the day school, Bill personally provided funding to meet the school's expenses. Bill Zimmerspitz is justly proud of his service as President of the Sabbath Observance Council of Pennsylvania.

Congregation Sons of Israel in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, is fortunate to number him among its dedicated Board members. At Congregation Sons of Israel, Bill takes an active part in various charitable efforts, most notable of which is the Gernilot Chesed fund, of which he was Chairman. Through this fund, those in need secure loans at favorable rates of interest.

As Chairman of the Cherry Hill Political Action Committee, Bill has provided outstanding leadership and much time and effort to influence U.S. policy on many issues of importance. Members of the U.S. Congress, governors and other government officials have been better able to do their jobs because of his extensive efforts.

Bill has served for several years on New Jersey's Commission of Holocaust Education, for which he spent a great deal of time traveling the State of New Jersey providing a vivid "verbal picture" of life in the ghetto and of his deep hope and belief that events such as these should never happen again.

Bill's reputation as a noted lecturer, teaching today's youth of the devastating consequences of hatred cannot be overemphasized. Unfortunately, health problems have surfaced which cause him to be unable to carry out the rigorous schedule he believes is necessary to continue his mission.

Mr. Zimmerspitz met his wife, Nancy, while living in Philadelphia, and there founded the W–Z Jewelry Company. Bill and Nancy have two daughters, Faye and Rochelle, and five grandchildren, of whom they are very proud. Three grandchildren, Aviva, Ricky and Ami live in Israel while two grandchildren, Jennifer and Ricky, live in Clifton, New Jersey.

While his contributions to Holocaust education will surely be missed, I am pleased to pay tribute to William Zimmerspitz, a true gentleman and one of the finest human beings I have ever had the privilege of knowing. A finer man you will never meet.

RECOGNIZING MARY LOUISE VIVIER

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the City of Visalia and the Kaweah Delta Health Care District to recognize Mary Louise Vivier upon her retirement. Mary Louise is the former mayor of Visalia and has worked the past 17 years at the Kaweah Delta Hospital. Her accomplishments and activities are vast and varied and they have contributed much to the good of her community.

Mary Louise's education began in 1952 when she studied nursing at the University of California at Berkeley. Later, at the Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing she became a registered nurse. Mary Louise did not end her educational endeavors there; from 1958 to 1967 she went on to obtain three more degrees from the University of California system.

Mary Louise took her educational background to many fields. Most recently she was the Community Outreach Program Director for Kaweah Delta District Hospital for which she also served as Clinical Nurse Specialist. Mary Louise held several nursing, instruction, lecturing and leadership positions in the medical field.

Along with her extensive employment history, Mary Louise has been and still is involved with a number of organizations. She is currently involved in the American Association of University Women, the Sons of Italy in America Lodge, Networking for Women, the Tulare County Women's Symphony League, Soroptomists International of Visalia, Police Activities League, the Tulare County League of Mexican American Women and Pro Youth Visalia. In 1995 she was elected to the Visalia City Council, and served as Mayor of Visalia from 1995 to 1997.

Mary Louise Vivier has gone far above the call of duty to immerse herself in the needs of others and her community. She has dedicated her life to making Visalia a great place to live. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing

Mary Louise for her service and dedication and wishing her a fulfilled and successful future.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINE KADLUB

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Christine Kadlub, the Governmental Affairs Officer for the Platte River Power Authority. Ms. Kadlub has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment to power consumers and the State of Colorado. Her tireless efforts on issues related to air quality, water and the restructuring debate have gone far to protect many diverse interests, to level the playing field with the federal government, to protect our heritage and to better our environment. Her keen insight, boundless energy, and ageless wisdom make her a special person and a great asset to Coloradans. Mr. Speaker, I commend Christine for all her efforts, and I look forward to working with her in the future.

IN HONOR OF THE PANCYPRIAN ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA DANCE DIVISION AND MR. ANDREAS CHRISTODOULOU

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to the Pancyprian Association of America Dance Division on the occasion of its 23rd Anniversary on February 6, 1999.

The Dance Division, known as the Pancyprian Dance Group, was established in 1976 with the purpose of promoting and teaching traditional Cypriot and Greek dances to the young people of the Hellenic community and others interested in dance and culture. Through dance we are able to enjoy other cultures and learn their history. Only through understanding can we establish positive linkages with our friends abroad.

The Pancyprian Association of America Dance Group has performed in many multicultural events around the United States and abroad.

They have performed before President Jimmy Carter, Senator Paul Sarbanes, Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator Bill Bradley, Congressman Benjamin Gilman, Congressman Michael Bilirakis, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, President Glafcos Clerides, President George Vasiliou, Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Dr. John Brademas, myself, and others.

The Pancyprian Dance Group has performed at Hofstra University; the Odyssey Cultural Festival; the Olympic Cultural Center, Washington, DC; the Maliotis Cultural Center, Boston, MA; and in Cyprus, Chicago, New Jersey, Tampa and New York.

This evening of celebration will also honor Andreas Christodoulou. Mr. Christodoulou was one of the founders of the organization that established the phenomenal model that President Costas Hadjicharalambous and members of the Dance Division now follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in this tribute to the Pancyprian Association of America Dance Division, a group dedicated to bringing understanding, forming bonds and educating with dance and music.

GOVERNMENTS ARE FOR PEOPLE

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in Yugoslavia, the popular belief strong cold-blooded leaders are best for the social order has again brought many innocent citizens to the hell of war. The question is why do civilized, educated people allow sovereign predators like Slobodan Milosevic to lead them into catastrophe and destruction? There are no easy answers to this question—and Serbia is far away and mysterious to most of us. But closer to home, in too many governors and mayors in America we see the glorification of the strong, cold-blooded leader. Elected executives who recklessly cut families from the welfare rolls, deny food stamps and obscure the right to medicaid exhibit the same temperament as national dictators. Across the nation elected officials are refusing to utilize the special health care program for children (Child Plus); they are also refusing to spend available funds for day care and job training programs. No one in American public life would use the phrase "ethnic cleansing", but a member of the New York Times editorial board once proudly sanctioned the concept of "planted shrinkage". Governments are for people. Cities exist to make life more enjoyable for the residents. Police are hired to protect the populace, not to serve as occupying armies. These should be self-evident truths, however there are governors and mayors who have forgotten the reason for state governments and the purpose of cities.

ANTHEM OF THE STRONG MAYOR

O say can you see
Perfection beckons me
Power Mayors show no pity
Traffic is the purpose of a City
Parks are not for dogs
Kids are worst than hogs
Playgrounds breed infant crime
Welfare mothers are a menace
Keep seniors off the street
Incontinence is never neat
Short skirts are a sin
Cops bring holy violence in
O say can you see
Order is sweet rhapsody
Great revenues we bring
With the parking ticket sting
We fill your days
With quota tow-aways
Auto bahs big and trains on time
Progress with efficiency rhymes
Traffic is the purpose of a City
Power Mayors show no pity
O say can you see
Perfection beckons me.

HONORING DR. HENRY FOSTER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT, FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, AS A LEADER IN THE HEALTHCARE INDUSTRY

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Henry W. Foster, Jr., on the occasion of his retirement, for forty-one years of service to the United States of America and the state of Tennessee, as a leading healthcare advocate and practitioner. Dr. Foster's entire professional life has been dedicated to ensuring healthy women and babies across the globe.

Dr. Henry Foster has contributed tremendously to the quality of our national healthcare. In 1995, President William Jefferson Clinton nominated him for United States Surgeon General. As a fellow Tennessean and Member of Congress, I fully supported Dr. Foster's nomination.

One year later, in 1996, President Clinton named him Senior Advisor on Teen Pregnancy Reduction and Youth Issues. That same year he was named an Expert Consultant to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and to the Director of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Dr. Foster's input on the national level has been highly valuable to our nation's healthcare as we prepare to enter the 21st Century.

He graduated from the University of Arkansas School of Medicine in 1958. During his career he has served in the U.S. Air Force, as Chief OB/GYN at Tuskegee University, and as Dean and acting President of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee.

Henry Foster has published over one hundred scientific articles and has served on numerous professional and community boards, committees and councils.

Dr. Foster implemented Meharry's "I Have a Future" Adolescent Health Promotion Program in 1987. It is a year-round, comprehensive, community based health initiative designed to reduce the incidence of early sexual activity, teenage pregnancy, alcohol, tobacco and other substance use among adolescents, ages 10–17. The program has been recognized for excellence by the Tennessee House of Representatives, the American Medical Association, the American College of Nurse Midwives-Tennessee Chapter, and former President George Bush, as the 404th Point of Light.

Dr. Foster has been honored numerous times by peers. These awards include: 1982 Man of the Year Award, Music City March of Dimes Chapter; 1992 Boss of the Year Award, Meharry Association of Office Personnel; 1995 Nashvillian of the Year Award, The Tennessee Scene Magazine; 1996 Drum Major for Justice, Martin Luther King Award, Southern Christian Leadership Council, Atlanta; 1996 Meritorious Service Award, National Medical Association, Obstetrics and Gynecology Section, Chicago; and The President's Award,

from both Meharry Medical College Alumni Association, and Morehouse College Alumni Association, 1995.

Dr. Henry Foster's work has not been limited to the United States. He has been recognized world-wide for advancement in the field of Obstetrics and Gynecology and has participated in healthcare events in Spain, Mexico, Africa, Turkey, Israel, Egypt, Canada, Southeast Asia, England, Australia, Austria, Italy, China, Vietnam, West Indies, and France.

Dr. Henry Foster has unselfishly served the citizens of the United States of America for over forty years and has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of healthcare for every woman and child. Every time Dr. Foster has been called on to serve his nation, he has done so without hesitation or reservation. His sense of duty and courage are exemplary. For these reasons I honor Dr. Henry Foster today. I wish him the best in his retirement. God bless.

REPORT FROM MADISON COUNTY, INDIANA—HOOSIER HEROES

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my "Report from Indiana" where I honor distinguished Hoosiers who are actively engaged in their communities helping others.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my strong belief that individuals and communities can do a better job of caring for those who need help in our society than the federal government. The wonderfully kind and committed Hoosiers who I have met traveling around Indiana have not changed my view.

Ruthie and I have met hundreds of individuals who are committed to making our communities a better place in which to live and raise our children—we call them "Hoosier Heroes".

I recognized this genuine Hoosier Hero in Madison County, Indiana recently in front of the Anderson Rotary Club. He is Jim Ault, who is currently retired from General Motors but hasn't been spending his time sitting around. Jim by working tirelessly on behalf of the less fortunate epitomizes a Hoosier Hero.

Jim has made Madison County a better community through his voluntary efforts. He serves on the Board of the Wilson's Girl's and Boy's Club, and raised a large amount of money so that the club may direct the energies of Anderson's youth in a positive direction. Jim is also the President of Madison County Community Foundation and he played an essential role in restoring the Paramount Theatre to its former glory and beauty.

Jim's work has given so many people, the most precious gift possible, hope. He doesn't do it for the pay, which is zilch; he does it for the smiles and laughter. Jim, you are a true hero in my book doing good works for others with no other motive than Christian charity.

Jim Ault deserves the gratitude of his county, state, and nation and I thank him here today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

HONORING LEE ECKERT

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Lee Eckert, a dedicated community leader from Millstadt, Illinois, in my congressional district.

Mr. Eckert has served the Village of Millstadt for 40 years as their Trustee. He and his wife, Lucille, live in Millstadt, where they raised their four children, Trudy, Lana, Kelly, and Toby.

Lee Eckert is retiring this month after a distinguished career of public service. During his tenure as chair of the Public Works Committee and Village Board, his tireless efforts can be recognized in many projects completed under his direction. Mr. Eckert skillfully guided the development of the Industrial Park and new sewer treatment plan for the Village of Millstadt. He also was instrumental in coordinating the building plans for the new government facility, which houses the Village Hall, Library, Mayor's Office, and until recently, the Millstadt Police Department.

What is most notable about Lee Eckert is his willingness to meet any challenge presented to him. I commend Mr. Eckert for his integrity, compassion, and commitment to the Village of Millstadt, so evident to anyone who has had the opportunity to know him. I want to join the community in thanking Mr. Eckert for his dedication and invaluable service for the past 40 years. I am confident that his future years of retirement will be as productive and fulfilling as his past.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lee Eckert for the example he has set for us all.

IN HONOR OF THE PAN GREGORIAN FUND OF METROPOLITAN NEW YORK AND LONG ISLAND, INC. ON THE OCCASION OF THE ACADEMIC AWARDS BANQUET

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to the Pan Gregorian Fund of Metropolitan New York and Long Island on the occasion of their Academic Awards Banquet on Sunday, March 7, 1999.

The Pan Gregorian Fund, spearheaded by Tassos Manesis, is a non-for-profit corporation established in 1995 by the Food Industry Cooperative of New York, Inc. The Fund's main purpose is to advance, support, and promote the Hellenic-American education system, the Greek language, and academic excellence. Its activities are directed and carried out primarily by Greek-American restaurants and others involved in the food industry.

Since its creation in 1995, the Fund has awarded over $100,000 in grants and scholarships to the top graduates of the Hellenic-American day schools, as well as teachers and principals in the New York City metropolitan area in recognition of their dedication to the education of youth.

In addition to the grant recipients, the Pan Gregorian will be honoring Dennis Mehiel, Stanley Matthews and Thomas Calamaras at the awards banquet.

Mr. Mehiel, a New York City native of Hellenic heritage, is the chairman, CEO and principal shareholder of the Four M Corporation, Sweetheart Cup Company, and The Fonda Group, Inc. Since 1978, he has been a leader in the field of education as a board member of the New Jersey independent high school for girls, a New York school for learning disabled children, Yeshiva University's Wuzweiler School of Social Work and the American Board of Overseers of Bar-ilan University.

In 1966, he returned to his birthplace, Washington Heights, and founded the "All The Way" program, a kindergarten through college education support program. "All The Way" provides educational enrichment and supplemental health and social services for children and their families, culminating in a four-year, pre-paid college education.

Mr. Matthews, born in Varvitsa, Lakonia, Greece, grew up during the German Occupation and the Civil War. He emigrated to the United States in 1951. He founded the Greek Children's Fund at Memorial-Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. As a result of a personal experience, he became acquainted with the financial and emotional stress cancer imposes on its victims and their families. His fund has raised approximately $2 million to help Greek-American families who have to deal with a life-threatening illness in addition to the added burden of adapting to a new culture.

Mr. Thomas Calamaras came to the United States as an immigrant and proceeded to establish a family food service business. Today, he and his family are an example of successful businesspeople and community-minded individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in this tribute to the Pan Gregorian Fund and its honorees, a group dedicated to extending a helping hand to others.

HONORING THE GOOD PEOPLE AT TROUT AND RALEY

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all the good people at Trout and Raley, a natural-resource oriented law firm in Denver, Colorado. Their work demonstrates an unparalleled commitment to sound practices, common sense and reason with regard to environmental policy. The tireless efforts, particularly of Mr. Bennett Raley, Mr. Jim Witwer and Mrs. Julie McKenna have gone to protect many diverse interests, to level the playing field with the federal government, to protect our heritage and to better our environment. This team is indeed a great asset to the people of the State of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I commend the people of Trout

and Raley for all their efforts, and I look forward to working with them in the future.

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE C. LAVAL III AND FAMILY

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Claude Laval III and his family for their continual support of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation (JDF). This year, the JDF chapter in Fresno is honoring Claude Laval and family as the first recipients of the ''Living & Giving Award.'' The Laval family played an instrumental part in the Pediatric Diabetes Center in Fresno, at Valley Children's Hospital. The mission statement of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation is to ''Find a cure for Diabetes and its complications through the support of research.'' Mr. Laval is an active participant in promoting the JDF mission statement.

The Laval family became involved with the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation 20 years ago when their daughter was diagnosed with Diabetes. Along with their support for JDF, the Laval family supported numerous Diabetes camps, making it possible for many children to attend the camps. They are also dedicated supporters of the JDF walks to cure Diabetes.

Claude Laval was born and raised in Fresno, he graduated from Stanford University in 1957. He is the sole owner and president of the Claude Laval Corporation. The Claude Laval Corporation is an International manufacturing company of filtration devices and down hole cameras. The Corporation is in its 27th year.

In addition to his Corporation, Claude is deeply committed to our community and actively serves on several state and local organizations. He has been on the Executive Committee of the Fresno Business Council since 1993, Chairman of the Jobs and Economic Development Committee and a member of the Fresno Business Council since 1996. Mr. Laval has served as Chairman of the Central Valley Business Incubator since 1997. His service is not only limited to the Central Valley, he serves as Director of International Forest Products in Vancouver, BC, Canada since 1994 along with a committee in Washington, DC where he is currently active on the Irrigation Association Legislative and Regulatory Committee. Claude is Director of GDT Corporation in Phoenix, Arizona and the Director of American Ground Water Trust in Concord, New Hampshire. These are just a few of the services that Mr. Laval has committed himself to.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Claude Laval III and his family, for their service to the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation. Mr. Laval is a faithful public servant, who has taken it upon himself to be a active participant in numerous causes and organizations throughout the United States and Canada. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Laude Laval and his family many more years of continued service and success.

KOSOVO IS A CAMPAIGN OF COMPASSION

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the US/NATO military intervention in Kosovo is not driven by any vested interests, financial or strategic hidden agenda. These nations are motivated by great moral interests and high standards which require that civilized people never again should tolerate any rationalization for genocide. Our nation's generous commitment of resources and the large-scale risk of American lives, not in pursuit of the usual narrow vital interests, but to protect the sacred lives of human beings that we will never know personally, represents a laudable and noble national action. The Roman Empire only dispatched its legions to achieve greater conquests. This American ''indispensable nation'' has deployed its armies in an unprecedented campaign of compassion.

Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Sadam Hussein, Ede Amin, the Hutu Generals of Rwanda; Slobodan Milosevic; call the roll of sovereign predators who have used murderous ethnic scapegoating to seize, hold and expand their powers. From ancient Egypt to Kosovo the demagogues repeatedly have used the same methods and found a willing mass of supporters. The U.S.-led resistance to genocide in Kosovo shows that finally we have not only learned a vital lesson of history, but now that knowledge also provides an imperative for painful but effective action.

Slobodan Milosevic should have been declared a war criminal eight years ago. Diplomatic patience has been cleverly manipulated by this sovereign predator. Better late than never, we must now declare Slobodan Milosevic a war criminal and send a clear message to all of his confused civilian followers now mobilizing in their neighborhoods under misplaced banners of nationalism and patriotism. For more than eight years the citizens of Serbia/Yugoslavia have failed to marshal internal sovereign resistance to the genocidal policies of their dictator. Their popular will majority's complicity with evil is the true cause of the present conflagration in the Balkans.

War is hell and we extend our prayers to innocent victims on all sides. But the refusal to watch the repeat of Hitler's death pageant is our duty. There are some who say that because we cannot stop genocide everywhere, we should refuse to stand against genocide anywhere. We can not save them all: Tutsis in Rwanda; Kurds in Iraq; Tibetans in China; but the world can take united action now. In this clear and present instance a portion of the civilized world has both the capability and the will to stop genocide. I am certain that the angels in heaven are applauding these bold and brave actions.

Since the civilian electorate of Serbia/Yugoslavia has not been willing or able to save itself from totalitarian disease; and because a minority of military monsters with tanks and machine guns can hold the majority of a nation hostage; outside intervention is sometimes the only antidote to a spreading poison. Decades of autonomy was the peaceful solution that Milosevic eradicated. Let the Kosovo campaign of compassion send a message to sovereign predators everywhere. Sovereign predators will not be allowed to savagely devour human rights. Diplomatic condemnation of genocide will always be a certainty—and sometimes military confrontation will also be possible.

I appeal to progressive thinkers everywhere to lay aside any fuzzyminded analyses and remember the Hitler syndrome. ''Never Again'' must not be an abstract slogan. Each one of us has a duty to take a forceful position. We should all be proud of the fact that this ''indispensable nation'' has both the will and the power to reinforce the foundations of a compassionate civilization.

SIKHS MARCH TO CELEBRATE 300TH BAISAKHI DAY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 10, the Sikhs of the United States marched to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the initiation of the Khalsa Panth. The march, which was led by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh and the Council of Khalistan, was a celebration of all the Sikhs in this country. Similar celebrations have been held or are being held in other countries. This was a major milestone for the Sikh Nation. I congratulate the Khalsa Panth (Sikh Nation) on their auspicious 300th Baisakhi Day.

The Sikhs received congratulations from several of my colleagues including our own Minority Whip, and also from the Mayor of Washington, DC, Anthony Williams. I note that the Governors of Texas and New Jersey have also proclaimed ''the Year of the Khalsa.'' It is good to see such bipartisan support for the Sikhs, who are being subjected to brutal atrocities and repression in India. Justice Ajit Singh Bains, Chairman of the Punjab Human Rights Organization, and General Narinder Singh from Punjab, Khalistan, spoke to the event. Their remarks were very well received, from what I am told.

I wish I could have joined my Sikh friends at this march, but I was not able to do so. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate them on this important anniversary. I look forward to greeting many of them at the upcoming Vaisakhi Day parade in New York.

This anniversary has attracted worldwide attention. The Washington Post and many other important media outlets covered this event. At this march, the Sikhs of America raised their voices loudly for freedom.

The heritage of the Sikh Nation is freedom. They ruled Punjab from 1765 to 1849. It was noted at the march that the last of the Sikh Gurus, Guru Gobind Singh, gave them a sense of national identity 300 years ago. It was pointed out that every day the Sikhs pray that they shall again rule their homeland, Punjab, Khalistan.

Sikhs are a separate people, both religiously and culturally. They are not a part of Hindu

India. No Sikh representative has ever signed the Indian constitution.

Many of us in this House, from both parties, have been calling for an end to American aid to India until it respects basic human rights and for a free and fair vote on the political status of Punjab, as well as notes on the status of Kashmir, Nagaland, and all the nations living under Indian rule. This auspicious anniversary would be a good time to renew that call and renew our efforts to bring freedom, peace, and prosperity to all the people of South Asia.

I insert the Washington Post article in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1999]

SIKHS PARADE AND PRAY FOR SEPARATE NATION

(By Caryle Murphy)

Chanting praises to their greatest guru and walking behind a giant model of their Golden Temple, several thousand Sikhs marched down Constitution Avenue yesterday to celebrate the 300th anniversary of their religion's most sacred event, the creation of the first community of Sikh believers.

Five bearded Sikh priests bearing long daggers and dressed in saffron-hued turbans, led the colorful Khalsa March '99 from the Lincoln Memorial to the Capitol. A float carried the Sikh scripture, Granth, which was covered by a silver canopy decorated with flowers.

The march, which drew many of the Washington area's 7,000 Sikhs and others from across the country, was mainly to honor Sikhism.

''I came to celebrate our religion and what it's given to humanity,'' said Permeil Dass, 24, of Cleveland, who works in a community computer center.

''Our religion is very modern,'' she added, noting that it opposes inequality between human beings, the worship of idols and use of intoxicants.

But yesterday's day-long event was as much political as religious, with speakers at a pre-parade rally calling for an independent Sikh nation—to be named Khalistan—in the northwest Indian state of Punjab, home of the Sikh religion. The Indian government opposes a separate Sikh state in Punjab.

''In the Sikh religion, religion and politics are inseparable,'' said Gurmit Singh Aulakh, head of the District-based Council of Khalistan, one of the groups sponsoring yesterday's event. ''We are aware that without political power no religion can flourish.''

Among the banners carried in the parade were ones that said, ''To Save Sikhism, Sikhs Want-Khalistan'' and ''A Sikh Nation, On the Move.''

In an interview, San Diego resident Harinder Singh indicated that nationalism, as much as religious devotion, had brought him to yesterday's event.

''This is the least we can do to have some political voice around the world,'' the 36-year-old software engineer said. The message he hoped to deliver, he added, was that ''sooner or later [Khalistan] is going to happen.''

On Friday, the Indian Embassy's Deputy Chief of Mission T.P. Sreenivasan, said celebrations of the Sikh religion are ''something we heartily support.''

As for political demands voiced at the parade, Sreenivasan added: ''This is a free country. But that is not the purpose of the march.''

In a 1984 crackdown on Sikh militants, Indian police raided their Golden Temple at Amritsar. In retaliation, Sikh bodyguards killed Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi five months later.

Yesterday's event, which Aulakh estimated drew 25,000 Sikhs, commemorated the day in 1699 when the 10th and greatest Sikh teacher, Guru Gobind Singh, initiated Khalsa Panth, the ''Brotherhood of the Pure.''

Khalsa Panth is the community of those who commit themselves to the tenets of Sikhism. In creating Khalsa Panth, Gobind broadened authority within the religion and took the final step, Sikhs believe, in the centuries-long establishment of their religion, which began in the 1400s with the first Sikh teacher, Guru Nanak.

Before yesterday's march, the Sikhs gathered in front of the Lincoln Memorial, where many waved small U.S. flags and saffron-colored flags with the blue Sikh symbol of Khalsa. On state, musicians played Sikh songs on the harmonium and drums called ''tabla.''

Dressed in long, flowing tunics with matching pantaloons, women wound their way up a red carpet to kneel and kiss their holy scripture, dropping offerings of a dollar or two. Later, all stood in place with hands folded and heads bowed for a communal prayer. Then it was time to march.

IN HONOR OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY, AND THEIR ANNUAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY OBSERVANCE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Jewish Community Center of Bayonne, New Jersey, on their annual Holocaust Remembrance Day Observance.

The Jewish Community Center, headed by co-chairmen Aaron and Michael Kessel, has organized a remarkable program designed to provide understanding about the horrors of the Holocaust through education; our most important and fundamental tool in promoting the truth about the Holocaust. Using the theme ''In Darkness there is Light,'' the message is that even at one's lowest moment—when one is stricken with despair and sees no way out—even then, there is still hope; there is still possibility; there is still life.

From the eighth grade students who will be taking part in a special assembly program to the seventh grade students who will be meeting with teacher volunteers to the proclamation which will be given by the mayor of Bayonne and honorary chair of the event, Mr. Joseph Doria, this day of remembrance and recognition is an all-encompassing event. Supported by the city of Bayonne, the Bayonne Interfaith Clergy and the Jewish Community Center, the goal is to bring all members of the community together to learn and discuss the atrocities of not only the Holocaust but the repercussions of prejudice, discrimination, degradation—the driving force behind the Holocaust.

The highlight of the event, however, is sure to be from the guest speaker and Holocaust survivor, Mr. Fred Margolies. Mr. Margolies fled from Germany to Holland following the ''Kristalnacht.'' At only 11 years old, Mr. Margolies had to endure unimaginable pains in order to survive. Once arriving in the United States, Mr. Margolies made it a priority to not let his experiences go silenced. Rather, he was pro-active in many organizations, serving as former Vice President to the Long Island Committee for Soviet Jewry and to the Temple of Shalom in Westbury. Presently, Mr. Margolies serves on the New York State Holocaust Education and Jewish Advisory Committee of Nassau County and speaks extensively on college campuses, public and private schools, and community organizations.

For these tremendous contributions to New Jersey and their unwavering commitment to fighting discrimination, I am very happy to honor all of the individuals who have worked so diligently on this event. I salute and congratulate all of them on their extraordinary accomplishments to the Jewish Community.

OVER-TAXED CITIZENS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, it is time we hear the cries of the American taxpayer and offer much needed tax relief to the citizens of this country. This week I am especially reminded of the many hardworking families in Southern California and across the country who foot the bill year after year for Washington's tax and spend mentality.

Every year, the federal government takes more and more tax dollars from America's families. Today the average American family pays more in local, state and federal taxes than for food, clothing, shelter and transportation combined. In fact, the Census Bureau recently reported that the average household pays $9,445 in annual federal income taxes alone—twice that paid in 1985. Yet despite a projected surplus of $4.9 trillion over the next 15 years, taxpayers will pay more than $10 trillion in taxes to the federal government over the next five years and more than $22 trillion over the next ten years!

Mr. Speaker, while the President fights to raise taxes, my Republican colleagues and I are struggling to lower them. I think the choice to lower taxes is an obvious one. We must keep hard-earned wages where they belong—in the pockets of those who earn them. We must stand up for the American taxpayer.

TRIBUTE TO ROD KUHARICH OF COLORADO SPRINGS UTILITIES

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rod Kuharich of Colorado Springs Utilities. Mr. Kuharich has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment to power consumers and the State of Colorado.

His tireless efforts on issues related to air quality, water and Endangered Species Act reform have gone far to protect many diverse interests, to level the playing field with the federal government, to protect our heritage and to better our environment. Mr. Kuharich's keen insight and wealth of experience is a great benefit to Coloradans. Mr. Speaker, I commend Rod for all his efforts, and I look forward to working with him in the future.

HONORING RICHARD KRESEVITEH GILBERT FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize one of Pennsylvania's outstanding young students; Mr. Richard Kreseviteh Gilbert. This February, Richard attained the coveted rank of Eagle Scout, a distinguished goal that only 2 percent of Boy Scouts reach. Rich's achievement is the culmination of years of hard work, dedication, and community service.

Each Eagle Scout candidate is required to have earned a minimum of 23 Merit Badges, as well as contribute as least 100 man-hours toward a community oriented service project. Richard Gilbert, true to his selfless Scout nature, went above and beyond these minimum requirements, earning 33 Merit Badges and logging over 400 man-hours on his Eagle Scout Project. For his particular project, Rich chose to design and build a new retaining wall between American Legion Post 660 and St. Ireanaeus Church in his hometown of Oakmont.

Under his direction, Richard and 33 others gave up their summer vacations to work on the old retaining wall which had deteriorated on the S. Ireanaeus school playground. He and his crew worked through the hottest months of this summer to shape 120 ties and 22 tons of gravel into a wall which measures 6 feet tall and 110 feet long. Because of Richard's exemplary commitment to his project, St. Ireanaeus Church and Post 660 both sponsored his efforts, and Conrail graciously donated the needed railroad ties. Not only did Rich's labor improve the aesthetic beauty of the community, but it greatly improved the safety of the nearby playground.

Richard Kreseviteh Gilbert is currently a Junior at Riverview High School in Oakmont, and continues to shine as an outstanding leader among both his classmates and fellow Scouts in Troop 7854. His Scoutmaster, Mr. Dave Scatina has certainly provided the guidance and leadership that promote the growth of outstanding young Scouts like Rich. I am honored to stand here today in sincere praise of this outstanding example of the importance of community involvement. Congratulations Richard, your achievements make us all very proud.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION ON INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT FUNDING

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues to introduce a resolution calling on the President and Congress to fully fund the federal government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, commonly known as P.L. 94–142. The Act built upon previous legislation to mandate that all States provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) to all disabled children by 1978. It also established the federal commitment to provide funding aid at 40% of the average per pupil expenditure to assist with the excess costs of educating students with disabilities. Historically, however, the appropriations for IDEA have not come close to reaching the 40% level. Federal funding has never risen above 12% of the cost. As a result, local schools and States are picking up the tab for an additional 28% above their fair share of special education costs.

As a former Governor, I have a unique understanding of special education funding and the tremendous burden this unfunded mandate places on schools. Local school districts spend on average 20 percent of their budgets on special education. Put simply, local schools are expected to pay much more than their fair share. This needs to change. If the federal government fulfilled its special education obligation for local schools, Washington would not have to step in to address issues such as class size reduction and building new school buildings. These decisions could be left up to local school districts who better understand the dynamics and needs of their students. This is precisely why the federal government must fulfill the commitment it made in 1975.

In Delaware, for instance, our largest school district, the Christina School District, currently receives $800,000 per year in special education funding. The federal commitment is to pay Christina School District $4.4 million. This means that if we fulfilled our commitment, Christina School District would have an additional $3.3 million to focus on the needs of their students and teachers. The entire State of Delaware, if special education were fully funded, would receive an additional $24.8 million. This is a tremendous amount of money, that is desperately needed by local schools in order to reduce class size, build and modernize schools, and implement technology into education. If the federal government fulfills its commitment to fund 40% of special education costs, States and schools across the nation would have the opportunity to focus their funds on the unique and individualized needs of their schools.

The Republican Congress has worked to increase special education funding. Since 1995, IDEA funding has increased by over 85%. This is an increase of approximately $1.4 billion. Congress now needs to garner the support of the President and the Administration to make IDEA funding a priority for our nation's schools.

WOMEN AND BUSINESS

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the enormous contribution women have made to the economy. As a Member of the Small Business Committee and life-long Long Islander, the issue of small business is an important one to me.

As we approach the new millennium, an increasing number of women are starting their own businesses. According to the National Foundation of Women's Business Owners, as of 1997 there were 8.5 million women-owned businesses in the United States employing over 23 million people and generating close to 3.1 trillion in sales as of 1997. Between 1987 and 1997, the number of women-owned firms increased by 89% nationwide, and as of 1996 women-owned businesses accounted for 36% of all firms in the United States.

Knowing how important small businesses are to our economy, I hope we will continue supporting the collection of data on women owned businesses as a regular part of the economic census of business. The knowledge such data provides is truly priceless, and I want to ensure it remains fully funded every year. Thousands of remarkable women have made significant advances for our economy, and they deserve nothing less than our full support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday returning from my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following three roll call votes: No. 78 on H. Res. 135 regarding amendments to H.R. 98, Aviation War Risk Insurance Program Extension; No. 79 on H.R. 911, to designate the new Federal Building in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the "Terry Sanford Federal Building"; and No. 80 on H. Con. Res. 68, instructing conferees on the FY 2000 budget to protect Social Security and Medicare.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNSON'S CORNER

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in Larimer County, Colorado, there is a family-owned

business, Johnson's Corner, which has been named as one of the top ten best places in the world to eat breakfast, and was the only United States restaurant to be named. Founded by Joe Johnson in 1953 along Interstate 25 before it was an interstate, it is now run by his widow, Virginia, and stepson, Chauncey Taylor.

What distinguishes Johnson's Corner from all the rest? According to Travel & Leisure magazine, it's the restaurant's cinnamon rolls. Today, I wish to confirm that the "World Famous Cinnamon Rolls" are the best and deserve recognition as does the restaurant business itself.

A way station for travelers driving the interstate highway, this old-fashioned, 24-hour truck stop lit up with neon signs, serves up cinnamon rolls and other good food on formica-topped tables in a family atmosphere. The nearly 50-year old business maintains a great deal of pride in its service to a clientele of farmers, truckers, cowboys, bikers, and tourists. In addition, its location and hospitality have proven to be a good place for Members of Congress and other elected officials to hold town meetings.

It is for these reasons I happily rise today to honor the Johnson family and their employees at Johnson's Corner. I hold them up to the House and to all Americans, as a fine example of the best of America's businesses. They exemplify the industrious spirit and can-do-attitude that have made America great.

CONGRATULATING THE SIKH NATION ON ITS 300th BAISAKHI DAY SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE SIKHS

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, the Sikh Nation will celebrate its 300th Baisakhi Day. This is a major milestone for the Sikhs of America and the world, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate them on this occasion.

More than 40,000 Sikhs came to Washington, D.C. this past weekend to celebrate with a march organized by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, who is a friend of many of ours. The march was a huge success, and I would like to congratulate Dr. Aulakh and everyone who was involved in this very successful event. Through their hard work one of the largest groups that Washington has seen in a long time showed up to celebrate the Sikh heritage and declare the need for a free and independent Khalistan.

There are about 500,000 Sikhs in the United States. They are part of a vibrant 22-million strong Sikh community around the world. They have added to America in many different fields of endeavor. Here the Sikhs live in freedom and prosperity. Yet in their homeland, Punjab, Khalistan, they suffer under the brutal tyranny of the Indian government. Under this brutal policy, the Indian government has murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs since 1984. Thousands more are held in Indian jails, most without charge or trial.

Sikhism is an independent, monotheistic, revealed religion. It is not part of any other religion, though it does have some beliefs that are also held by other religions. Like Christians and Muslims, Sikhs have been victims of the Hindu extremists who dominate Indian life. Like Christians and Muslims, Sikhs are religiously and culturally distinct from Hindu India.

The Sikhs have a heritage of self-rule. They ruled Punjab independently from 1765 to 1849. No representative of the Sikh people has ever signed the constitution of India, 51 years after India became independent. In October 1987, Khalistan declared itself independent from India, much as we declared our own independence in 1776. They created the Council of Khalistan, headed by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, to serve as the government pro tempore and lead the peaceful struggle for independence.

What we know as India never existed before the British created it. Prior to the British conquest of South Asia, the region had many countries which ruled themselves. Just as the Soviet Union's multiethnic empire collapsed, so must India's. It is inevitable. Given India's nuclear weapons and missile development, the world must remain alert to make certain that South Asia does not become another Balkan Peninsula full of Bosnias and Kosovos. The best way to do that is to work for peaceful solutions to the region's ethnic and religious violence.

In previous Congresses, I have sponsored a resolution calling for a free and fair plebiscite under international supervision to achieve a peaceful solution to the issue of independence for Khalistan. I urge the same also for Kashmir, where it was promised by India in 1947, for Nagaland, and for all the states and regions where there are independence movements. This is the democratic way to settle these issues, and India claims to be a democracy. Let the world see Indian democracy in action by scheduling these plebiscites now. If it is good enough for the people of Puerto Rico and Quebec, it is good enough for the people of Khalistan, Kashmir, Nagaland, and the rest of South Asia.

In addition to calling for a plebiscite, we should end U.S. aid to India until basic human rights can be freely exercised by all people under India's rule and we should declare India a violator of religious liberty for the killings of Christians, Muslims, Sikhs, and others, then impose the sanctions that this status brings. If the situation changes, the sanctions can and should be lifted.

Congratulations again to the Sikhs on their 300th anniversary. May this occasion mark not just an anniversary, but a new birth of freedom in South Asia.

REPORT FROM MUNCIE, INDIANA—HOOSIER HEROES

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my "Report from Indiana" where I honor distinguished fellow Hoosiers who are actively engaged in their communities helping others.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my strong belief that individuals and communities can do a better job of caring for those who need help in our society than the federal government. The wonderfully kind and committed Hoosiers who I have met traveling around Indiana have not changed my view.

Ruthie and I have met hundreds of individuals who are committed to making our communities a better place in which to live and raise our children—we call them "Hoosier Heroes".

There is a genuine Hoosier Hero in Muncie, Indiana. He is Craig Miller, who I am proud to say is a constituent of mine and has made our community a better place to live.

Craig has made Muncie a better place through his voluntary efforts. He is on the Board of the Indiana Red Cross; in fact, he spent so much time on others needs, they made him, "Volunteer of the Year for 1997", because of his efforts on behalf of the less fortunate. Craig also serves on the Board of the Boys' and Girls' Club in Muncie.

His work has given so many people the most precious gift possible, hope. Craig doesn't do it for the pay which is zilch; he does it for the smiles and laughter. You are a true hero in my book, doing good work for others with no other motive than Christian charity.

Craig Miller deserves the gratitude of his city, state, and nation and I thank him here today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO SHERLLYNN RUSSO

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the achievements of a special person, Ms. Sherllynn Russo. This evening she is being honored as one of the Clinton Township Goodfellows of the Year recipients for 1997–1998 by community members and friends.

The members of the Clinton Township Goodfellows have contributed their time and resources to the betterment of the community for many years. Their goal is to aid the public in ways that other charities and the government could not. For the past five years, Sherllynn has served in various Board positions for the Goodfellows. She has done particularly commendable work on behalf of children. She has co-chaired the Christmas Toy Committee for the past two years providing joy to many children who otherwise might not have had a merry Christmas.

Sherllynn is employed by the General Motors Corporation as a Communications Manager, but still finds the time to volunteer in many community organizations. She is an Executive Advisor for Junior Achievement of Southeast Michigan, the President of the Board of Directors of her home owners association and Financial Secretary for the G.M. Women's Club.

The Clinton Township Goodfellows know that they can count on Sherllynn as they honor her this evening. I would like to congratulate Sherllynn Russo as she celebrates

this auspicious occasion with family and friends.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF THE KOESTER CORPORATION FOR ITS OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO THE DEFIANCE COMMUNITY FOR THE PAST THIRTY YEARS

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay special tribute to a remarkable, community-minded organization from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District—the Koester Corporation.

In 1970, guided by an unwavering commitment to quality and entrepreneurial spirit, William C. Koester founded the Koester Corporation. For the past thirty years, the Koester Corporation has been an integral part of the Defiance community, and has been a key player in the manufacturing industry in Northwest Ohio and around the world.

Through Mr. Koester's innovation and determination, the Koester Corporation has grown from the small firm of three employees he started in the early 1970's, to an industrial heavyweight with approximately sixty employees, conducting its business both domestically and in the international marketplace. Throughout its success, the Koester Corporation has maintained its presence and headquarters in Defiance for almost thirty years.

Mr. Speaker, the true greatness of American productivity and manufacturing prowess is evident from the unique history of the Koester Corporation. With great expectations and more than a little hard work, William Koester has transformed his vision into a highly successful manufacturing and process control business. With the combination of his vision and the dedication and talents of the employees at the Koester Corporation, the recipe for success is written. At the same time, Mr. Koester has maintained his commitment to the local community and has strived to succeed as a good community partner, as well.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that America succeeds due to the outstanding contributions of her citizens. In the case of William C. Koester and the Koester Corporation, I think that adage is very appropriate. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to the Koester Corporation. For its thirty years of service to business, industry, and the Defiance area, we offer our sincere gratitude and our best wishes for the future.

RECOGNITION OF SPEECH BY STUDENT GOVERNOR REBECCA DESILETS UXBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the superb speech delivered by Rebecca Desilets, a Senior at Uxbridge High School. Ms. Desilets was elected Student Governor for the 1999 Massachusetts Student Government Day. For the past 52 years, the high schools of Massachusetts have democratically elected student delegates to assume the roles of constitutional officers, court justices, and members of the General Court on Student Government Day. This has been a most worthwhile experiment in state government. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered by Ms. Desilets is both eloquent and timely, and it is with great pride that I submit it for the RECORD.

Ms. Rebecca Desilets, Student Governor, Uxbridge High School. It's quite remarkable to see so many of us here in this historical chamber. I use the word remarkable because we are here as a result of an interest in government. We won our elections in our respective high schools. We took the risk and threw our hats into the ring. This is remarkable. At a time when the political talking heads have focused their attention on scandal and investigation, when TV news coverage devotes more time to a stain on a dress than to the President's many attempts to discuss Kosovo, it becomes easy to turn off, to become cynical about government and politics.

A cynicism has infiltrated our view of the political process. The very word ''politics'' conveys a negative connotation. Who hasn't heard the seemingly endless jokes of the late night show hosts? Is nothing sacred or off limits? No wonder there is such distrust of the American political system. No wonder there is apathy among the citizens of this nation.

In preparation for Student Government Day, I conducted a survey of my peers. This was a random sampling of the Juniors and Seniors at my high school. It is pretty safe to say that although my survey may not be 100% scientific, it is accurate enough to be a reflection of what you would find if repeated at your high school. I was trying to get a handle on how cynical our age group has become. The results were depressing to say the least. Let me give some of the findings. 75% of the respondents blamed their distrust of government on political parties, on lack of bipartisanship. 60% stated that the political scandals of late had added to their negativity. In the comment area that I provided there were some interesting opinions and observations made. The word ''corruption'' appeared over and over again as an explanation for the pessimism toward government. Perhaps even more significantly, many students attributed their distrust to the media. Specifically, the press was blamed for focusing on the worst case scenarios of political blunder and bad behavior. One responder said that politicians were more concerned with the ''power prize'' than with the common good, the good of the American people. Politicians are viewed by many as motiviated by self-interest rather than the good of the people they represent.

What is the cause of this cynicism? Of course, some of it comes from politicians and the political party system. Our forefathers were right to have a fear of party politics, of faction. It is also a result of an unrestrained press and the race for great ratings.

It is up to us to reduce the effects of cynicism. However, we can't nor should we eliminate it. A healthy skepticism is a good thing, no doubt. But how can we make sure that voters don't get so turned off that they stay away from the polls, that they simply do not participate in this democracy?

As you probably know, last November's election had one of the lowest turnouts ever. Sure we can rationalize and blame it on the candidates. You know those people who say ''I didn't vote because I didn't like either candidate''; or the oldest excuse ''I didn't vote because my vote doesn't really make a difference.''

Adlai Stevenson, a Governor of Illinois and a presidential candidate in the 1950s, said: ''As citizens of this American democracy, you are the rulers and the ruled, the lawgivers and the law-abiding, the beginning and the end.'' Stevenson was right. We do have an active role to play as citizens of our towns or cities, state, and country. We have rights but also responsibilities.

I know that this room is filled with people who are interested. We care about capital punishment, health care, and education. We may be somewhat cynical but this doesn't stop us from knowing what is at stake in Kosovo.

We are the voters who will decide the issues of the 21st Century. Some of us will be the policy makers of the new millenium. Let us send the message, as we are in a small way just by being here, that cynicism will not keep us from our responsibilities as citizens. In fact, let us be the ones that replace cynicism with healthy skepticism. Jay Leno may make us laugh, he will not turn us off. The Drudge Report can contain sensational gossip, but it won't keep us away from the polls. There may be scandal and corruption but some of us will still consider politics as honorable and public service a priviledge.

TRIBUTE TO THE PUEBLO PACHYDERM CLUB

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the Pueblo Pachyderm Club of Pueblo, Colorado for its outstanding leadership and years of exemplary service to the local community.

This patriotic association brings together common citizens to discuss and consider a wide spectrum of political topics both national and local in scope.

Colorado Governor Bill Owens last month proclaimed April 20, 1999 Pueblo Pachyderm Day in the State of Colorado. In honor of this recognition, I hereby submit for the RECORD a copy of the Governor's declaration.

STATE OF COLORADO, HONORARY PROCLAMATION—PUEBLO PACHYDERM DAY APRIL 20, 1999

Whereas, the organization represents a unique concept for political clubs by being patterned after the weekly meeting type luncheon clubs, with programs centered around political and governmental affairs; and

Whereas, the Pueblo Pachyderm Club promotes the development of future political leaders and citizen participation as embodied in their motto, ''Free Government Requires Active Citizens,'' and is open to both male and female members; and

Whereas, the Pachyderm Clubs promote better government through club programs and meetings open to the public, providing scholarships for political science students,

sponsoring campaign workshops and encouraging awareness of political affairs;

Now, Therefore, I, Bill Owens, Governor of the State of Colorado, do hereby proclaim April 20, 1999, as Pueblo Pachyderm Day in the State of Colorado.

GIVEN under my hand and the Executive Seal of the State of Colorado, this tenth day of March 1999.

BILL OWENS *Governor*.

A FEW OUTSTANDING WOMEN

HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand before the House of Representatives today and acknowledge the tremendous contributions of the women of the sixth congressional district of Georgia to our state and nation. In particular I want to acknowledge the contributions of women in business.

The growth and economic prosperity of Georgia's economy has been paralleled by the growth of Women-Owned Businesses and Enterprises. Their contributions have provided quality jobs, innovative services, and new products for Georgia.

I am very pleased to inform you that Georgia is now the second fastest growing state in America in terms of women business owners. For just a moment I would like to tell you about a few of these outstanding women.

Carolyn Stradley, the founder and owner of C and S Paving in Marietta, Georgia is a true success story. Orphaned as a child and a school dropout as a teenager, Carolyn founded her business with a shovel and determination. Today she sits on the National Women's Business Council, and is one of Georgia's leading contractors.

Jane Carithers, along with her husband Larry, owns and operates the successful Carithers Florist in Marietta, Georgia. Jane is Georgia's leading florist and an innovator in her field. She initiated the use of flowers and floral arrangements for business promotion, office interiors, and community benefits. Even while reaching the heights of her profession, she still commits time and resources to many community events and programs.

Jackie Ward, founder of Computer Generations, is one of North America's leading developers of computer technology and services to corporate America. Jackie has created jobs for thousands of men and women in Georgia and the United States. While building her business she has also worked to bring business to Georgia by serving as the first woman President in the history of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

So many women in so many ways are growing Georgia's economy. Women in real estate like Pat DiGeorge, Mitzi Jaznicki, Mary Ann Anziano, Gail Hurst, Sandra Eades, Shirley Hardman, and Annie Parker. Women in homebuilding like Kay Cantrell, and in new home marketing like Bea McDowell. Women in commercial planning and design like Bianca Quantrell, and women in economic development like Annie Hunt Burrus.

I could acknowledge so many more for all they have done and contributed to Georgia. I am very pleased that the Congressional Caucus for Women's issues has chosen to acknowledge the contribution of women, and I am pleased to recognize the tremendous contribution of women in business throughout the sixth district of Georgia.

SIKH MARCH FOR BAISAKHI SUPPORTS FREE KAHLISTAN

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend the Khalsa March this past Saturday. The March celebrated the 300th anniversary of the Sikh Nation. Over 40,000 people from all over America attended this special event. I thank my friend Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, for inviting me to this auspicious occasion.

There are 22 million Sikhs in the world and nearly 500,000 here in the United States. They have enriched American life in almost every walk of life, including law, farming, medicine and many other. I was interested in learning that a Sikh named Dalip Singh Saund even served in the U.S. Congress. I would like to take this opportunity to salute their contributions to this country.

Mr. Speaker, the March was truly a success. There was a tremendous amount of excitement in the air, as they celebrated their heritage of freedom and showed their support for regaining their lost sovereignty in an independent homeland they call khalistan. Their struggle against the oppression that the Indian government inflicts on them should be supported by every American and by those who support freedom around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Khalistan has issued a press release about the March. I would like to place this press release into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

[From the Council of Khalistan, April 12, 1999]

KHALSA MARCH VERY SUCCESSFUL—OVER 40,000 SIKHS COME TO WASHINGTON, DC TO CELEBRATE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF KHALSA PANTH

WASHINGTON, DC, APRIL 12.—Over 40,000 Sikhs, more than twice as many as expected, came to Washington, D.C. on Saturday, April 10 to participate in Khalsa March 1999, celebrating the 300th anniversary of the day that Guru Gobind Singh baptized the Sikh Nation. It was the first time that so many Sikh gathered in the Nation's Capital. A sea of saffron turbans and scarves could be seen around the Reflecting Pool. There are 22 million Sikhs world wide and about 500,000 here in the United States.

The mood of attendees was jubilant and excited as they celebrated the Sikh heritage. The celebration began in front of the Lincoln Memorial, which is a symbol of freedom, and the participants marched to the U.S. Capitol. The stage displayed pictures of Guru Gobind Singh Baptizing the Panj Pyaras (the Five Beloved Ones), depictions of Gurdwara Kesgarh Sahib, the birthplace of the Sikh Nation, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest Sikh shrine, other major events in Sikh history, and banners with slogans like ''Indian Free Khalistan'', ''Long Live Khalistan'', etc.

''Guru Gobind Singh gave the Sikh Nation a heritage of freedom,'' said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, the coordinator of the march. ''Today we had a joyous celebration of that heritage,'' he said. ''Now we must dedicate ourselves to freeing our homeland, Khalistan.''

Participants in the march celebrated with family and friends and raised slogans. They carried banners that said ''India Free Khalistan,'' ''Long Live Khalistan,'' and ''Raj Karega Khalsa.'' There was a float bearing a replica of the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest of Sikh shrines, and another promoting ''Khalistan—the Sikh Nation on the Move.

Speakers included dignitaries from Punjab, Khalistan like Justice Ajit Singh Bains, chairman of the Punjab Human Rights Organization (PHRO), and retired General Narinder Singh, as well as U.S. Congress Dan Burton (R-Ind.), Dr. Walter Landry, Executive Director of the Think-Tank for National Self-Determination, representatives of Sikh women and youth, and others.

Justice Bains discussed the genocide and human-rights violations that the Indian government has committed against the Sikh Nation since 1984. He said that there is no rule of law in Punjab. He pointed out the Indian government's policy of mass cremations of Sikhs, which the Indian supreme Court called ''worse then a genocide.''

General Narinder Singh spoke of the sovereignty of the Sikh Nation. He noted that Guru Gobind Singh gave the Sikh Nation sovereignty and that this sovereignty is part of the Khalsa birthright. He said that there is no reason why the Khalsa Panth should not have sovereignty.

Congressman Burton offered his continued support for the Sikh cause. He spoke against the Indian government's atrocities against Sikhs, Christians, Muslims, and other minorities. He urged that the United States stop supporting the Indian government. He said that Sikhs should have their freedom and that the United States should support it. Many other Members of Congress sent their greetings, including House Minority Leader David Bonior (D-Mich.), Congressman Nick Rahall (D-WV), and others.

Mayor Anthony Williams of Washington, D.C. sent a message of congratulations. He wrote, ''It is my distinct pleasure to extend warm greetings and congratulations to the members, guests and friends of the Council of Khalistan as you celebrate your 300th anniversary of the initiation of the Khalsa Panth. This is a significant milestone in the history of the world's religions as you celebrate Vaisaakhee Day.'' Mayor Williams added that ''you are to be congratulated for your efforts to provide spiritual enhancement to the principles of peace, prosperity, dignity, integrity, human rights and justice for all.''

Dr. Paramjit Singh Ajrawat, the Secretary of the march and Master of Ceremonies at the Lincoln Memorial, reminded the audience that Guru Gobind Singh created the Khalsa and recognized the whole human race as equal, including gender equality. He noted that Abraham Lincoln also worked to end slavery.

Attendees passed resolutions to reiterate their support for a free Khalistan, the Sikh homeland that was declared independent on October 7, 1987; to honor Sikh martyrs; to ask the Indian government to release the tens of thousands of Sikh political prisoners

it is holding; and to demand that the Akal Takht, the seat of the Sikh religion, be freed from the Badal government, asking the Khalsa Panth to boycott and oppose the Badal government; asking the Khalsa Panth to boycott and oppose the Badal government; and to declare there full support for Jathedar Bhai Ranjit Singh as the genuine Jathedar of the Akal Takht.

''Sikhs are religiously, culturally, and linguistically distinct from Hindu India or any other nation,'' said Dr. Aulakh. ''On this once-in-a-lifetime, milestone anniversary, let us dedicate ourselves to reclaiming our lost sovereignty,'' he said.

''Nations and religions that do not have political power do not survive,'' Dr. Aulakh said. ''Under Indian rule, the Sikhs are the victims of genocide,'' he said.

Since 1984, the Indian government has murdered more than 250,000 Sikhs. Tens of thousands more languish in Indian jails without charge or trial. Some of the have been there since 1984. India has also murdered than 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, over 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, and tens of thousands of Assamese, Manipuris, Tamils, Dalits (''black untouchables,'' the aboriginal people of the subcontinent), and others.

''The atrocities clearly show that for Sikhs, India is not a democracy,'' Said Dr. Aulakh. ''Every day we pray 'Raj Kare Ga Khalsa,' the Khalsa shall rule ,'' he said. ''It is time to keep our promise to the Guru, live up to our heritage, and unite to liberate Khalistan,'' he said.

''MY SERVICE TO AMERICA''

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize an impressive young North Dakotan. Margretta Hanson of Blanchard is the winner of the 1999 Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Contest. Miss Hanson's essay is based on the theme "My Service To America."

I am very pleased to see such wonderful patriotism and values coming from North Dakota's youth. It is my pleasure to submit Miss Hanson's essay for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY SERVICE TO AMERICA

1998–99 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP COMPETITION

NORTH DAKOTA WINNER MARGRETTA HANSON

''Be all that you can be,'' is a popular slogan of the United States Army. By joining the armed forces, one is showing true patriotism and devotion to the protection and betterment of our great nation, the United States of America. To put one's life on the line by defending the freedoms of the people of this country is a noble deed, but I feel that this is not the only way that one can give service to America. My service to America is to ''be all that I can be'' as an American citizen. We don't have to risk our lives to make a difference. By simply smiling as you pass someone on the street or in the hallway, you're bringing joy into the lives of others. Theodore Roosevelt once said, ''Do what you can, with what you have, where you are.'' I want to make the most of the talents and opportunities that I have been blessed with.

Some people say that the future of the United States is looking glum. They fear that our youth are committing more crimes, they fear that our youth are abusing more illegal substances, they fear that our youth are showing less respect, they fear that our youth are becoming less motivated, and they fear that our youth are lacking ethical morals and values. What can I do to change the destiny of my generation? Benjamin Franklin wrote in Poor Richard's Almanac, ''A good example is the best sermon of all.'' Through my service to America, I am ''preaching'' to my peers through the positive choices I make in my life. Joined with the efforts of other young men and women of my generation who are also striving to make positive choices in their personal lives, my efforts will make a difference.

I have been a Girl Scout for 11 years. In Girl Scouts, we promise,

''On my honor, I will try:
To serve God and my country,
To help people at all times,
And to live by the Girl Scout Law.''

A large part of being a Girl Scout is trying to help other people by following our promise and law. I have held true to my promise by giving my time and talents for the betterment of my community and church. By investing my time in community service and church activities, I am not only bettering my community, but I am also setting a positive example for others.

I strongly believe that the best leadership is leadership by example. The impact of one individual who sets a good example is amazing. It is important to me that I do what I can to better myself and the world around me by making positive choices. One person who develops a strong set of values and upholds themself to high moral standards can make a positive influence on the lives of others. The power of a single individual who tries to be the best person he or she possibly can as they put their talents to work for the betterment of themself, their work, and others is very impressive. By making positive choices in my own life, I am serving as a role-model for everyone around me. My service to America is setting a good example for others in the choices that I have made and the choices I will make in the future.

I am working towards the ultimate goal of being all that I can be by working hard towards my goals, showing respect towards others, and abstaining from destructive behaviors. These choices, among others, are permitting me to work towards becoming all that I can be.

I have challenged myself to be all that I can be. My service to America is not one of enlistment in the armed forces, but one that I hope will be beneficial to myself, my community, and this great nation.

FEDERAL JUDGES FOR FLORIDA ACT

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Judges for Florida Act that will provide seven additional federal district court judgeships in Florida.

The Federal Judges for Florida Act will provide five new judgeships in the Middle District of Florida and two new judgeships in the Southern District of Florida. These new judgeships are based on the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Although the Judicial Conference has repeatedly recommended additional federal district judgeships for Florida, a new federal judgeship has not been created in the state since 1990.

The Middle District stretches 400 miles from Jacksonville to Naples and is broken up into five divisions: Jacksonville, Ocala, Orlando, Tampa and Ft. Myers. It encompasses three major metropolitan areas and 35 counties. The Southern District of Florida includes Ft. Lauderdale and Miami. These two federal judicial districts cover about 80 percent of the state population. The population of Florida is expected to continue to increase at a rapid pace, with over 20 million residents projected in 2025. Since 1990, the Florida population has grown by over 15 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the need for additional federal district judgeships in Florida is reaching a crisis point. For example, the Middle District of Florida has one of the heaviest caseloads per judge in the nation—ranking in the top ten for civil filings, drug cases, pending cases and total case filings.

The Middle District as well as the Southern District both have High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Almost half of the criminal caseload in the Middle District is drug-related—reflecting the use of Florida as a conduit in drug trafficking and vigorous law enforcement efforts to combat it. The Middle District has been 50 percent higher in the number of criminal defendants per judge than the national average. The Southern District has conducted more criminal trials and had more criminal cases pending than most other district courts.

Our Federal District Courts are crucial in the fight against drug trafficking, terrorism, organized crime and fraud—we cannot allow them to operate at a disadvantage. We must respond to the crises facing the federal district courts and fulfill our congressional responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

DECLARATION OF POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1999

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss my support of H.R. 4, the Missile Defense bill. H.R. 4, declares that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system. The importance of this legislation can be found in its absence to declare the type of system to be created, the date of deployment and the location of the eventual system.

I believe that it would be dangerous to rush into deployment of a National Missile Defense (NMD) system without the development of appropriate technology. We must not stake America's national security on a system which

has failed 14 out of 18 tests. This legislation does not mandate a date of deployment, which allows technology to advance so that when a successful NMD system is developed it can be deployed.

Additionally, I feel that compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) II are far more important in our near future than deploying a limited national missile defense. And H.R. 4, does not threaten U.S. compliance by mandating the type of system or the number of interceptors necessary. I believe it is possible for a national missile defense system to complement deterrence, but only through compliance with the treaties already in place.

I am disappointed that the rule prohibited an amendment by my colleague Mr. ALLEN, which would have specifically addressed the issues of effectiveness and treaty compliance when deploying a NMD system. For this reason, I will oppose the rule and support a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to include this amendment. While I believe Mr. ALLEN's amendment would have been a positive addition to this legislation, I do not feel it is necessary for my support. H.R. 4, by remaining silent on how, when, and where a NMD system will develop allows the Administration to negotiate our compliance with our treaties and for technology to advance so that an effective missile defense system can be deployed.

TRIBUTE TO EVELYN AND ALBERT DEDENBACH

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the achievements of a very special couple, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Dedenbach. This evening, April 14th, they are being honored as two of the Clinton Township Goodfellows of the Year recipients for 1997–1998 by community members and friends.

The members of the Clinton Township Goodfellows have contributed their time and resources to the betterment of the community for many years. Their goal is to aid the public in ways that other charities and the government could not. For the past nine years, the Goodfellows knew that they could count on Al and Evelyn to be there volunteering their time and talents to achieve these goals.

The Dedenbachs have been married for 58 years and have four children and six grandchildren. Al served in the Air Force during WWII and when the war ended, began working in the engineering field while Evelyn was busy taking care of a growing family. Volunteering is second nature to Evelyn. She has served in the local schools as a library lunch aide, read to the kindergarten children and was active with the Girl Scouts organization. When Al retired in 1981, they joined the senior group in Clinton Township and enjoy sharing many social activities together.

One of their greatest joys is working and helping the Goodfellows with charitable projects. Al and Evelyn have given to their community with spirit and dedication throughout the years. I would like to congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Dedenbach as they celebrate this auspicious occasion with family and friends.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LANCE CPL. BOBBY J. LAWRENCE

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the heroism of a young United States Marine from my district whose selfless actions saved the life of a fellow Marine and embody the values of our U.S. Armed Forces.

Lance Cpl. Bobby J. Lawrence of Evart, Michigan, died tragically last Friday at Camp Pendleton in California.

He and Lance Cpl. James N. Jones Jr. of Pueblo, Colorado, were riding in a 12-ton truck when Lance Cpl. Lawrence realized the brakes had failed. To avoid plunging over a cliff after the emergency brakes also failed, Lance Cpl. Lawrence jerked the steering wheel and intentionally tipped his truck. It overturned and Bobby Lawrence, a week away from his 21st birthday, was tragically killed when the truck overturned. But his passenger was saved.

Lance Cpl. Lawrence will be flown back to Evart for burial. His noble actions will not rescind his loss, nor can they ever fully alleviate the pain of the family and friends who must bury this young Marine.

Mr. Speaker, I know that each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives joins me and the residents of the 4th Congressional District in offering Lance Cpl. Lawrence's loved ones our prayers, our thoughts and our gratitude. May his soul rest in peace and may his bravery be forever remembered in the hearts of those for whom he served.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF COLONEL JAMES R. PROUTY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

Colonel James R. Prouty is recognized for exceptionally distinguished service to the United States Army and to the United States of America during the period July 6, 1972 to May 31, 1999. Throughout a distinguished twenty-seven year military career, Colonel Prouty served in a series of increasingly demanding positions that immeasurably contributed to the security of the nation, culminating as the Executive Officer to the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Army.

A brief summary of his accomplishments over the last decade follows.

As Commander of the 2d Battalion, 5th Air Defense Artillery (Vulcan/Stinger), 2d Armored Division, he was responsible for leading, training, maintaining, and caring for approximately 600 soldiers and their associated equipment (45 track and 175 wheeled vehicles). MG Mallory, the Division Commander, remarked that ''his battalion set the training standard for the division because of Jim's leadership.'' When war came, that uncompromising investment in training returned valuable dividends for the 125 highly-motivated and professional soldiers he provided to Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

As Operations Officer, and later Chief of Staff, for the United States Army Space and Strategic Defense Command (USASSDC), COL Prouty was responsible for planning and resourcing all current, future, and contingency operations; determining, analyzing, and integrating requirements for Army Space Systems; and coordinating those requirements with the Army Staff, the Joint Staff, and US Space Command. Leveraging his broad warfighting talents, COL Prouty initially focused his directorate's efforts on incorporating space considerations into Army doctrine and training events. From these efforts, he developed and prioritized requirements for Army Space Systems, published in the first Army Space Modernization Plan, supporting commanders across all Battlefield Operating Systems. LTG Lionetti described him as ''smart, innovative, and visionary; he made improvements of enormous significance.'' Later, his directorate stood up USASSDC's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) cell, and COL Prouty became the Army's focal point for a wide variety of TMD initiatives. Once again, COL Jim Prouty was equal to the task, overseeing the integration of delivery of the TMD Force Projection Tactical Operations Center (TOC), a major new warfighting asset available to support Joint Land Force commanders worldwide. At the same time, COL Prouty was instrumental in directing the command's highly successful participation in support of the Commission on Roles and Missions.

As Commander, Test and Experimentation Command (TEXCOM) Experimentation Center, COL Prouty was responsible for conducting and supporting a wide range of independent operational tests and experiments using state-of-the-art, real time casualty assessment instrumentation, data reduction, and analysis. He was also responsible to lead, train, and care for an organic Armored/Mechanized Infantry Battalion Task Force of over 350 soldiers. As in previous assignments, his initial emphasis was on training and performing to standard. As a result, his soldiers achieved record success on the gunnery ranges, and the major weapons systems were maintained at unprecedented operational readiness rates. More importantly, every operational test and experiment was carefully planned, coordinated, and executed on time, under budget, yielding results which were both analytically sound and compelling. The highly successful operational test of the Battlefield Combat Identification System (BCIS) is a testament to COL Prouty's leadership, superb knowledge of training, and understanding of how to operationalize emerging technology. The latter months of COL Prouty's command were once again dedicated to the mission of inactivation—and taking care of troops. In recognizing the professional manner in which COL Prouty inactivated the command, MG Lehowicz remarked that ''he turned in equipment and facilities (valued at over $100M) in

such an outstanding condition that it defied the imagination.''

Since July 1997, COL Prouty has served as the Executive Officer to Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Army (AVCSA). It is in this role that COL Prouty's unique talents and abilities have had their greatest impact on the Army. While his duties are broadly defined, as in his previous assignments, it is in the details where COL Prouty has left an indelible mark on the future of our Army.

His ability to energize a diverse body of senior executives and general officers, from across the Army Staff, with widely different interests, toward a common purpose, is truly remarkable. He succeeds because he invests the time, energy, and intellect necessary to understand the most complex issues from the perspectives of all stakeholders; he possesses the wisdom, experience, and judgment to find the common ground; and he employs the finely-honed leadership skills to motivate all to positive action. These skills were particularly evident in directing the AVCSA's efforts to transition two incoming VCSAs and develop a workable strategy to fully integrate the Army's active and reserve components—later detailed in the CSA White Paper, One Team, One Fight, One Future.

Immediately upon assuming his duties, he developed the trust and confidence of every senior leader on the Army Staff, and countless others in the department and on Capitol Hill. Through two full Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS) cycles, and in defense of two Army budget submissions, the Chief of Staff, the Vice Chief of Staff, and/or the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff were invariably present at the decisive place and time, with the compelling argument for Army requirements and resources. These opportunities were more often than not developed behind the scenes, via a broad, but comprehensive staff effort with COL Prouty at the helm. Perhaps of even greater importance, COL Prouty's insight, instincts, and mastery of the subject matter allowed him to resolve innumerable requirements and resource issues, in a manner favorable to Army objectives, without requiring the dedicated attention of the senior leadership.

COL Jim Prouty's team-building and managerial skills have never been more fully validated. The office of the AVCSA is a model of efficiency—lean, professional, effective, and highly-credible. This success is singularly attributable to the leadership talent and managerial savvy of COL Jim Prouty. As the role of the AVCSA continued to evolve, COL Prouty ensured that the office staff remained one step ahead of the issues, and cultivated the professional working relationships necessary to ensure the role of the AVCSA on the Army Staff was well understood and fully integrated. He sets high standards in all aspects of staff performance, and inspires subordinates to achieve them. Even under the most difficult circumstances, morale was invariably high, and the staff never missed a beat.

COL Jim Prouty served with uncommon distinction in each of these critical positions during these last ten years. His outstanding performance in each position contributed extensively to the success, not just of his unit, but to the Army. The impact of COL Prouty's professionalism, selfless commitment, and accomplishments will endure well beyond his retirement. His level of responsibility, particularly in his final position, was far above that of his peers, and his performance was on a par with most of the general officers I routinely work with. Given these factors, it is most appropriate that COL Prouty's extraordinary service to the United States Army and the United States of America be recognized by the 106th Congress.

GENERAL JOHNNIE E. WILSON

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to General Johnnie Edward Wilson, who, on April 26, is retiring from the United States Army after more than 37 years on active duty and has served this country with honor and dignity. General Wilson is an exceptional leader, a ''soldier's soldier.''

Having started his career as a private, he understands soldiering, leadership, and selfless service. He is known on Capitol Hill for his dedication and integrity. As the Army's senior logistician for the past 3 years, he has tackled the tough issues in technology, acquisition and logistics while consistently focused on proper care for his personnel. Thanks to the efforts of patriots like General Wilson, the United States Army enters the new millennium as a strong, proud fighting force. This outstanding American deserves the praise and thanks of a grateful nation.

Born on February 4, 1944, General Wilson was raised in Lorain, Ohio, and entered the Army in August 1961 as an enlisted soldier, attaining the rank of staff sergeant before attending Officer Candidate School (OCS). After completing OSC in 1967, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Ordnance Corps. He was awarded a bachelor of science degree in logistics management from the Florida Institute of Technology. His military education includes completion of the Ordnance Officer Basic and Advanced Course, the Army Command and General Staff College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

General Wilson held a wide variety of important command and staff positions culminating in his current assignment as the commanding general, U.S. Army Material Command. Other key assignments include: deputy chief of staff for logistics, Department of the Army, Pentagon; chief of staff, U.S. Army Material Command; commanding general, Ordnance Center and School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland; deputy commanding general, 21st Theater Army Area Command, U.S. Army Europe and 7th Army; commander, 13th Support Command, Fort Hood, Texas, and, commander, Division Support Command, 1st Armored Division, U.S. Army, Europe.

General Wilson served with distinction at every level of command. He commanded three times at the company level—a maintenance company in the 82nd Airborne Division as a first lieutenant, followed by command of a supply and services company in Vietnam with the 173rd Airborne Brigade, and a maintenance company with the 1st Armored Division in Europe. At the lieutenant colonel level, General Wilson commanded the 709th maintenance Battalion, 9th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington, which converted and became the Army's first Main Support Battalion. General Wilson commanded twice at the colonel level, serving as the Division Support Command commander of the 1st Armored Division followed by command of the 13th Support Command at Fort Hood, Texas.

General Wilson next served as the deputy commanding general, 21st Theater Army Area Command, the Army's largest and most diverse logistics unit. Based on his wide experience with leading soldiers, General Wilson was selected to command the Ordnance Center and School responsible for training thousands of soldiers, NCOs and officer every year. Following this successful assignment, General Wilson served as the chief of staff, AMC, where he was responsible for resource and personnel management for a workforce with over 80,000 military and civilian members. From 1964 to 1996, General Wilson served as the deputy chief of staff for logistics, Department of the Army, where he was responsible for worldwide logistics.

General Wilson's awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Legion of Merit (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Bronze Star Medal (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), Meritorious Service Medal (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal, Good Conduct Medal, Special Forces Tab, Master Parachutist Badge, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.

General Wilson is married to the former Helen McGhee of Elyria, Ohio, and they have three children: Johnnie E. Jr., Charlene, and Scott, and five grandchildren. Please join me in commending the service of General Johnnie Wilson this month upon the occasion of his retirement.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—INTRODUCTION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I come to the Floor this afternoon to introduce a House Concurrent Resolution to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The cosponsors and I believe that the federal government cannot continue to ignore the commitment it made over 24 years ago to children with disabilities.

In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, commonly known as P.L. 94–142. The Act established the federal commitment to provide funding at 40% of the average per pupil expenditure to assist with the excess costs of educating students with disabilities.

Since 1995, upon Republican insistence, funding for IDEA has risen over 85%. With this increase in funding, IDEA is now funded at 12% of the average per pupil expenditure—much higher than the 7% of 5 years ago. We

must continue to increase funding to reach the 40% of the average pupil expenditure funding level mandated in law. Without these federal IDEA funds, local school districts must cover the unpaid federal share.

President Clinton proposes to level fund IDEA for FY2000. Considering that the number of children with disabilities is projected to increase by 123,000 from 1999 to 2000, the President's budget request actually cuts funding for children with disabilities from $702 per child in FY1999 to $688 per child in FY2000.

Congress must ensure that the Federal government lives up to the promises it made to the students, parents, and schools over two decades ago. We must fully fund IDEA before Washington creates new education programs.

Once the Federal government begins to pay its fair share under IDEA, local funds will be freed up, allowing local schools to hire and train high-quality teachers, reduce class size, build and renovate classrooms, and invest in technology.

The resolution I introduce today urges Congress to fully fund IDEA while maintaining its commitment to existing federal education programs. We can both ensure that children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education and ensure that all children have the best education possible if we just provide fair federal funding for special education.

I urge everyone to support this important resolution. Congress must fulfill its commitment to assist States and localities with educating children with disabilities.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. CLAY Mr. Speaker, It is my honor to rise in tribute to the late A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. He was a great American and a great friend. Higginbotham was a man who excelled in many disciplines. He was a scholar, a writer, a lawyer, a judge and especially a humanitarian.

Leon Higginbotham studied engineering a Purdue University, continued his education at Antioch College and received a LL.B. from Yale University in 1952. Eighteen years later, he became the first black elected trustee of Yale after defeating five other distinguished alumni in a nationwide ballot

In 1963, President Kennedy nominated A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. for the U.S District Court of Eastern Pennsylvania. However, Senator James Eastland of Mississippi blocked his confirmation by the Senate. After Kennedys assassination, President Johnson nominated Higginbotham, and in 1964 appointed him to a seat on the U.S. District Court of Eastern Pennsylvania. In 1977, Judge Higginbotham was elevated to the 3rd US Circuit Court of Appeals. He served as the Chief Judge of the Appeals Court from 1990 to 1993. His celebrated career was filled with judicial accomplishments. He was the author of more than 600 published opinions and books, including "In the Matter of Race: Race and the American Legal Process" and "Shades of Freedom."

I first met Judge Higginbotham when he was supporting Senator John F. Kennedy in his campaign for President. In the past twenty years we developed a closer friendship, exchanging telephone calls and letters. I admired and respected the Judge for his intellectual prowess and his untiring commitment to civil rights.

At the time of his death last December, Judge Higginbotham was a retired Chief Judge Emeritus of the United States Court of Appeals, the Public Service Professor of Jurisprudence at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and Counsel to the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison in New York. During his life, Judge Higginbotham received numerous honors including the Presidential Medal of Freedom the National Human Relations Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Urban Award for outstanding contributions towards the goal of equal opportunity, the 81st NAACP Spingarn Medal for the highest and noblest achievement by an African-American, and the 1994 recipient of the Congressional Black Caucus' Leland Humanitarian Award.

In 1996, Higginbotham became an advisor to Texaco, Inc. after the company agreed to a $176 million settlement of a race-discrimination case. There he initiated a formal evaluation of the company's human resource policies and diversity practices in an effort to make Texaco an industry model for its hiring and promotion of black employees. In an interview that year with the St. Louis Post-Diatch, Judge Higginbotham was described as seeing "the future of race relations with an equal mixture of optimism and pessimism." Leon Higginbotham knew and understood the terrible history of racial discrimination in the justice system. He knew that this history could never be forgotten if black Americans ever hope to achieve equal justice under law. For this reason, Judge Higginbotham shared my dismay when former President George Bush presented Clarence Thomas as his choice to replace justice Thurgood Marshall as Associate Supreme Court Justice. On that day, independent-minded women were appalled, knowledgeable black Americans were outraged and advocates for the poor abandoned their hopes. Then, the disastrous day came when the U.S. Senate confirmed Clarence Thomas' appointment and the waves of despair washed over millions who had fought, sacrificed, and suffered to overcome centuries of discrimination and to achieve respect and quality. In Black America, six months after Thomas' appointment the attitude and sentiment toward him as a person was reflected in the words of Judge Higginbotham who wrote:

> Suppose someone wanted to steal back past achievements, reign in the present gains and cutoff future expectations among African-Americans about participation in the Judicial process. that person would have found it difficult to devise a better plan than nominating Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court which decreasing the number of African-Americans on the federal bench.

Mr. Speaker. Judge Higginbotham was devoted to educating this nation about the perils of one black man, Clarence Thomas, being misconstrued as a respectable replacement for Thurgood Marshall who was a bonafide representative of the hopes, dreams and aspirations of black Americans. In this undertaking, Judge Leon Higginbotham wrote to Clarence Thomas upon His confirmation to the Supreme Court. Higginbotham documented the legal struggles that had abolished impediments to the freedom of black people and enunciated the underlying personal values and courage which guided those who led these battles. In this letter, Higginbotham challenged Thomas to recall, to understand and to emulate the lives of those great gladiators who changed the course of history. In this open letter, Higginbotham cited the damage done to the cause of black America and the crisis in race relations spurred by Judge Thomas' confirmation. Excerpts from this letter provide the details of his message:

> At first I thought that I should write you privately—the way one normally corresponds with a colleague or friend. I still feel ambivalent about making this letter public, but I do so because your appointment is profoundly important to this country and the world, and because all Americans need to understand the issues you will face on the Supreme Court. In short, Justice Thomas, I write this letter as a public record so that this generation can understand the challenges you face as an Associate Justice to the Supreme Court, and the next generation can evaluate the choices you have made or will make. . .
>
> By elevating you to the Supreme Court, President Bush has suddenly vested in you the option to preserve or dilute the gains this country has made in the struggle for equality. This is a grave responsibility indeed. . . . And while much has been said about your admirable determination to overcome terrible obstacles, it is also important to remember how you arrived where you are now, because you did not get there by yourself.
>
> You can become an exemplar of fairness and the rational interpretation of the Constitution, or you can become an archetype of inequality and the retrogressive evaluation of human rights. The choice as to whether you will build a decisional record of true greatness or of mere mediocrity is yours.
>
> Black Ivy League alumni [Higginbotham and Thomas finished Yale] in particular should never be too impressed by the educational pedigrees of Supreme Court Justices. The most wretched decision ever rendered against black people in the past century was Plessy v. Ferguson. It was written in 1896 by Justice Henry Billings Brown who attended both Yale and Harvard law schools. The opinion was joined by Justice George Shiras, a graduate of Yale Law School, as well as by Chief Justice Melville Fuller and Justice Horace Gray, both alumni of Harvard Law School.
>
> If those four Ivy League alumni on the Supreme Court in 1896 had been as faithful in their interpretation of the Constitution as Justice John Harlan, a graduate of Transylvania, a small law school in Kentucky, then the venal precedent of Plessy v. Ferguson, which established the federal "separate but equal" doctrine and legitimized the worst forms of race discrimination, would not have been the law of our nation for sixty years. The separate but equal doctrine; also known as Jim Crow, created the foundations of separate and unequal allocation of resources, and oppression of the human rights of blacks.

The tragedy with Plessy v. Ferguson is not that the Justices had the ''wrong'' education, or that they attended the ''wrong'' law schools. The tragedy is that the Justices had the wrong values, and that these values poisoned this society for decades.

I have read almost every article you have published, every speech you have given, and virtually every public comment you have made during the past decade. Until your confirmation hearing, I could not find one shred of evidence suggesting an insightful understanding on your part on how the evolutionary movement of the Constitution and the work of civil rights organizations have benefited you. . . .

While you were a presidential appointee for eight years, as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and as an Assistant Secretary at the Department of Education, you made what I would regard as unwarranted criticisms of civil rights organizations of the Warren Court, and even of Justice Thurgood Marshall. Perhaps these criticisms were motivated by what you perceived to be your political duty to the Reagan and Bush administrations. Now that you have assumed what should be the nonpartisan role of a Supreme Court Justice, I hope you will take time out to carefully evaluate some these unjustified attacks.

But your comments troubled me then and trouble me still because they convey a stunted knowledge of history and an unformed judicial philosophy. . . . You are no longer privileged to offer flashy one-liners to delight the conservative establishment. Now what you write must inform, not entertain. Now your statements and your votes can shape the destiny of the entire nation.

During the last ten years, you have often described yourself as a black conservative. I must confess that, other than their own self-advancement, I am at a loss to understand what is it that the so-called black conservatives are so anxious to conserve. Now that you no longer have to be outspoken on their behalf, perhaps you will recognize that in the past it was the white ''conservatives'' who screamed ''Segregation now, Segregation forever!'' It was primarily the conservative who attacked the Warren Court relentlessly because of Brown v. Board of Education and who stood in the way of almost every measure ensure gender and racial advancement.

Of the fifty-two Senators who vote in favor of your confirmation some thirteen hailed from nine Southern states. Some may have voted for you because they agreed with President Bush's assessment that you were ''the best person for the position.'' But, candidly, Justice Thomas, I do not believe that you were indeed the most competent person to be on the Supreme Court. Charles Bowser, a distinguished African-American Philadelphia lawyer said: ''I'd be willing to bet that not one of the Senators who voted to confirm Clarence Thomas would hire him as their lawyer.''

Later, Judge Higginbotham questioned the decision of the Judicial Council of the National Bar Association which had invited Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas to address its annual convention. In that letter, which appeared in the September 1988 edition of Emerge magazine, Higginbotham explained why he was "shocked" to learn of Thomas' invitation:

I will not take a position as to whether he should be disinvited, and leave that significant responsibility to the judgment of the Executive Committee. I am not one who believes there is, or should be, a monolithic view within the African-American community on all issues; but, I do think there are certain undisputable common denominators as to what constitutes progress or regress. Within that context and from the perspective of almost every constitutional law scholar, there is no doubt that Justice Thomas had done more to turn back the clock of racial progress than has perhaps any other African-American public official in the history of this country.

Higginbotham continued, mentioning those ruling in which Thomas overlooked history to undermine the progress of black Americans in the civil rights struggle and wrote:

In view of his harsh conservative record, please explain to me why you invited Justice Thomas, who has voted consistently against the interest of African Americans, minorities and women.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, Judge Higginbotham underwent open heart surgery. After his recovery he wrote to his many friends thanking them for their expressions of concern and prayers. In his note, the judge quoted what a renown heart specialist had said:

During the last twenty years, I have talked to many dying patients. I have never met one who wished that s/he had spent more time at the office, but I have met thousands who regretted that they did not spend more time enjoying their family and pursuing less stressful options.

Judge Higginbotham did reduce his voluminous schedule of activities, but fortunately he remained a powerful voice which helped to shape attitudes and influence opinions about race and racism in this country. His contributions to the civil rights movement will be forever cherished.

THE CORRECT APPROACH TO GLOBALIZATION

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no issue facing us is more important than how we respond to the question of adapting to the new global economy. Until fairly recently, the accepted wisdom was that all governments had to do was to allow capital to find its most profitable niche, and we would all reap the benefits. Increasingly people understand that this is an incomplete approach to governance and an inadequate response to the social economic and political problems posed by the new global economy. In the interest of fostering discussion of this important set of issues, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point three commentaries on this issue which while diverse in the perspective from which they are made, share a common understanding of the general direction in which we should be going, and are also distinguished by a strong intelligence.

First, I insert a speech given by John Sweeney, President of the AFL–CIO, at Davos. John Sweeney's thoughtful leadership in trying to find a way to reconcile the strengths of the market with policies that offset the negative effects of a pure market approach is a genuine asset for the United States in our efforts to deal with this matter.

Second, I insert an article by Bruce Freed who has been writing very thoughtfully in commentary aimed at the enlightened leadership of the business community.

Third, I insert a very thoughtful article by one of the most thoughtful of our contemporary journalists, E.J. Dionne, on the theoretical aspects of this broader question.

REMARKS BY JOHN SWEENEY, PRESIDENT OF THE AFL–CIO, 1999 ANNUAL MEETING WORLD, ECONOMIC FORUM, DAVOS, SWITZERLAND, JANUARY 30, 1999

It is a delight to be here once more, and to have this opportunity to share with you some of the perspectives of the 40 million working men and women in households represented by the AFL–CIO.

We've been asked to talk about how to ''manage the social impact of globalization.'' But let us not think of globalization as a natural phenomenon with regrettable social side effects. The forces of globalization now wracking the world are the creation of man, not of God. Our task is not to make societies safe for globalization, but to make the global system safe for decent societies.

This is not a quibble about words. As we meet, about a third of the world's economy is in recession. 100 million people who thought they were part of a growing middle class have been brutally thrust back into poverty. And, as recent events in Brazil have shown, the crisis is far from over.

Global deflation is now the nightmare of central bankers. Too many goods, too much productive capacity chasing too few consumers with too little money. In the crisis, the US is the buyer of last resort. But US consumers are already spending more than they make. US manufacturers are in recession. In recent months, 10,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs to a flood of imports, their families disrupted, their communities devastated. The US trade deficit is headed to unsustainable new heights.

The terrible human costs can have one good effect. They can sober the debate about the global economy. For two decades, conservative governments have been on a binge, dismantling controls over capital, currencies, and corporations. Now we awake the morning after, our heads aching, our hearts burdened by the destruction that we see around us.

Globalization—in the extreme, corporate dominated, de-regulated form we have witnessed—is not the scapegoat of the current crisis; it is the cause of it. After two decades, the results are very clear. The global casino of capital and currency speculation has generated booms and busts of increasing severity and frequency, as World Bank economist Joseph Stiglitz has warned. And it has produced slower growth and greater inequality in countries large and small, developed and developing—as governments scramble to protect themselves from the global storms.

In its current form, globalization cannot be sustained. Democratic societies will not support it. Authoritarian leaders will fear to impose it. The so-called Washington consensus is no longer the consensus even in Washington.

Over the last year and one-half, workers, environmentalists, consumers—reflecting the opinion of the vast majority of Americans—came together to block the president's request for fast track trade authority not once, but twice.

We insisted that enforceable worker rights and environmental protections be central to any new round of trade negotiations.

And we were right. Now US Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin calls for a new ''architecture'' to limit instability. President Clinton pushes new initiatives on child labor, on core labor rights, and on the environment. America's voice, I suggest to you, will either sound a new note in any future round of trade negotiations, or it will be muted in spite of itself.

When you are in a hole, the first thing to do is to stop digging. If the newly sobered global community has stopped digging, we're still left in the hole. Working people across the world understand that if nothing is done, corporate globalization will continue, unchecked and uncontrolled. We need to go a different way.

Calls for greater transparency, better accounting and more generous safety nets are satisfying, but not sufficient. The essential building blocks of a new internationalism can be seen in the struggles of workers and citizens across the world.

People are demanding protection from the havoc caused by currency and capital speculation. If this is not done at a global level, it will be done at a national level—as we've seen from Hong Kong to Malaysia to Chile.

While curbing speculators, we must get the global economy going again. Recent efforts to lower interest rates in Europe and the United States, and to pump up demand in Japan should be seen only as first steps.

In this crisis, as the IMF recently admitted, enforcing austerity on indebted countries only makes things worse. The Fund and the Bank should help restructure debt and stimulate growth. And as the growing Jubilee 2000 movement has called for, industrial nations should move to relieve the debt burdens on the poorest nations, while increasing investment in sustainable energy, education and health care.

At the same time, we need to create the conditions for sustainable growth.

That is why it is vital to empower workers—to enforce core worker rights in the global market—the right to organize and to bargain collectively to improve one's lot, the prohibitions against child labor and forced labor, the elimination of discrimination.

Empowering workers strengthens democracy. It is also vital to sustaining prosperity, to making markets work.

When the famed US labor leader, Walter Reuther, visited Japan in the 1960s, he saw that Japanese autoworkers were riding bicycles to work. ''You can't build an automobile economy on bicycle wages,'' he warned the Japanese. But of course they could, by exporting their automobiles to the United States.

No limits of that export-led growth model are apparent. A vibrant economy requires consumers—workers who capture a fair share of the profits that they produce. The struggle to do just that is taking place in offices and shop floors across the world. As President Clinton has said, global rules are crucial if we are to keep the global market from becoming a race to the bottom.

Finally, this debate can no longer be contained in closed rooms in luxurious hotels. It is already being waged on the streets, the shop floors and the computer screens across the world. As the cloistered negotiators of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment discovered, trade and investment agreements must gain public support if they are to go forward at all. Open covenants, openly arrived at is not simply a slogan—it is a growing reality.

We are entering a new era. We will either build a new internationalism that empowers workers, protects consumers and the environment, and fosters sustainable growth—or we will witness a harsh reaction as desperate peoples demand protection.

I urge of all you to join us in our effort to bend the forces of globalization so they help workers everywhere build a better future.

MR. MARX, MEET MR. FRIEDMAN

(By E.J. Dionne Jr.)

PARIS—A characteristic of politics in most of the well-off democracies is that we know far better what we don't want than what we do.

The trends in most democratic countries are toward moderate governments and away from pure free-market parties. Electorates don't fully trust the global economy and want protection from its fluctuations. But to win elections, parties of the left promising those protections have to prove they're comfortable with the market and accept its disciplines.

France's Socialist Prime Minister Lionel Jospin caught the mood when he declared that he favored a ''market economy'' but opposed a ''market society.'' We want capitalism, but want it tempered by other values—equity, community and compassion, for starters.

If you want to know how much has changed, consider these comments from Robert Hue, the national secretary of the once hard-line French Communist Party. ''The Communists are not adversaries of the market,'' he declared last week. ''The Communists have broken with the statist vision of things.'' Imagine: Karl Marx dining with Milton Friedman.

The social philosopher Anthony Giddens explains this transformation in ''The Third Way,'' his important recent book. ''No one any longer has any alternatives to capitalism—the arguments that remain concern how far, and in what ways, capitalism should be governed and regulated.''

''These arguments are certainly significant,'' he continues, ''but they fall short of the more fundamental disagreements of the past.'' That may explain some of the listlessness of contemporary politics. Utopias and searing critiques of the status quo are exciting. But why should progressive parties pretend to have answers they don't, or attempt to build systems that can't work?

The Third Way idea is seductive because it seems to represent realism with a heart. But Giddens—the director of the London School of Economics who's thought of as British Prime Minister Tony Blair's favorite social philosopher—tries to show that the Third Way is more than a marketing slogan.

The core problem with contemporary conservatism, he says, is an inconsistency at the heart of its creed. Its ''devotion to the free market on the one hand, and to the traditional family and nation on the other, is self-contradictory.''

Why? ''Individualism and choice are supposed to stop abruptly at the boundaries of the family and national identity, where tradition must stand intact. But nothing is more dissolving of tradition than the 'permanent revolution' of market forces.''

Giddens is perceptive on the thorny question of risk vs. security. The standard account is that if government provides too much security, no one will want to take risks. But Giddens is alive to the need for certain social protections if what you desire is a risk-taking society.

To encourage citizens to be ''responsible risk-takers,'' he writes, ''people need protections when things go wrong'' and ''also the material and moral capabilities to move through major periods of transition in their lives.'' That's the reason every party in every country is talking about education.

The upshot is we shouldn't dismantle the welfare state, but rather reconstruct it into a ''social investment state'' to provide ''resources for risk-taking.'' Gidden's welfare state would also cooperate extensively with community institutions that are independent of government.

As for the global economy, Giddens sees its expansion as removing more and more activity from the regulatory reach of individual nations. In what he calls ''depoliticized global space,'' there are no rules establishing ''rights and obligations.'' Figuring out what those are and whether they can be enforced across national boundaries is one of the central political problems of our time.

The strongest critique of the Third Way is that its careful balancing act sounds too good to be true. Center-left parties trying to calibrate market efficiencies against concerns for social justice are not working in some sanitized laboratory. In the politics of democracies, interests and passions intervene.

That was brought home in the recent battle between Germany's Social Democratic chancellor, the centrist Gerhard Schroeder, and his left-wing finance minister, Oskar Lafontaine. Lafontaine resigned, protesting that ''the heart isn't traded on the stock market yet.'' But where Lafontaine saw a socially minded heart beating, German business saw a statist cancer growing.

The Paris daily Le Monde noted archly that it was pure ''coincidence'' that at the moment Lafontaine quit, Anthony Giddens was visiting Bonn to unveil the German edition of ''The Third Way''—of which Schroeder is a public fan.

''The Third Way'' is worth finding, and Giddens makes an honorable effort to draw us a map. But as the struggles of the new German government show, the road there is still under construction.

BUSINESS MUST TAKE LEAD TO WIN FAST TRACK

Steel tops Congress' trade agenda. But just beneath the surface remains fast track, the missing critical link in long-term U.S. trade policy.

Twice in the past two years, Congress refused to give broadened authority to the president to negotiate trade agreements. With a third try being readied, the challenge for the corporate community is to provide the leadership that will finally achieve it.

The push needs to come soon. As globalization quickens, opportunities for U.S. companies to sell their products increase. However, access to foreign markets must be guaranteed, a process fast track would facilitate. ''If we don't get [fast track] this year, we're not going to get it until well after the presidential election,'' Rep. Jennifer Dunn (R-Wash.), a member of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, said in an interview.

The implications of fast track's absence are beginning to be seen. This is the case in Latin America, a key market for U.S. exports. By not being able to move forward with a Latin American free-trade agreement, the United States runs the risk of being cut out as the European Union forges closer trading ties with Mercosur, the powerful southern cone trade group.

Winning fast track, however, will require a fundamental change in the way business deals with Capitol Hill and how it approaches the politics of trade. ''You've got a

lot of folks stuck in a rut now,'' said Dunn. The problem business faces is that the Republican-anchored coalition it is looking to to pass fast track hasn't worked effectively since the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement almost six years ago.

How does business get out of this rut and turn the fight for fast track into a winning game? Last December, this column suggested a counterintuitive trade strategy that looked center-left to offset growing Republican isolationism. Now is the time to apply it. With Congress so closely balanced, business can't afford to ignore the Democrats, including liberals, labor and the environmentalists.

Rep. Cal Dooley (Calif.), a staunch free-trade and leading pro-business Democrat, recognizes this as he pushes for a serious dialogue between business and labor and the environmentalists. Those groups have been fast track's toughest opponents. ''The message I've been delivering to business is that you have to be providing the leadership and identifying the policies that address the environmental and labor issues that can broaden the base of support for fast track.'' Dooley told me.

Key business groups have started doing this but it needs to be done seriously in order to construct a new coalition. That coalition can be made up of Democrats and environmental, labor and internationalist Republicans. House Banking Committee Chairman Jim Leach (R-Iowa) suggested this approach a year ago as a way to break the deadlock over funding for the International Monetary Fund. Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) has urged business and liberals to find ways to deal with each other on trade and other elements of their agendas.

Where do corporate CEOs fit into this new strategy? In several ways. First, they need to pledge their unwavering commitment to the effort—from start to finish—just as they do with company initiatives.

Next, they need to shape the public's perception of fast track as critical to the nation's economic growth and their personal well-being. This can only be done by leadership outside Washington that can soften the partisanship that hurt fast track previously. CEOs can do this, Dunn said, by ''articulating much more in public and much more with their employees the benefits and importance of free trade.''

Lastly, they need to provide the ongoing leadership of the fast-track, campaign. Usually, this is done by the White House with the support of outside groups. However, long-term, proactive leadership has not been the forte of this White House as demonstrated by the last minute, ad hoc—and unsuccessful—campaign it mounted for fast track in 1997.

Business needs to be pragmatic and go where the votes are if it is to win fast track. By doing that, business leaders will have a real shot at achieving a U.S. trade policy that is truly global.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOE DIMAGGIO

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, last month the Nation lost a true American hero. I am deeply saddened that Joe DiMaggio, ''the Yankee Clipper,'' passed away at the age of 84 in his hometown of Hollywood, Florida, on March 8, 1999. We mourn the loss of a man whose legacy will be remembered for years to come. Indeed, Joe DiMaggio has a long and storied list of athletic accomplishments, but he is also remembered for his service to the South Florida community and the Nation. Joe DiMaggio is a man who achieved greatness, and it was also the way in which he carried himself that was truly great.

Voted the ''Greatest Living All-Time Baseball Player'' by the Baseball Writers Association in 1969, Joe DiMaggio's impact was felt in the Major Leagues soon after his rookie season in 1936. After winning only one World Series in the seven years prior to his joining the team, the New York Yankees won four straight world championships. By the time he retired in 1951, Joltin' Joe DiMaggio's role in the dominance of the New York Yankees was undeniable: his leadership brought a total of ten pennants and nine world series to New York in the span of 13 major league seasons. Over his career, Joe DiMaggio would win three MVP awards, become the only major league player in major league history who has more than 300 home runs and fewer than 400 strikeouts, and be inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1955.

Career statistics aside, Joe DiMaggio had perhaps one of the most remarkable years ever when he won the Most Valuable Player award in 1941. That year, like Sammy Sosa and Mark McGwire did during the summer of 1998, Joe DiMaggio and Ted Williams captivated the entire Nation with two spectacular individual performances. While Ted Williams would hit .406, DiMaggio would take center stage while hitting safely in 56 straight games—an amazing record which stands today.

Though one could talk about Joe DiMaggio's greatness based on baseball statistics alone, we must not forget the service that Joe DiMaggio performed for our nation during times of war. In 1943, Joltin' Joe swapped his Yankee paycheck for a $50-a-month private's salary as he left baseball to serve as physical trainer for Army Air Force cadets. Finishing his term of service three years later, Joe DiMaggio had risen to the rank of sergeant and, in 1974, he was awarded the Silver Helmet award from AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam). Only three years after receiving this award, he would be further honored in a way that few are: he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Carter.

Mr. Speaker, Joe DiMaggio lived much of his life in private. Though he also performed much philanthropy work in private, he was very public about his affiliation with the Memorial Hospital which lies within my Congressional District in Hollywood, Florida. In 1992, the new children's wing of Memorial Hospital was christened the ''Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital, at Memorial Regional Hospital'' in recognition of his extensive support. Since 1992, DiMaggio helped raise more than $4 million for the care of sick children there. For his charitable work, we all own the late Joe DiMaggio a debt of gratitude. I assure you that Hollywood and the surrounding areas will miss him greatly.

In summary, there was something special about Joe DiMaggio. He was unpretentious and proud, a man who carried himself with the utmost class and dignity. Joltin' Joe DiMaggio was truly a hero in an era when America was coming out of the Great Depression, and era when America needed someone to turn to for inspiration. It is with great sorrow that I praise him today, and hope that in some small way this statement can thank him for all his greatness, for his accomplishments both on the baseball field and off it as well.

EXPOSING RACISM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to document and expose racism in America, I submit the following articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROSECUTOR: BLACK MAN'S MURDER INTENDED TO DRAW ATTENTION TO NEW HATE GROUP

(By Michael Graczyk)

JASPER, TX (AP).—The heinous dragging death of a black man last year was part of a plan to draw attention to a new white supremacist group being organized by his accused white killer, John William King, prosecutors say.

''I do believe he was trying to form his own personal hate group in Jasper, Texas,'' Jasper County District Attorney Guy James Gray said Tuesday after the first full day of testimony. ''I believe we'll be able to establish that this killing was to promote his own personal agenda.''

King, 24, an unemployed laborer and ex-convict, faces life in prison or death by injection if convicted of the June 7 murder of James Byrd Jr.

The 49-year-old East Texas man was chained to the back of a pickup truck and dragged for three miles before his body, minus a head, neck and arm, was left dumped on a road across from a black church and cemetery.

Gray, who said DNA evidence would be introduced today, has said he hopes to wrap up his side of the case by the end of the week.

Two other men, Lawrence Russell Brewer, 31, and Shawn Allen Berry, 23, are to be tried later on the same charges.

In his opening statement Tuesday to the jury of 11 whites and one black, Gray said physical evidence, racist tattoos all over King's body and letters written by King would tie him to Byrd's murder.

Correspondence seized by authorities from King's Jasper apartment the day after Byrd's death and entered into evidence late Tuesday included 22 pages of handwritten by-laws and a code of ethics for what King called the ''Confederate Knights of America Texas Rebel Soldiers.''

''Dear Student,'' King wrote. ''Welcome to the Aryan Institute for Higher Learning . . . Welcome to the dream.''

In one of the documents, he labels himself ''Captain'' of the organization. In another, where he signs himself as ''President,'' he describes his group as working for the ''struggle of our white race'' and complained of ''thousands of organizations working for the interest of minorities.''

''How many groups stand up for the cultural values and ideals of the white majority?'' he asked. ''We of the Confederate

Knights of America are unapologetically committed to the interest, ideas and cultural value of the White Aryan race.''

Prosecutors said other physical evidence includes a lighter engraved with Knight's prison nickname ''Possum'' and a Klu Klux Klan symbol of interlocking three K's found along the bloody route. Byrd's blood also was found on King's shoes, Gray said.

Tattoos over more than 65 percent of his body include a black man hanging from a tree, nazi swastikas and a Woody Woodpecker cartoon character wearing a Klan robe and hood.

Defense attorney Haden ''Sonny'' Cribbs, who declined an immediate opening statment, objected to the introduction of the written material and photos of King's tattoos, saying such items were protected by the Constitution as freedom of expression. State District Judge Joe Bob Golden overruled the objections.

Prosecutors began testimony by laying out the crime scene, with Sheriff Billy Rowles telling how he first thought he had a routine hit-and-run accident. But he said he was puzzled by the lack of parallel tire tracks that should have followed the trail of blood typically left by someone dragged under a vehicle.

When investigators found the lighter, ''That's when we started having some bad thoughts,'' the sheriff added. ''I knew somebody had been murdered because he had been black.''

Other items from the crime scene included tools with the name ''Berry'' scratched into the surface. Authorities knew Berry was a mechanic and arrested him on outstanding traffic warrants. When he gave an affidavit that included information identifying King as having the nickname ''Possum,'' ''I know this country boy's in trouble,'' Rowles testified.

In love letters he sent from prison to Michele Chapman, a Jasper woman described by King as ''my precious Aryan Princess,'' King used obscenities and vulgarities when referring to blacks and Mexicans. He bragged about what he said was $3,000 worth of tattoo work he received for free all over his body from an inmate tattoo artist.

''White is right!!!'' he wrote in one letter, signing it off: ''. . . Take care and stay white and beautiful.''

Prosecutors also showed jurors photographs of Byrd's remains and introduced into evidence tattered remnants of Byrd's clothing. Several members of Byrd's family began sobbing as the clothing was revealed.

BLACK MARINE BEATEN, PARALYZED BY WHITE MEN TO FACE ATTACKERS

(By Michelle Williams)

SAN DIEGO (AP)—Sitting in a wheelchair with only the slightest movement in his left hand, Lance Cpl. Carlos Colbert still has his voice to describe how five men savagely changed his life at a Memorial Day party.

The black Marine, who is paralyzed, today was to face the white men who drunkenly beat him, broke his neck and left him motionless on the ground in what prosecutors say was a racist attack.

Colbert was to tell them how his life has changed. He is 21. Jessee Lawson, 20; Trenton Solis, 18; Robert Rio, 23; Jed Jones, 21; and Steven Newark III, 18, pleaded guilty last month to felony assault and avoided potential life sentences at today's hearing.

Prosecutor Craig Rooten said Tuesday that Colbert wanted the case to go to trial, but understood the guilty pleas ensured jail time for his attackers.

''There were a lot of people involved and there was a lot of alcohol involved, making it a difficult case to sort out,'' Rooten said.

Colbert, of Forestville, MD, was one of just a few blacks who attended a party last May at the home of Tim Bullard, a fellow Camp Pendleton Marine. At least 100 people packed the small house at Santee, a rural community 20 miles northeast of San Diego.

When a fight broke out in the front yard, there were no streetlights to illuminate what was happening and most of the people were drunk, Rooten said. Police interviewed about 50 people over four months before making any arrests since few stories were alike.

One common denominator was that the attackers punched and kicked Colbert while shouting racial slurs and ''white power,'' Rooten said.

Colbert's memory of the attack was that a fellow Marine went outside to help a woman who was hit by a ''skinhead.'' When he heard the commotion, he went outside to see what was happening.

''Out of the corner of my eye I saw a guy coming toward me with brass knuckles,'' Colbert told The San Diego Union-Tribune. ''I felt it on my neck. . . . He came up behind me and broke my neck. I fell flat on my face.''

At a hearing last month, Judge Frederick Link asked Lawson if he beat Colbert because he was black and he tearfully said: ''That is correct.''

Lawson's admission means he faces two to 11 years in prison. The others face five years probation with one year in jail. They will receive credit for jail time already served. Solis has been free on $250,000 bond for a few months, but the others have been jailed since their arrest in September.

The parents of some of the attackers recently went on a radio talk show, saying their sons were coerced into confessing that the crime was racially motivated, and it really was just a drunk brawl. A witness called in to say that such hatred isn't created by alcohol, it only enhances it.

Colbert spent several months at a Veteran's Administration hospital in Long Beach before moving to a Virginia hospital closer to his family's Maryland home. He was recently moved to a home modified for his wheelchair, Rooten said.

SETTLEMENT REACHED IN CALIFORNIA RACE-BASED ADMISSIONS CASE

(By Bob Egelko)

SAN FRANCISCO (AP)—City schools and the NAACP reached a last-minute settlement over race-based admissions on the same day a federal trial was to begin deciding the constitutionality of San Francisco's school desegregation program.

The program bars any school from having more than 45 percent of any one racial or ethnic group, a practice the families of three Chinese-American students alleged kept the youngsters out of their preferred schools.

U.S. District Judge William Orrick ordered details of Tuesday's agreement between the school district and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People kept confidential until a hearing today.

But participant's comments indicated that court-ordered limits on racial and ethnic groups at each school in the 63,000-student district would be repealed.

Daniel Girard, lawyer for the three Chinese-American students and their parents, who filed the lawsuit in 1994, said the agreement is ''a balanced resolution'' that achieves the plaintiffs' objectives.

''This is definitely worth the fight,'' said Charlene Loen, whose 14-year-old son, Patrick Wong, was denied admission to elite Lowell High School in 1994 because the school then required higher test scorers from Chinese American than other ethnic groups.

That policy has been changed, but the court order still has the effect of curbing Lowell's Chinese-American enrollment, the largest of any group. Wong, 18, now attends the University of California, Irvine.

The 1993 order, which resolved a 1978 discrimination suit by the NAACP contained a 45 percent ceiling on any racial or ethnic group at a school. The limit is 40 percent at alternative or ''magnet'' schools. Those include Lowell, which has an entrance exam and counts U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer and the late Gov. Pat Brown among its alumni.

A draft settlement would prohibit assigning students abased on race or ethnicity but would let the district consider their socioeconomic status, and Patrick Manshardt, a lawyer for the state of Board of Education who saw the draft but was not part of the negotiations.

The settlement comes at a time of increasing judicial hostility to race-based admissions. In November, a federal appeals court struck down race as an admissions factor at the prestigious Boston Latin School, a ruling the school board decided not to appeal.

The San Francisco settlement will not end desegregation efforts, insisted NAACP lawyer Peter Cohn. He said the agreement would ''continue to protect the educational rights of all children.''

[From the USA Today, February 23, 1999]

NEW AVENUES AIDING HATE GROUP NUMBERS

(By Laura Parker)

The number of hate groups operating in the United States increased again last year, spurred by the Internet, white power rock-'n'-roll music and the efforts of fringe groups to attract mainstream followers, according to a report by the Southern Poverty Law Center in Montgomery, Ala.

For the first time, the Council of Conservative Citizens, which has drawn Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Rep. Bob Barr, R-Ga., as speakers at meetings, was listed as a hate group in the law center's annual survey of hate and paramilitary groups.

The report, to be issued Tuesday, says there were 537 hate groups operating in 1998, up from 474 groups in 1997. That includes the 33 chapters of the Council of Conservative Citizens, which claims 15,000 dues-paying members.

The council was listed as hate group after the law center published an exposé about the group last year. The CCC, according to the law center, has its roots in the old White Citizens Councils, organized to combat the 1954 Supreme Court ruling outlawing ''separate but equal'' schools. The organization has pushed national issues such as opposition to affirmative action, immigration and school busing.

''But its chief interest remains race,'' the center says in its report.

When the involvement of Lott and Barr became public last year, both men disavowed the council's views.

The number Ku Klux Klan organizations is also up from 127 chapters in 1997 to 163 chapters, and the number of Internet groups ballooned from 163 in 1997 to 254 last year, the report says.

Racist rock-'n'-roll music, by bands with names such as White Terror, is also widely available on the Internet.

''The organized hate movement in this country is quite clearly growing and has been for several years,'' says Mark Potok, the law center's spokesman.

But it is difficult to measure whether the rise in hate groups translates into a rise in hate crimes. The FBI has been unable to say whether more hate crimes are being committed or more are merely being reported.

The increase in hate groups also coincides with a robust economy. Normally, such activity declines in economic good times. But Potok says the booming economy is not making everyone rich, particularly blue-collar workers. Laborers who once made good wages in heavy industry find themselves in lower paying service-sector jobs, he says, and some are attracted to racist groups.