SENATE—*Tuesday, June 8, 1999*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 7, 1999)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

For the Lord God is a sun and shield;
The Lord will be of grace and glory;
No good thing will He withhold
From those who walk upright.

Holy Father, Source of strength, Author of the absolutes of morality, and the One to whom we are accountable, we renew our commitment to walk uprightly. We want to stand tall with steady eyes focused on Your irrevocable mandates for character and behavior. Our deepest desire is to walk with You, dear God, at Your pace, in Your timing, and toward Your goals. Help us not to run ahead of You or to lag behind. Only then can we hear what You have to say for each situation and relationship. May this be a sublime day of serenity because we have placed our hands in Your strong and guiding hand.

We join our hearts in sympathy for Mrs. Joe Biden as she grieves the death of her father, Donald Jacobs. Comfort her with Your presence and hope. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the defense appropriations bill with a vote ordered on the pending Grassley amendment to occur at 9:45 a.m. As a reminder, first-degree amendments to the bill must be offered by 2:30 p.m. today. Therefore, additional amendments and votes are expected throughout today's session, with the expectation of finishing the bill this evening. Cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to the Y2K legislation yesterday. Thus, a cloture vote will take place on Wednesday.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1122, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:.

A bill (S. 1122) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Stevens (for Grassley) amendment No. 540 to reduce to $500,000 the threshold amount for the applicability of the requirement for advance matching of Department of Defense disbursements to particular obligations.

AMENDMENT NO. 540

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 15 minutes of debate relative to the Grassley amendment No. 540 with a vote to follow thereon.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, do I control that 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls the time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will not use all of that time for my amendment.

First of all, as to the amendment that is pending, authored by the Senator from Iowa, I thank the Senator from Alaska for offering my amendment yesterday, and I thank the Senator from Alaska for asking for a rollcall vote on my amendment, although this amendment has been offered 5 previous years and adopted 5 previous years without a rollcall. So, personally, I do not think it is necessary to have a rollcall vote. But if the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee want such a rollcall vote, that is OK with me. So I will take then just a few minutes to speak about my amendment on matching disbursements with obligations.

The American taxpayers would take for granted, they would expect, the nurturing of their tax dollars to be so well done at the Federal level that Congress would not have to pass a special amendment which would say that the Department of Defense cannot pay out $1 of taxpayers' money without being able to match it with an invoice and contract that specified what goods or services they were buying. I hope in most of Government that is the case, but it has not been so with the Defense Department. In fact, I have been speaking for years on the subject of the tens of billions of dollars that have actually been spent, and at the time of payment, the department failed to match the particular service or goods that are being paid for with their corresponding contract.

I have had the support of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in setting in place policies that would gradually reduce the amount of money that could be paid out without an invoice and contract to match. This policy has been incorporated in the last five appropriations bills—fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999. We are now working on the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill. It is my understanding that the committee supports the amendment again this year.

Under current law, the matching threshold is set at $1 million effective this month. This means that the Department of Defense disbursing officials must match each payment of $1 million or more with a corresponding obligation or contract before the payment is made. My pending amendment would continue the process of ratcheting down the threshold began 5 years ago. It would lower the threshold then from the $1 million in present law to $500,000. Reports of the General Accounting Office and inspectors general consistently show that this policy is helping to reduce DOD's unmatched disbursement problems. As I understand it, the DOD has lowered the threshold to zero in most disbursing centers.

I thank the Department of Defense for having adopted a policy that every taxpayer would assume is a principle of good Government management, and that is that they would not pay out one penny without being able to show what they ordered and received for that penny. That has become a policy at some of the disbursing centers but not at all the centers. So we want to see the threshold lowered to zero at all locations because we think it is just sound business management that not one penny of the taxpayers' dollars should be paid out if there is not an invoice and contract for what has been bought and received, either goods or services, for that amount of money.

So we are not quite at zero all over the country with all of the centers. Some Department of Defense disbursing centers still have problems.

This amendment will help keep the pressure on and hopefully in time will help the Department of Defense eliminate in the future all unmatched disbursements, so that the Senator from Iowa will never have to come to the Senate floor again and say we have these billions of dollars that the Pentagon paid out and they have never been able to show exactly what they ordered and received.

If the threshold specified in this amendment is unworkable, then I have asked the chairman to adjust the dollar level in conference, but I hope it is so obvious that we will be able to tell the taxpayers of this country that we know what they are buying; that at least for the next year we should keep the pressure on for the still fantastically high level of $500,000 that could be paid out under certain circumstances without the invoice and contract immediately available.

I do not want to stand before the Senate and be embarrassed by saying that we can somehow justify even a $500,000 check being written without knowing what goods and services were, in fact, ordered and received and being paid for.

I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, and I thank the ranking minority member, Senator INOUYE, for their continuing support of this amendment. Every year for the last 5 years I have offered this amendment, and every year for the last 5 years they have put the amendment in the bill, kept it there and protected it in conference. This effort, particularly with their respected leadership in the area of defense, is very positive toward the Department of Defense changing their attitude about unmatched disbursements and leading us to a point where we are reducing the amount of unmatched disbursements.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their unwavering support, and I hope all my colleagues will support this simple but important amendment. I yield the floor.

I have time left over, and if the Senator from Alaska wants some of my time, he can have it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will take a couple of minutes.

I was pleased to offer this amendment for my good friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. Senator GRASSLEY's determined effort to improve the Department of Defense financial accounting standards, by demanding that funds disbursed are matched by funds obligated—simply meaning that they balance their checkbook and they let us know so the taxpayers will know what the checks have been written for—his efforts has already yielded results in lowering the Department's unmatched disbursements.

To those who may be unfamiliar with this problem, as of the fiscal year 1998, according to the Department's own inspector general, the Department reported a substantial problem with disbursements. That means that funds were reported having been disbursed to the Treasury but not processed, or, in other cases, the Department's employees could not match a disbursement to an obligated item.

There is a conflict here. We are trying to make certain those who provide services to the Department of Defense are promptly paid. On the other hand, there is a requirement for the taxpayers that we know what they have paid and what we have bought with the funds, as the Senator said.

The Appropriations Committee is pleased to work with Senator GRASSLEY and the Department of Defense to ensure the Department makes steady progress in reducing these problem disbursements. I do support the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, and I believe all Senators seek to improve the Department's control over the appropriation of taxpayers' funds to the Department of Defense.

What time will the vote take place, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. I remind Senators that first-degree amendments to this bill must be offered by 2:30 p.m. Additional amendments and votes are expected through today's session. My colleague and I are working on a package of amendments which we will submit as soon as this time has expired and this amendment has been voted upon. At least we will discuss this package. It is my hope we will be able to finish this bill today. I am going to work to achieve that goal.

Does the Senator from Hawaii wish to make any comments on this amendment?

Mr. INOUYE. No.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, what time is the vote scheduled to take place?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 9:45.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 540. 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 Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent due to a death in the family.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—93

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

NOT VOTING—7

Biden	Grams	Torricelli
Crapo	McCain	
Dodd	Moynihan	

The amendment (No. 540) was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 541

(Purpose: To substitute for section 8106 (relating to operational support aircraft) a requirement for a report)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 541.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8106, and insert the following:

SEC. 8106. Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the inventory and status of operational support aircraft, Commander-in-Chief support aircraft, and command support aircraft of the Department of Defense. The report shall include a detailed discussion of the requirements for such aircraft, the foreseeable future requirements for such aircraft, the cost of leasing such aircraft, commercial alternatives to use of such aircraft, the cost of maintaining the aircraft, the capability and appropriateness of the aircraft to fulfill mission requirements, and the relevancy of the missions of the aircraft to warfighting requirements.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be laid aside for further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be laid aside.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 542, 543, 544, AND 545, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to send to the desk a series of amendments which provide adjustments in the bill brought about by a review made by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget. These amendments allocate funds in a different manner under the bill.

The first change is an increase in funds for the Army Test Range Facilities Program.

The second readjusts one account in the Navy, and moves $51.84 million into the Joint War Fighting Experimental Program, and leaves it under the control of Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs reporting to the defense committees of the House and the Senate.

The third will appropriate funds to meet the authorization bill's provision of funds to assist the Red Cross in providing Armed Forces emergency services.

The fourth is to deal with the addition of $10 million from cockpit modifications to the U2.

I send them to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) proposes amendments numbered 542, 543, 544, and 545, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 542, 543, 544, and 545), en bloc, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 542

(Purpose: To provide funds for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . In addition to any funds appropriated elsewhere in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $9,000,000 is hereby appropriated only for the Army Test Ranges and Facilities program element.''

AMENDMENT NO. 543

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy'', is hereby reduced by $26,840,000 and the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', is hereby increased by $51,840,000 to reflect the transfer of the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program may be obligated until the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reports to the Congressional defense committees on the role and participation of all unified and specified commands in the JWEP.''

AMENDMENT NO. 544

(Purpose: To provide funding for the American Red Cross Armed Forces Emergency Services program)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense, $23,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, that the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $23,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services.''

AMENDMENT NO. 545

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

''SEC. . In addition to the funds available in Title III, $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for U–2 cockpit modifications.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to study these four amendments. They are authorized by the authorizing committee. I am in full support of them.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 542, 543, 544, and 545), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are working on a managers' package. We have several amendments that we believe the Senate should include in such a package. I urge Members who have identified amendments they intend to offer to consult with my friend from Hawaii, myself, and our staffs to see if we can't enlarge this package and take care of a series of items that are really not controversial during the time that we have a vehicle.

As I have stated before, all amendments to this bill in the first degree must be introduced by 2:30 this afternoon.

We stand ready to work with any Member on an amendment. This would be a good time for anyone who has an amendment that is controversial to come and offer it. So far, no one has volunteered to undertake that task. But pending a Member wishing to offer an amendment, 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives the companion bill to S. 1122, the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration thereof; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1122, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for the third time and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that S. 1122 not be engrossed and that it remain at the desk pending receipt of the House companion bill, and that upon passage of the House bill, as amended, the passage of S. 1122 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are working on the managers' package, and to do this, we have to be off the floor. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. We hope Members will come and talk to us about this managers' package in the event they want amendments in it.

There being no objection, at 10:42 a.m., the Senate recessed until 11:32 a.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ENZI).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that Danelle Scotka, a fellow in the office of Senator HUTCHISON, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1122.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 547

(Purpose: To set aside $63,041,000 of Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation funds for C–5 aircraft modernization)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, I offer an amendment and ask that it be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 547.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', $63,041,000 shall be available for C–5 aircraft modernization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and set aside.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ms. Sandi Dittig, on the staff of Senator GRAHAM of Florida, be granted full privileges of the floor during this debate.

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

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 548

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of refugee relief funds for long-term, regional development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] proposes an amendment numbered 548.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) for emergency support of refugees and displaced persons and the local communities directly affected by the influx of refugees may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, which I will agree to have set aside whenever the chairman decides to do so, is to address the issue of the reconstruction of Kosovo and funds that might be spent in Kosovo for reconstruction. The concept of reconstruction, of course, is something that is going to have to be dealt with by the Congress and the President over the next few months, no matter what happens relative to the air war.

One of the concerns I have, and I think many Americans have, is that America will end up paying a disproportionate cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo and potentially Yugoslavia. It is my opinion that no American funds should be spent for the reconstruction of Yugoslavia until Milosevic is removed as its leader.

It is further my view that America's participation in the cost of long-term reconstruction of Kosovo should be extremely limited, that our cost should be minor, a fraction of the amount of the cost of reconstruction, and that the vast majority of the burden of reconstruction should be borne by the European nations.

As a nation, the United States has borne a disproportionate amount of the cost of the war that has gone on in Yugoslavia. It is, after all, a European issue more than an American issue. The United States had no national strategic interest in this part of the world. Not until the hundreds of thousands of refugees were created did we really have any significant interest at all in this part of the world; the refugees, of course, being a function of part of the diplomacy of this administration, which, in my opinion, has been a gross blunder in this region of the world.

In any event, this is a European issue which should be addressed by the European nations. Certainly, the reconstruction issue is a European issue which should be addressed by the European nations, and American taxpayers should not be asked to bear the cost of it.

What my amendment does is simply state that the emergency appropriations, which we eventually pass for purposes of fighting the war in Kosovo, will be limited in their application so they cannot be used for long-term structural reform of the economy or the capital needs of Kosovo, without the President coming to Congress and requesting those funds be used in that way and without him putting forward a strategic plan which reflects how much it is going to cost us as a nation to reconstruct the Kosovo infrastructure. Until we receive that plan and it is approved by the Congress, these funds would not be made available for that sort of effort.

It does not limit these funds being used for humanitarian purposes. It does not limit these funds being used for the immediate needs of our own military, should our own military be interjected into Kosovo for some reason. It does not limit the funds being used for things such as replacing wells and getting people back in their homes with electricity temporarily.

What it does limit is any long-term attempt to rebuild Kosovo's infrastructure, which would be part of an overall plan for reconstruction, without us first getting such a plan and knowing how much it is going to cost the American taxpayers. I do think the administration has an obligation to be honest with the taxpayers and tell us exactly what they are really thinking we are going to have to pay in terms of costs.

I have read news reports coming out of the European Union that suggested the European Union position is that the U.S. taxpayer should pay for half of the cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo. To me, that would be unacceptable. I have read other news reports from folks who work for our agencies saying the United States may be willing to pay up to 25 percent of the long-term cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo. We are talking about, potentially, 5, 10, 15 years, with significant capital expenditures in that region of the world, and 25 percent would be a huge number.

If that is the administration's position, we need to know what that number is before we start down that road.

This amendment is a minor attempt to keep us from starting down that road and to get the administration to be forthright as to what are these costs.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will discuss this matter later, but I will say that the Senator's amendment is consistent with my understanding of the purposes for which we passed the 1999 supplemental. The moneys in that supplemental were for assistance to the refugees and for conducting the air war. It is my understanding that there was no money for the ground war, no money for the subsequent force—whatever it may be—that follows after the cessation of hostilities in that area. As the Senator stated, it would be for the long-term reconstruction and not for the temporary things that might be done to assist the Kosovo refugees to go back to their former homes. I think that will be probably something that will have to have money immediately, once we have a cessation of hostilities, which I pray will be very soon.

I think this ought to be a marker that we put down that we want to see how these costs are going to be met in this area after the hostilities cease. The economy of the European Union now is greater than ours. Their employment picture is even better than ours. I don't see any reason why there should be an assumption that we will carry on at the past level of expenditures. There is no question that the expenditures made in the war so far are overwhelmingly U.S. expenditures. I do not deny the participation of the NATO allies in the activities, but their costs are infinitesimal compared to ours when you view the long line that our supplies have to follow to get there and the cost of maintaining our forces there as compared to those who go home every night, in terms of the participants from the European Union.

I hope the Senate will take a very careful look at the Senator's suggestion. I want to make sure that it does not impede the activities of our forces to really provide for their own protection, as well as the facilities that will be needed by our people if they move into the area immediately after the cessation of hostilities. But I do think when we get to a long-range concept, a new Marshall Plan for this area, it is something that the Congress must be involved in, and the taxpayers must know what our share is going to be before we commence such activities.

I urge the Senator to lay his amendment aside.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe my amendment is in sync with the opinions expressed by the chairman. I ask that my amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 549 AND 550, EN BLOC

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes amendments numbered 549 and 550, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 549

(Purpose: To set aside $10,000,000 of Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide funds for carrying out first-year actions of the 5-year research plan for addressing low-level exposures to chemical warfare agents)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'' for the Office of the Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Gulf War Illnesses, $10,000,000 shall be available for carrying out the first-year actions under the 5-year research plan outlined in the report entitled ''Department of Defense Strategy to Address Low-Level Exposures to Chemical Warfare Agents (CWAs)'', dated May 1999, that was submitted to committees of Congress pursuant to section 247(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1957).

AMENDMENT NO. 550

(Purpose: To increase by $10,000,000 the amount provided for the Army for other procurement for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements, and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', $51,250,000 shall be available for the Information System Security Program, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Department of Defense operates over two million separate computers and 25,000 distinct computer systems to conduct its mission. These computer systems are integral parts of a wide variety of Department of Defense (DOD) programs. Many of these programs are critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; but other vital activities also affected include command and control, satellites, inventory and transportation management, medical equipment, payment of checks, and personnel records.

The Department is now becoming aware that attacks on these systems may be capable of significantly affecting our military power, just as surely as a direct physical assault. Experience with ''hackers'' and DOD exercises indicate that defense systems, often globally-linked and readily-accessed, are vulnerable to unauthorized penetration of their information networks. Newspapers have been filled with reports in recent days about ''hackers'' attacking the web sites of the FBI, the White House, the Department of Interior, and even the Senate.

For example, I am told that by using unsophisticated ''hacker tools,'' intruders are able to crack systems passwords, establish super-user status (network control), search for and turn on microphones or cameras on personal computers connected to the installation campus area network. Hackers may then capture intra-office conversations and live video and download it to their computers. A simple test of the microphone sensitivity revealed low-level conversations were easily heard from roughly thirty feet away. This is particulary critical in areas where classified and sensitive information is stored and discussed.

The compelling need for controlling access to our Nation's vital information networks through computers becomes immediately evident when one considers just one battlefield scenario—the possibility that one of our important command and control outposts on the ground is overrun by hostile forces. Just imagine what leverage that would provide to a computer-sophisticated enemy. And, I am told that the Department has learned from its experience in Kosovo that this kind of a threat is not limited to major world powers.

At the present time, the basic process the Department relies upon to protect its computer systems are some kind of card and/or passwords including random characters. Users often are required to have several such cards or passwords in connection with their work. This approach to information security has some serious drawbacks for the long run. Passwords can be forgotten, shared, or observed, and cards can be lost, stolen, or duplicated. Moreover, as the need for even more security grows with advancing technology, the situation will become more cumbersome and less effective. On the other hand, more sophisticated means are expected to become available to make unwanted intrusions, necessitating even more complex password and card systems.

There is an emerging technology available to the Department that promises to provide a more effective information security system, and that is biometrics. Almost everyone is familiar with fingerprints. Fingerprints are a biometric signature. Others are

voice, face recognition, the iris of the eye, and keystroke dynamics or typing patterns; and I understand there are others as well. With this approach, access to a particular computer or network of computers is controlled by comparing one or several biometric signatures of the person asking to use the machine, with a template on file in a central location that contains the biometric identification of the authorized user of that computer. There is no card. There is no password. The test is whether the potential user is who he or she claims to be. The system authenticates a claimed identity from previously enrolled patterns or distinguishable traits. I understand that in the commercial world there are some examples of biometric identification already in use. Some ATM machines, for instance, now rely on iris signatures to permit access rather than the familiar card we all carry.

The Army has a particular interest in developing an effective control over the access to its information systems through computers, because of the far flung nature of its forces, and because its battle systems are becoming increasingly dependent on information networks.

This bill already includes $5.0 million in the Other Procurement, Army, appropriation for an initial biometrics computer information assurance system prototype project. I understand that the Army has exhibited strong leadership in the exploration and development of technologies in the biometrics arena, and is a natural leading candidate to be considered as the executive agent in this work for the Department of Defense and perhaps the federal government. The amendment I am offering is intended to respond to the immediacy of the critical information assurance requirement of the Army, and to build on the Army's leadership role in biometrics technology. The amendment also builds on the biometrics prototype project to explore a more focused and synergistic effort to develop information assurance technology. Finally, it also builds on and anticipates a working relationship with the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the FBI, which houses and operates the world's finest single biometric data base—fingerprints. Specifically, my amendment provides an additional $10.0 million for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements, and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be laid aside.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment to this bill. In fact, I am a member of the subcommittee and I commend the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE, for their leadership and work on this legislation. I am pleased to work with them on a range of issues that deal with the defense of this country and with the strengthening of the Armed Forces. I think they do an excellent job.

There is one area—and not just on this legislation—of the policy debate in Congress I wanted to mention during the discussion on funding, and that is the area of national missile defense. I do have some concerns about the policy and direction of national missile defense. I wanted to express them now because I think this is the appropriate place.

I don't quarrel with the question of research for national missile defense. We have been involved in a robust research program on missile defense. Hopefully, that research, at some point, will bear fruit sufficient that if a threat exists that would persuade us to deploy, we would deploy a national missile defense system that is a workable system and one that provides real and significant protection to our country.

Last week—I think perhaps it was a week ago tomorrow—I was driving on a road up in far northeastern North Dakota. I looked to my left and I saw this huge concrete structure. It is, of course, the only antiballistic missile system that was ever built in the free world. It was built in the late 1960s, early 1970s. It was built in Nekoma, ND, up in the northeastern corner of our State. The very month it was declared operational it was also mothballed. Apparently, in today's dollars, somewhere around $20 billion was spent. We still have the massive quantities of concrete poured into a building that looks very much like a modern-day pyramid up in the vast reaches of northeastern North Dakota. That is a legacy, I suppose, to the taxpayers who say sometimes you can have a very expensive program that doesn't turn out quite the way you expected. Some will say, well, that program was just fine; it was a bargaining chip in arms control, and it was mothballed the very month it was declared operational because that was part of the strategic calculation of our country. Of course, that is not the case.

I want to talk for a moment about the range of threats against our country. One of those threats is the threat of a terrorist nation, or an adversary, acquiring an intercontinental ballistic missile and affixing to the top of this missile a nuclear warhead and then firing that missile at the United States of America. If that should happen, do we want to have in place a national missile defense system to intercept it? Of course. The answer is yes, of course.

What are the likely threats? I mentioned an intercontinental ballistic missile being acquired by a terrorist nation. But, it is far more likely that it would not be an intercontinental ballistic missile but a cruise missile; they are much more widely dispersed, and it would be much more easily acquired. That cruise missile would travel 500 feet above the ground, at 500 or 600 miles an hour, and would be launched from a barge, or a submarine, or a plane just off our shores. That is not going to be intercepted by a national missile defense system.

Some say we are working on theater defense that will intercept cruise missiles. Yes, but that theater defense isn't part of what is going to protect the perimeter of our country. It is far more likely that a terrorist nation would acquire a cruise missile. Is there a defense system against a cruise missile?

It is far more likely a terrorist nation would, in fact, terrorize our country with a deadly vial of biological or chemical weapons that could cause the kind of chaos that nearly occurred in Japan a couple of years ago, where the right kind of deadly biological agents can kill thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million people. It is far more likely that a major U.S. city would be threatened by a suitcase bomb placed in the trunk of a rusty Yugo car on a New York City dock by a terrorist nation. That is far more likely than them acquiring a sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missile.

The potential, for example, of an adversary such as Russia, which has substantial nuclear might, accidentally launching tubes full of missiles from a Russian submarine would not be defeated by the national missile defense system we are talking about because the system being discussed could only potentially defeat a handful of missiles, not an accidental launch of all the tubes of a Russian submarine. Only a handful of missiles could be intercepted by the missile defense system that is currently under discussion. That doesn't suggest that we ought not consider it. But the question I ask is this: Consideration at what price and with what other consequences?

First, as we begin to make decisions about a national missile defense system, I don't think we ought to just throw money at the system. I think some who have an appetite for it say we should just keep pouring money in there and somehow a system will emerge that will protect our country. I think that would lead to a great deal of waste.

Second, the debate we have about deploying a national missile defense system, as soon as technologically possible or feasible, is a debate that worries me, because it seems to suggest all

of the consequences are less important and all of the consequences should be set aside.

What are those other consequences? One is a program we now have under way with Russia in which we actually saw the wings off Russian bombers. We actually remove Russian missiles from their silos and remove the warheads from the missile. We are reducing in a dramatic way the number of missiles and bombers and the capabilities of delivering warheads aimed at this country.

I have in this desk drawer a little vial which, with the consent of the Presiding Officer, I will show. This little vial of material is wiring that was ground up. It is from a Russian submarine that carried missiles aimed at the United States. That submarine is reduced to small pieces of metal. It is cut up. It doesn't exist anymore. I have some of the wiring right here.

How do we acquire the wiring of a Russian ballistic missile submarine? You could shoot it and destroy it. That is one way. Or, the other way is with an agreement between ourselves and the Russians to reduce weapons of mass destruction and the delivery capabilities of each side. We have seen submarines and bombers and nuclear warheads being systematically reduced in a very aggressive way.

That is exactly what is happening here. That happens through the Nunn-Lugar funds that are offered in this kind of legislation. It is a very important program. It has been remarkably successful. I do not want to, by what we are doing in other areas, jeopardize that kind of arms reduction and arms control.

One other point, Mr. President: It is true that this is an increasingly difficult and dangerous world. North Korea is testing medium-range missiles. Iran is testing medium-range missiles. Pakistan and India do not like each other, and they exploded nuclear weapons right under each other's nose. It is a difficult and dangerous world.

I support research on missile defense. But I do not support efforts that would say let us demand deployment of any system as soon as technologically feasible, even if it is at the expense of injuring other efforts to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons, or to eliminate delivery systems of nuclear weapons under current arms control regimes.

Some say the ABM Treaty is for a country that no longer exists, the old Soviet Union; don't worry about it; ignore it.

The fact is that we have made significant progress under our arms control agreements. I think we need to be very careful as we proceed down this road not to do one thing at the expense of others that we know will work.

I only wanted to say again that the national missile defense program is one that I have provided support for by substantial amounts of research. I do worry sometimes that the amount of money offered is exceeding the amount of money the system is capable of using effectively. It is a difficult technology to hit a bullet with a bullet at intercontinental missile speeds. Some of my colleagues make the point that it is not one program, it is many programs in a seamless transition of dealing with suppression of missile threats in the theater, and also dealing with intercontinental ballistic missile threats.

It is true that these programs represent a number of different kinds of programs. But the largest of them is the national missile defense program, commonly referred to as that, which would be deployed to defend against an intercontinental ballistic missile. Representing a State that has housed the only ABM or national missile defense program that was ever built in the Free World, I have some acquaintance with it.

It is my hope that when and if this country deploys a system in the future, it not be done at the expense of arms control reductions that exist in other arms control agreements. That we not decide to focus so much on this issue that we do so at the expense of the nonproliferation efforts this country ought to have as job one. We ought to worry very much every day and in every way about efforts to prevent the proliferation and spread of weapons of mass destruction.

I think there is a lot of evidence out there about which we need to be very concerned. Frankly, I think it has taken a back seat in recent years. I think it has taken a back seat in Congress and a back seat in the administration. I don't think we have had nearly as much effort as I would feel comfortable with to try to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There are not too many countries that have nuclear weapons at this point, but many countries want to acquire them. There is a black market in the weapons material and production of nuclear weapons. As all of those countries are seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, I hope, as we discuss all of these issues, our country will understand that to prevent proliferation of these weapons, we should not just discuss national missile defense in a way that says it is more important than any other area. If we are to build a safer future for ourselves and our children, it must be a priority for us to say that the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world is a very serious problem that this country ought to pay serious attention to, and it ought to command a substantial amount of our time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), for Mr. NICKLES, proposes an amendment numbered 551.

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

''None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other act may be made available for reconstruction activities in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of Kosovo) as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).''q

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be set aside.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 552 THROUGH 573, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a portion of the managers' package that we have been working on. I will delineate each amendment, send them to the desk, and ask they be considered en bloc.

The first is an amendment of Senator INHOFE pertaining to the Starstreak missile. The next is an amendment of Senator MACK, $6 million for advanced-track acquisition; another amendment of Senator MACK, $3 million electronic propulsion systems; Senator MACK, $5 million for the tropical remote sensing radar; an amendment of Senator BURNS, $6 million for pollution/waste systems, research and development; Senator MCCONNELL, $13 million for the MK–45, and $19 million for the Close In Weapon System.

I have an amendment for $1.5 million for the Pallet-Loading System; Senator BENNETT, $1 million for the alternative missile engine; Senator HOLLINGS, $3 million for the Environmental Pollution Preventive Initiative; Senator

REID, $4.5 million for hot gas decontamination projects; Senator LIEBERMAN, $2 million for the Medical Informatics; Senator REID, $2.8 million for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System; Senator KERREY, $2 million for recombinant vaccine research; Senator LAUTENBERG, an Army firefighting equipment amendment; Senator BIDEN, $3 million for advanced composite materials processing; Senator DOMENICI, $5 million for Army warfare analysis; Senator DOMENICI, $7.5 million for shield imaging; Senators WYDEN and SMITH, $4 million for laser fusion; an amendment of mine for $20 million for supersonic noise reduction; Senator LEAHY, JCETS reporting requirement; Senator SHELBY, $5 million for the DAU pilot program; Senator INOUYE, an amendment for training by the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management.

As I indicated, these amendments are part of the managers' group and I ask they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendments by number.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for himself and Mr. INOUYE, and on behalf of other Senators, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 552 through 573.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have studied the measures. I have no objection.

Mr. STEVENS. These amendments have been cleared on both sides. I ask they be considered en bloc, passed and adopted en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 552 through 573) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 552

At the end of the general provisions, insert the following:

SEC. . The Department of the Army is directed to conduct a live fire, side-by-side operational test of the air-to-air Starstreak and air-to-air Stinger missiles from the AH–64D Longbow helicopter. The operational test is to be completed utilizing funds provided for in this bill in addition to funding provided for this purpose in the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–262): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department is to ensure that the development, procurement or integration of any missile for use on the AH–64 or RAH–66 helicopters, as an air-to-air missile, is subject to a full and open competition which includes the conduct of a live-fire, side-by-side test as an element of the source selection criteria: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition & Technology) will conduct an independent review of the need, and the merits of acquiring an air-to-air missile to provide self-protection for the AH–64 and RAH–66 from the threat of a hostile forces. The Secretary is to provide his findings in a report to the Defense Oversight Committees, no later than March 31, 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 553

(Purpose: To authorize use of $6,000,000 of Air Force RDT&E funds (in PE 604604F) for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $6,000,000 may be made available for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system.

AMENDMENT NO. 554

(Purpose: To authorize use of $3,000,000 of Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy funds for electronic propulsion systems)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for electronic propulsion systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 555

(Purpose: To authorize use of $5,000,000 of Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense funds for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE,'' up to $5,000,000 may be made available for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems)

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill the following:

''SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $6,000,000 may be provided to the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory to continue research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems.''

AMENDMENT NO. 557

(Purpose: To correct the allocation of Navy operation and maintenance funds between two naval gun depot overhaul programs)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY,'' up to $13,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the MK–45 weapon system, and up to $19,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the Close In Weapon System.

AMENDMENT NO. 558

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System)

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY,'' up to $1,500,000 may be available for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System.

AMENDMENT NO. 559

(Purpose: To designate funds for the development of alternate missile engines)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new general provision:

SEC. . Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $1,000,000 may be made available only for alternative missile engine source development.

AMENDMENT NO. 560

(Purpose: To set aside $3,000,000 of Army research, development, test, and evaluation funds for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriate in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative.

AMENDMENT NO. 561

(Purpose: To provide funds for a hot gas decontamination facility)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $4,500,000 may be made available for a hot gas decontamination facility.

AMENDMENT NO. 562

(Purpose: To support a DoD Center for Medical Informatics)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to support the establishment of a DoD Center for Medical Informatics.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

(Purpose: To increase funds for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS'', up to $2,800,000 may be made available for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System.

AMENDMENT NO. 564

(Purpose: To support recombinant vaccine recombinant vaccine research)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to continue and expand on-going work in recombinant vaccine research against biological warfare agents.

AMENDMENT NO. 565

(Purpose: To require conveyance of certain Army firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey)

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) The purpose of this section is to provide means for the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, to furnish fire protection through the City's municipal fire department for the tenants, including the Coast Guard, and property at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, thereby enhancing the City's capability for furnishing safety services that is a fundamental capability necessary for encouraging the economic development of Military Ocean Terminal.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, convey without consideration to the Bayonne Local Redevelopment Authority, Bayonne, New Jersey, and to the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, jointly, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the firefighting equipment described in subsection (c).

(c) The equipment to be conveyed under subsection (b) is firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, as follows:

(1) Pierce Dash 2000 Gpm Pumper, manufactured September 1995.

(2) Pierce Arrow 100-foot Tower Ladder, manufactured February 1994.

(3) Pierce HAZMAT truck, manufactured 1993.

(4) Ford E–350, manufactured 1992.

(5) Ford E–302, manufactured 1990.

(6) Bauer Compressor, Bauer–UN 12–E#5000psi, manufactured November 1989.

(d) The conveyance and delivery of the property shall be at no cost to the United States.

(e) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 566

(Purpose: To provide $3,000,000 (in PE 62234N) for the Navy for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding))

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding).

AMENDMENT NO. 567

(Purpose: To set aside $5,000,000 of Army RDT&E funds (in PE 605604A) for Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $5,000,000 may be available for Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

(Purpose: To set aside $7,500,000 of Air Force RDT&E funds (in PE 603605F) for the GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $7,500,000 may be made available for the GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 569

(Purpose: To set aside $4,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $4,000,000 may be available solely for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries.

AMENDMENT NO. 570

(Purpose: To provide funds for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in title IV of this Act for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $20,000,000 may be made available for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research and development efforts.

AMENDMENT NO. 571

On line 22, page 97, insert the following:

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitate the waiver.

AMENDMENT NO. 572

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . From within the funds provided for the Defense Acquisition University, up to $5,000,000 may be spent on a pilot program using state-of-the-art training technology that would train the acquisition workforce in a simulated government procurement environment.

AMENDMENT NO. 573

(Purpose: To stipulate training activities of Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance)

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following:

SEC. . During the current fiscal year, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management and humanitarian assistance: *Provided*, That not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the training of foreign personnel conducted under this authority during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under the section: *Provided further*, That the report shall specify the countries in which the training was conducted, the type of training conducted, and the foreign personnel trained.

Mr. STEVENS. We have several other amendments we are trying to get agreed to. I plead with Members of the Senate to bring forth the amendments so we may study them and know the amendments that we will debate later today. It is my hope we will finish this bill this evening.

Let me state for the information of Members of the Senate, this is not a military construction bill. This is the defense bill. Military construction items will be in a separate bill. That bill will be marked up by the Senate tomorrow. Members who have amendments concerning military construction at home or abroad should present those to the subcommittee for consideration at markup tomorrow. We have had some suggested amendments to this bill; we do not want those to come to this bill. This is not within the jurisdiction of the Defense Subcommittee. We will be forced to oppose any amendment that is offered that deals with military construction.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 574

(Purpose: To authorize a project at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, to evaluate methods of improving efficiency in the operation of military installations)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an amendment numbered 574.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be set aside.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as in morning business for 3 minutes.

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

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF JAMES HORMEL

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was very surprised and disappointed to find that during our recess when we were not here, the President made a very controversial appointment of James Hormel to be U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. I believe it is something that should not be done. In fact, when I think of procedures, I look to a man I admire so much, Senator BOB BYRD from West Virginia.

During a recess in 1985, President Reagan made several appointments. Senator BYRD said: The recess appointment power should not be used simply to avoid controversy or to circumvent the constitutional power and responsibility of the Senate. In several cases, Reagan's recess appointments avoided serious and probing debate by the Senate on controversial issues. There is no evidence that the needs of government required any of these appointments to be made as recess appointments.

Then Senator BYRD went on to give the history, as he always does in his very eloquent style, as to how the Constitution does provide for emergencies, for such things as appointments back in the 1800s when people were traveling and unable to get here or when something strategic is pending. In the case of James Hormel, certainly there is not anything strategic pending.

For that reason, I am serving official notice today that I am going to do the same thing Senator BYRD did back in 1985: I am putting holds on every single Presidential nomination.

In the case of James Hormel, it is a little confusing to a lot of people as to why he became controversial. Yes, he is gay. That is not the reason for people opposing him. It is the fact that he is a gay activist who puts his agenda ahead of the agenda of America.

I can recall when he made the statement when first nominated by the President: I wish the President had nominated me to be Ambassador to Norway, because if they have something on the ballot—same-sex marriages or something like that—I might be able to influence it.

That, to me, demonstrated very clearly that he wanted to use this position to advance his own agenda and not the agenda of America.

I hasten to say, I would have the same feelings about any other appointment on any other issue. If David Duke were appointed and came to the conclusion he was going to use his militia interests as his motivation and his agenda more than America's agenda, I certainly would oppose that nomination in the same way. Notice is hereby served.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. I ask for the regular order.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 having arrived, the Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes; and under the previous order, at the hour of 2:20, the Senator from Alaska is to be recognized.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield my time to my friend from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 548, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. I send a modification to the desk to amendment No. 548.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that Commander Tom Bailey, a fellow serving on the staff of Senator COCHRAN, be allowed privileges of the floor during the debate on this bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 575

(Purpose: To authorize $4,000,000 of Army research, development, test, and evaluation funds (in PE 60481A) to be used for the Advanced Integrated Helmet System Program)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator GORTON and ask it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. GORTON, proposes an amendment numbered 575.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in the title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', $4,000,000 shall be made available for the Advanced Integrated Helmet System Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 576

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for the distinguished majority leader and ask it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 576.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

Office of Net Assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the United States Pacific Command, shall submit a report to Congress no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act which addresses the following issues:

1. A review and evaluation of the operational planning and other preparations of the U.S. Defense Department, including but not limited to the U.S. Pacific Command, to implement the relevant sections of the Taiwan Relations Act since its enactment in 1979.

2. A review and evaluation of all gaps in relevant knowledge about the current and future military balance between Taiwan and mainland China, including but not limited to Chinese open source writings.

3. A set of recommendations, based on these reviews and evaluations, concerning further research and analysis that the Office of Net Assessment and the Pacific Command believe to be necessary and desirable to be performed by the National Defense University and other defense research centers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and ask that it be qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 577.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 106, line 4, strike ''The Communications Act'' and insert ''(a) The Communications Act of 1934''.

On page 107, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(b)(1) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report which shall—

(A) set forth the anticipated schedule (including specific dates) for—

(i) preparing and conducting the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a); and

(ii) depositing the receipts of the competitive bidding process;

(B) set forth each significant milestone in the rulemaking process with respect to the competitive bidding process;

(C) include an explanation of the effect of each requirement in subsection (a) on the schedule for the competitive bidding process and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) when compared with the schedule for the competitive bidding and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) that would otherwise have occurred under section 337(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(b)(2)) if not for the enactment of subsection (a);

(D) set forth for each spectrum auction held by the Federal Communications Commission since 1993 information on—

(i) the time required for each stage of preparation for the auction;

(ii) the date of the commencement and of the completion of the auction;

(iii) the time which elapsed between the date of the completion of the auction and the date of the first deposit of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(iv) the dates of all subsequent deposits of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(E) include an assessment of how the stages of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a), including preparation, commencement and completion, and deposit of receipts, will differ from similar stages in the auctions referred to in subparagraph (D).

(2) Not later than October 5, 2000, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report which shall—

(A) describe the course of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a) through September 30, 2000, including the amount of any receipts from the competitive bidding process deposited in the Treasury as of September 30, 2000; and

(B) if the course of the competitive bidding process has included any deviations from the schedule set forth under paragraph (1)(A), an explanation for such deviations from the schedule.

(3) The Federal Communications Commission may not consult with the Director in the preparation and submittal of the reports required of the Commission by this subsection.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

(Purpose: To extend for a period of 3 years the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 and the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. ROBERTS, proposes an amendment numbered 578.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998 AND INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.

(a) EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—Section 2 of the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–194; 112 Stat. 627) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1999'' each place it appears and inserting ''September 30, 2002''.

(b) EXTENSION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 902(a) of the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1 note) is amended by striking ''for a period not to exceed one year upon enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''for a period not to exceed September 30, 2002''.

(2) REPORT.—Section 904 of such Act is amended by striking ''a one-year period described in section 902'' and inserting ''the first year following the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or September 30, 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator from Hawaii have any amendments?

Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 579

(Purpose: Relating to the conveyance of the remaining Army Reserve property at former Fort Sheridan, Illinois)

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator DURBIN on Fort Sheridan and ask that it be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 579.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph(1) is a parcel of real property, including any improvement thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 580

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding the accidental civilian casualties of live ammunition testing at Vieques, Puerto Rico, and actions to prevent a recurrence of such a tragic accident)

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN on Vieques, Puerto Rico, and ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 580.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress recognizes and supports, as being fundamental to the national defense, the ability of the Armed Forces to test weapons and weapon systems thoroughly, and to train members of the Armed Forces in the use of weapons and weapon systems before the forces enter hostile military engagements.

(2) It is the policy of the United States that the Armed Forces at all times exercise the utmost degree of caution in the testing of weapons and weapon systems in order to avoid endangering civilian populations and the environment.

(3) In the adherence to these policies, it is essential to the public safety that the Armed Forces not test weapons or weapon systems, or engage in training exercises with live ammunition, in close proximity to civilian populations unless there is no reasonable alternative available.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there should be a thorough and independent investigation of the circumstances that led to the accidental death of a civilian employee of the Navy installation in Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the wounding of four other civilians during a live-ammunition weapons test at Vieques, including a reexamination of the adequacy of the measures that are in place to protect the civilian population during such testing and of the extent to which the civilian population at the site can be adequately protected during such testing;

(2) the President should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition testing on

the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is not available an alternative testing site with no civilian population located in close proximity;

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the testing be carried out despite the potential risks to the civilian population;

(C) measures to provide the utmost level of safety to the civilian population are to be in place and maintained throughout the testing; and

(D) in the event that testing resumes, measures are to be taken to protect the Island of Vieques and the surrounding area from environmental degradation, including possible environmental harm, that might result from the testing of ammunition containing radioactive materials; and

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the President should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the President decides to resume live-ammunition weapons testing on the Island of Vieques, consult with the Governor on a regular basis regarding the measures being taken from time to time to protect civilians from harm from the testing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment for Senator INOUYE on native Hawaiians, and I ask to have that numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 582

(Purpose: To authorize the use of up to $35,000,000 for the retrofitting and improvement of the current inventory of Patriot missiles to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for Senator KENNEDY on Patriot missiles, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 582.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated in title III, Procurement, under the heading ''MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $35,000,000 may be made available to retrofit and improve the current inventory of Patriot missiles in order to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 583

(Purpose: To reduce funding for the National Missile Defense program by $200,000,000 and to increase funding for Army modernization programs by $200,000,000)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for Senator LEVIN on the National Missile Defense program, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 583.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in Title IV of this act under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, is hereby reduced by $200,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than $836,555,000 of the funds provided under this Act may be obligated for National Missile Defense programs: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Aircraft Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $56,100,000 for re-engining of the CH–47 helicopter; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Missile Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $98,400,000 for advance procurement of the Javelin missile; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army is hereby increased by $20,000,000 for procurement of the Field Artillery Ammunition Supply Vehicle; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Other Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $25,500,000 for procurement of SINCGARS radios.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and set aside.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 584

(Purpose: To reduce amounts appropriated for unrequested, low-priority, unnecessary, and wasteful spending by $3,100,000,000)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have 2 amendments to send to the desk. My understanding is, under the unanimous consent agreement, both of these amendments have to be proposed by the time of 2:30, so I send them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 584.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8108, and insert the following:

SEC. 8108. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act by titles III, IV, and VI is hereby reduced by $3,100,000,000, the reductions to be derived from appropriations as follows:

(1) From Operation and Maintenance, Army, $27,000,000.

(2) From Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $36,000,000.

(3) From Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, $10,200,000.

(4) From Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $61,800,000.

(5) From Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, $78,900,000.

(6) From Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, $53,500,000.

(7) From Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard, $2,900,000.

(8) From Aircraft Procurement, Army, $178,000,000.

(9) From Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, $26,400,000.

(10) From Procurement of Ammunition, Army, $37,500,000.

(11) From Other Procurement, Army, $135,500,000.

(12) From Aircraft Procurement, Navy, $69,000,000.

(13) From Weapons Procurement, Navy, $54,400,000.

(14) From Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, $317,500,000.

(15) From Other Procurement, Navy, $67,800,000.

(16) From Procurement, Marine Corps, $54,900,000.

(17) From Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, $164,500,000.

(18) From Missile Procurement, Air Force, $25,400,000.

(19) From Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, $5,100,000.

(20) From Other Procurement, Air Force, $53,400,000.

(21) From Procurement, Defense-Wide, $73,000,000.

(22) From National Guard and Reserve Equipment, $190,500,000.

(23) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, $249,100,000.

(24) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $288,700,000.

(25) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, $263,300,000.

(26) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, $287,900,000.

(27) From Defense Health Program, $226,200,000.

(28) From Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, $61,600,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 585

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive certain domestic source or content requirements in the procurement of items)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I send a second amendment to the desk, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 585.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Subject to subsection (c) and except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may waive any domestic

source requirement or domestic content requirement referred to in subsection (b) and thereby authorize procurements of items that are grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured—

(1) inside a foreign country the government of which is a party to a reciprocal defense memorandum of understanding that is entered into with the Secretary of Defense and is in effect;

(2) inside the United States or its possessions; or

(3) inside the United States or its possessions partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured outside the United States or its possessions.

(b) For purposes of this section:

(1) A domestic source requirement is any requirement under law that the Department of Defense must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item that is grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States, its possessions, or a part of the national technology and industrial base.

(2) A domestic content requirement is any requirement under law that the Department must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item produced or manufactured partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States or its possessions.

(c) The authority to waive a requirement under subsection (a) applies to procurements of items if the Secretary of Defense first determines that—

(1) the application of the requirement to procurements of those items would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding providing for reciprocal procurement of defense items that is entered into between the Department of Defense and a foreign country in accordance with section 2531 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) the foreign country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country; and

(3) one or more of the conditions set forth in section 2534(d) of title 10, United States Code, exists with respect to the procurement.

(d) LAWS NOT WAIVED.—The Secretary of Defense may not exercise the authority under subsection (a) to waive any of the following laws:

(1) The Small Business Act.

(2) The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c).

(3) Sections 7309 and 7310 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to ships in Federal Supply Class 1905.

(4) Section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 (10 U.S.C. 2241 note), with respect to articles or items of textiles, apparel, shoe findings, tents, and flags listed in Federal Supply Classes 8305, 8310, 8315, 8320, 8335, 8340, and 8345 and articles or items of clothing, footware, individual equipment, and insignia listed in Federal Supply Classes 8405, 8410, 8415, 8420, 8425, 8430, 8435, 8440, 8445, 8450, 8455, 8465, 8470, and 8475.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority under subsection (a) to waive a domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement is in addition to any other authority to waive such requirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and set aside.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman when he would like me to address the issue of one amendment concerning reallocation of $3.1 billion.

Mr. STEVENS. Could we wait until after 2:30? We are trying to get these in by the deadline, and then I will be happy to listen to the Senator's comments.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the chairman, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 586

(Purpose: To provide funds for continued research and development in Space Control Technology)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator SHELBY, and I ask that it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 586.

The amendment is as follows:

In Title IV, under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, add the following:

"Of the funds appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation Army, up to $10 million dollars may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 587

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it, amendments should be numbered and qualified now, and we still have a portion of the managers' package to complete. Would it be in order for me to reserve a place now for the final portion of the managers' amendment and just have an amendment numbered for that purpose at this time.

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

Mr. STEVENS. May I inquire now from the clerk what number will that be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. 587.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair, and 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 588

(Purpose: To authorize the use of $220,000 for a study at Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin, relating to environmental restoration and remediation at weapons and ammunition production facilities)

Mr. STEVENS. On behalf of the Senator from Hawaii, I send to the desk an amendment for Senator KOHL, and I ask that it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. INOUYE, for Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 588.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to $220,000 may be made available to carry out the study described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall carry out a study for purposes of evaluating the cost-effectiveness of various technologies utilized, or having the potential to be utilized, in the demolition and cleanup of facilities contaminated with chemical residue at facilities used in the production of weapons and ammunition.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the study at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin.

(3) The Secretary shall provide for the carrying out of work under the study through the Omaha District Corps of Engineers and in cooperation with the Department of Energy Federal Technology Center, Morgantown, West Virginia.

(4) The Secretary may make available to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government information developed as a result of the study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

Mr. STEVENS. Again, Mr. President, for the benefit of all Senators, after 2:30, no further amendments in the first degree will be in order; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 589

(Purpose: To provide $3,800,000 (in PE 0602315N) for polymer cased ammunition and to provide an offset)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senators LOTT and COCHRAN, and I ask that it be qualified and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. LOTT and Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 589.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . Of the total amount appropriated in this Act for RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY shall be increased by $3,800,000 to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 590

(Purpose: To set aside an additional $7,300,000 for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator GRAHAM, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 590.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'' (other than the funds appropriated for space launch facilities), $7,300,000 shall be available, in addition to other funds appropriated under that heading for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for space launch facilities for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules.

(b) The funds set aside under subsection (a) may not be obligated for any purpose other than the purpose specified in subsection (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 591

(Purpose: To provide for a study of the long term solutions to the removal of ordnance from the Toussaint River, Ohio)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senator VOINOVICH, and I ask that it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. VOINOVICH, proposes an amendment numbered 591.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', up to $500,000 may be available for a study of the costs and feasibility of a project to remove ordnance from the Toussaint River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 592 THROUGH 601, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments that I ask be adopted at this time: A Bond-Santorum amendment, $4 million for MTAPP; Senator HELMS amendment, $5 million for visual display environmental research; Senator BYRD, $10 million for addressing exposure to chemical warfare agents; Senator BYRD, $10 million for biometrics; Senators ASHCROFT and BOND related to the B–2 bomber; Senator SMITH, $10 million for U–2 upgrades; Senator HARKIN, $6 million for Gulf War syndrome; Senator GRAMM, $17.5 million for the F–15 data link; and Senator COLLINS, $3 million for MK–43 gun conversion; Senator INOUYE for Ford Island. I ask that these amendments be considered en bloc and adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes amendments numbered 592 through 601, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 592

(Purpose: To set aside $4,000,000 for the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'', up to $4,000,000 may be made available for the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 593

(Purpose: To set aside $5,000,000 of Army RDT&E funds for visual display performance and visual display environmental research and development)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $5,000,000 may be available for visual display performance and visual display environmental research and development.

AMENDMENT NO. 594

(Purpose: To increase by $10,000,000 the amount provided for the Army for other procurement for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements, and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', $51,250,000 shall be available for the Information System Security Program, of which up to $10,000,000 may be made available for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

AMENDMENT NO. 595

(Purpose: To set aside $10,000,000 of Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide funds for carrying out first-year actions of the 5-year research plan for addressing low-level exposures to chemical warfare agents)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'' for the Office of the Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Gulf War Illnesses, up to $10,000,000 may be made available for carrying out the first-year actions under the 5-year research plan outlined in the report entitled ''Department of Defense Strategy to Address Low-Level Exposures to Chemical Warfare Agents (CWAs)'', dated May 1999, that was submitted to committees of Congress pursuant to section 247(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1957).

AMENDMENT NO. 596

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress commending the men and women of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, for their ongoing contributions to Operation Allied Force over Yugoslavia)

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The B–2 bomber has been used in combat for the first time in Operation Allied Force against Yugoslavia.

(2) The B–2 bomber has demonstrated unparalleled strike capability in Operation Allied Force, with cursory data indicating that the bomber could have dropped nearly 20 percent of the precision ordnance while flying less than 3 percent of the attack sorties.

(3) According to the congressionally mandated Long Range Air Power Panel, ''long range air power is an increasingly important element of United States military capability''.

(4) The crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, deserve particular credit for flying and supporting the strike missions against Yugoslavia, some of the longest combat missions in the history of the Air Force.

(5) The bravery and professionalism of the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base have advanced American interests in the face of significant challenge and hardship.

(6) The dedication of those who serve in the Armed Forces, exemplified clearly by the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, is the greatest national security asset of the United States.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the skill and professionalism with which the B–2 bomber has been used in Operation Allied Force is a credit to the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, and the Air Force;

(2) the B–2 bomber has demonstrated an unparalleled capability to travel long distances and deliver devastating weapons payloads, proving its essential role for United States power projection in the future; and

(3) the crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base deserve the gratitude of the American people for their dedicated performance in an indispensable role in the air campaign against Yugoslavia and in the defense of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 597

In the appropriate page in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force,'' up to $10,000,000 may be made available for U–2 aircraft defensive system modernization.

AMENDMENT NO. 598

(Purpose: To set aside $25,185,000, the amount provided for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses, of which $4,000,000 is to be available for continuation of research into Gulf War syndrome that includes multidisciplinary studies of fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome and $2,000,000 is to be available for expansion of the research program in the Upper Great Plains region)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amount appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', $25,185,000 shall be available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for continuation of research into Gulf War syndrome that includes multidisciplinary studies of fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome, multiple chemical sensitivity, and the use of research methods of cognitive and computational neuroscience, and of which up to $2,000,000 may be made available for expansion of the research program in the Upper Great Plains region.

AMENDMENT NO. 599

(Purpose: To set aside $17,500,000 for procurement of the F–15A/B data link for the Air National Guard)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the total amount appropriated in title III under the heading ''AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE'', up to $17,500,000 may be made available for procurement of the F–15A/B data link for the Air National Guard.

AMENDMENT NO. 600

(Purpose: To increase funds for the MK–43 Machine Gun Conversion Program)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY,'' up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the MK–43 Machine Gun Conversion Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 601

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

SEC. . DEVELOPMENT OF FORD ISLAND, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Navy may exercise any authority or combination of authorities in this section for the purpose of developing or facilitating the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, to the extent that the Secretary determines the development is compatible with the mission of the Navy.

(2) The Secretary may not exercise any authority under this section until—

(A) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a master plan for the development of Ford Island; and

(B) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may convey to any public or private person or entity all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property (including any improvements thereon) or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is excess to the needs of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A conveyance under this subsection may include such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to any public or private person or entity any real property or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is not needed for current operations of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A lease under this subsection shall be subject to section 2667(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and may include such others terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) A lease of real property under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the lessee shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the real property covered by the lease if the property is then conveyed under subsection (b).

(4)(A) The Secretary may provide property support services to or for real property leased under this subsection.

(B) To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, any payment made to the Secretary for services provided under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriation, account, or fund from which the cost of providing the services was paid.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LEASEHOLD INTEREST BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may acquire a leasehold interest in any facility constructed under subsection (f) as consideration for a transaction authorized by this section upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to promote the purpose of this section.

(2) The term of a lease under paragraph (1) may not exceed 10 years, unless the Secretary of Defense approves a term in excess of 10 years for the purpose of this section.

(3) A lease under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the facility covered by the lease.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall use competitive procedures for purposes of selecting the recipient of real or personal property under subsection (b) and the lessee of real or personal property under subsection (c).

(f) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance of real or personal property under subsection (b), or for the lease of real or personal property under subsection (c), the Secretary of the Navy shall accept cash, real property, personal property, or services, or any combination thereof, in an aggregate amount equal to not less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased.

(2) Subject to subsection (i), the services accepted by the Secretary under paragraph (1) may include the following:

(A) The construction or improvement of facilities at Ford Island.

(B) The restoration or rehabilitation of real property at Ford Island.

(C) The provision of property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy may not carry out a transaction authorized by this section until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of the transaction, including—

(A) a detailed description of the transaction; and

(B) a justification for the transaction specifying the manner in which the transaction will meet the purpose of this section; and

(2) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(h) FORD ISLAND IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the ''Ford Island Improvement Account''.

(2) There shall be deposited into the account the following amounts:

(A) Amounts authorized and appropriated to the account.

(B) Except as provided in subsection (c)(4)(B), the amount of any cash payment received by the Secretary for a transaction under this section.

(i) USE OF ACCOUNT.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts, funds in the Ford Island Improvement Account may be used as follows:

(A) To carry out or facilitate the carrying out of a transaction authorized by this section.

(B) To carry out improvements of property or facilities at Ford Island.

(C) To obtain property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(2) To extent that the authorities provided under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, are available to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary may not use the authorities in this section to acquire, construct, or improve family housing units, military unaccompanied housing units, or ancillary supporting facilities related to military housing at Ford Island.

(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the following funds:

(i) The Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(ii) The Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(2) of that title.

(B) Amounts transferred under subparagraph (A) to a fund referred to in that subparagraph shall be available in accordance with the provisions of section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, for activities authorized under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of that title at Ford Island.

(j) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LAWS.—Except as otherwise

provided in this section, transactions under this section shall not be subject to the following:

(1) Sections 2667 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

(3) Sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483, 484).

(k) SCORING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive the applicability to any lease entered into under this section of the budget scorekeeping guidelines used to measure compliance with the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(l) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2883(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(i) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(ii) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''.

(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' has the meaning given that term in section 2801(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''property support service'' means the following:

(A) Any utility service or other service listed in section 2686(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Any other service determined by the Secretary to be a service that supports the operation and maintenance of real property, personal property, or facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 592 through 601) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider that action.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time has now arrived when no more first degree amendments will be cleared to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I inquire from the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to address the Senate at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment restores $3.1 billion in operations and maintenance and procurement funding that is cut by section 108 of the bill. It reduces various accounts to eliminate funding for low-priority, unnecessary and wasteful spending by an equal amount. The amendment doesn't change the total amount for defense in this bill. It simply redirects the cuts to eliminate pork barrel spending rather than high-priority readiness and modernization funds.

I find it staggering that the committee would cut funding for readiness and modernization by $3.1 billion when this bill contains nearly $5 billion in spending for unrequested, low-priority, unnecessary and wasteful spending programs that have not been scrutinized in the normal merit-based review process.

Congress recently passed an emergency spending bill that contained nearly $11 billion in defense spending to pay for the costs of ongoing operations in Kosovo. I believe the administration request was around $5 billion. As the chairman of the committee stated on the floor yesterday, we will very likely need to act later this year on another supplemental bill to pay for continued offensive operations against Serbia or to enforce a peace agreement and protect the Kosovars who return home.

Why, then, would we want to cut funding from this bill that would be needed to carry out these operations into the next fiscal year?

Why wouldn't we instead cut some of the $5 billion in pork barrel spending that has been put in this bill principally for the benefit of Members and their constituents?

Here is the list of unrequested programs included in the bill that I have accumulated.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of unrequested and unwanted projects be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions

[In millions of dollars]

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	
Army	
Fort Wainwright utilidors	$7
Air Battle Captain Helo. Flight Training Program	1.2
Joint Assessment Neurological Examination Equip.	1.5
Army Conservation and Ecosystem Management	3
BOS-Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	5
UC–35A Basing and Sustainment	17.8
Rock Island Bridge Repairs	5
Fort Des Moines—Historic OCS Memorial	2

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Directive Report Language: Directs the Army to consider conveying firefighting equipment to the Bayonne Local Redevelopment Authority and the City of Bayonne;	
Recommends that Rock Island Arsenal be included as a priority facility for the Department's Total Asset Visibility Implementation Plan.	
Navy	
Operational Meteorology and Oceanography	10
Shipyard Apprentice Program	12
Ship Depot Operations Support, Phila. Naval Shipyard	23
Warfare Tactics PMRF facilities improvements	5
UNOLS	3
Professional Development/Education Asia Pacific Ctr.	1.7
Barrow landfill	3
Directive Report Language: Directs the Navy to establish a pilot program for purpose of verifying cost savings that can be achieved through the use of a west coast propeller overhaul facility. Specifies characteristics that result in one possible candidate site.	
Marine Corps	
Initial Issue	15
NBC Defense Equipment	1.1
Air Force	
B–52 attrition reserve	35
Civil Air Patrol Corporation	12.5
University Partnering for Operational Support	5
TACCSF upgrades	10
Eielson utilidors	9.9
Tinker and Altus base repairs	25
Defense-Wide	
DoDDS Math Teacher Leadership Program	.4
Technology innovation and teacher education	5
OEA; Fitzsimmons Army Hospital	10
Charleston Macalloy site	10
OSD; Pacific Disaster Center operations	4
Clara Barton Center, Pine Bluff	1.3
Jefferson Project	5
Civil-Military Programs	
Youth Challenge	62.5
Innovative readiness training	20
Starbase Youth Program	6
National Guard and Reserve	
Directive Report Language: The Committee encourages the Army Reserve to expend resources on the Modern Burner Unit.	
Distance Learning Project	45
Addtional full-time support technicians	26
School house support	10
Project Alert	3.2
Fort Belknap Training Range	2
Defense Systems Evaluation, White Sands Missile Range	2.5
PROCUREMENT	
Aircraft, Army	
UC–35 aircraft (5)	27
UH–60 helicopter (11)	175
AH–64 helicopter mods	45
C–12 airplane mods	3
Kiowa Warrior helicopter mission trainer	6.6

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Kiowa Warrior switchable eyesafe laser rangefinder 2.6
Aircraft survivability equipment: advanced threat infrared countermeasures/common missile warning system 8.1
Night Vision Imaging Systems 5
Aircrew integrated systems 8
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army
Command and control vehicle 6
Heavy assault bridge mods 15.5
MK–19 automatic grenada launcher 5
Items less than $5 million 15
Ammunition Procurement, Army
40mm CTG 8
60mm mortar 9
120mm HE mortar CTG 3
120mm WP smoke CTG 5
105mm CTG artillery 10
Wide area munitions 10
ARMS Initiative 14
Other Procurement, Army
Tactical trailers/dolly sets 6
Army Data Distribution System 15
SINCGARS family 20
AN/TTC–56 warfighter information network (ACUS) 40
Secure terminal equipment (ISSP) 12.5
Worldwide Technical Control Improvement Program (Multi-purpose Range Targetry Electronics) 5.1
Information systems 45
LTWT Video reconnaissance system 1.5
Firefinder radar system mods 8.1
Striker command and control system 10
LOGTECH Army Automatic Identification Technology (AIT) 5
Ribbon bridge equipment 13.5
Lightweight Maintenance Enclosure 3.2
Water purification system 3
Combat medical support equipment 4
Combat training centers support (incl. Ft. Polk) 10
Improved moving target simulator upgrade program 3.5
Commercial Construction Equipment SLEP 8
Aircraft Procurement, Navy
F/A–18E/F advance procurement (6) 14
EA–6 aircraft transmitters 25
EA–6 night vision devises 15
SH–60 helicopter AQS–13F 7.5
UH–1 helicopter infrared radar system 10
UH–1 helicopter engine torque pressure system 2.5
P–3 aircraft AIP kits 24.2
C–2A aircraft propeller 5
Common ground equipment direct support sqdrn, readiness training 3
High Pressure Pure Air Generator 2.5
Weapons Procurement, Navy
BQM–74 aerial targets 30
Improved tactical air launched decoy (ITALD) 20
Weapons industrial facilities 7.7
MK–45 gun mount mods 28
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy
LHD–8 advance procurement 500
Other Procurement, Navy
Other navigation equipment 19

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Items less than $5 million (Distance Learning) 6.5
AN/BPS–15H surface search radar 8
AN/SPS–73 radar 8
SSN acoustics 2.6
JEDMICS 9
Information Systems Security Program (ISSP) 3.5
Passive sonobuoys 3
AN/SSQ–62 3
AN-SSQ–101 3
Weapons Range Support Equipment 11
Retrofit OMNI IV/V night vision goggles 18.1
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy ... 12
Procurement, Marine Corps
LAV mortar test program sets 4
Tracked vehicle modification kits 60.5
K-Band test obscuration pairing system 2
Radio systems 10
D–7G bulldozer 10
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force
F–16C/D (2) 50
F–16C/D advance procurement (12) 24
EC–130J (1) 87.8
C–130J spares and mods 24.2
F–15 E-Kit engine upgrades for Air National Guard 20
F–16 fuel tanks; oxygen generating systems; digital terrain system; theater airborne recon. system 34.5
C–17 maintenance trainer 3.5
C–12 spare parts 5
Common support equip.: multi-platform boresight equip 10
Missile Procurement, Air Force
Minuteman III mods 40
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force
Sensor Fuzed Weapon 8
Other Procurement, Air Force
Combat training ranges: unmanned treat emitter 28
C3 countermeasures 5
Theater Deployable Communication 35
Radio equipment 3.7
Laser eye protection 2.4
Mechanized material handling equipment 10
Procurement, Defense-Wide
Automatic Document Conversion System 50
Patriot PAC-3 procurement 60
Chemical decontamination 5
National Guard and Reserve equipment 300
RDTE ARMY
Defense Research Sciences: Cold Regions Military Eng. 1.0
University and Industry Research Centers:
Basic Research In Counter Terrorism 15.0
Electro And Hyper Velocity Physics Research 3.0
Advanced And Interactive Displays 1.3
National Automotive Center 3.0
Materials Technology: AAN Materials 2.5
Missile Technology:
Scramjet Technologies 2.0
Computational Fluid Dynamics 9.2
Modeling and Simulation Technology: Photonics 5.0
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology:
''Smart Truck'' Initiative 3.5

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Alternative Vehicle Propulsion 10.0
Chemical, Smoke, and Equipment Defeating Technology: Optical Spectroscopy 2.0
Electronics and Electronic Devices:
Hybrid Fuel Cell 1.5
Improved High Rate Alkaline Cell 1.0
Low Cost Reusable Alkaline Manganese-Zinc 1.4
Re-Usable Coin Cells 0.6
Lithium Carbon Monoflouride Coin Cells 0.4
''AA'' Zinc Air Battery 0.7
Countermine Systems: Nonlinear Acoustic Technology 1.0
Human Factors Engineering Technology: Emergency Medical Team Coordination 3.4
Environmental Quality Technology:
Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (PEPS) 8.0
Phyto-Remediation In Arid Lands 3.0
Texas Regional Institute for Env. Studies 1.0
Military Engineering Technology:
University Partnering For Ops Support 3.0
Cold Regions R&D 1.3
Medical Technology:
Disaster Relief And Emergency Medical Services 5.0
Center For Innovative Minimally Invasive Therapy 10.0
Osteoporosis And Bone Disease 2.5
Medical Advanced Technology:
Center For Prostate Disease Research WRAMC 7.5
Intravenous Membrane Oxygenator 1.0
Volume Angio CAT 6.0
Joint Diabetes Project 10.0
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology:
Future Combat Vehicle Development 5.0
Improved HMMWV Research 8.0
Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology: Innovative Sensor Enhancement And Integration 10.0
Manpower, Personnel and Training Advanced Technology: Army Aircrew Coordination Training 3.0
Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology: Future Missile Technology Integration (FMTI) 5.0
Joint Service Small Arms Program: Objective Crew Served Weapon (OCSW) 5.0
Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology: Digital Situation Mapboard 2.0
Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (DEM/VAL):
Missile Defense Flight Experiment Support 14.7
Tactical High Energy Laser 15.0
Acoustic Technology Research 4.0
Radar Power Technology 4.0
Family Of Systems Simulators (Fossim) 1.5
Small Fast ChemBio Detectors 1.0
SMDC Battlelab 5.0
Armament Enhancement Initiative: XM 1007 Precision Guided Kinetic Energy Munition 15.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Aviation—Adv Dev: Virtual Cockpit Optimization 5.0
Medical Systems—Adv Dev: Combat Trauma Patient Simulation 5.8
EW Development: ATIRCMS/CMWS 4.0
Brilliant Anti-Armor Submunition (BAT): TACMS 2000 ..... 10.0
Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System: JSTARS 10.0
Weapons and Munitions—Eng Dev:
Motar Anti-Personnel/Anti-Material (MAPAM) 7.2
50 Caliber Quick Change Barrels 2.0
Sense and Destroy Armament Missile: Program Increase 10.0
Firefinder: TBM Cueing 7.9
Threat Simulator Development:
Threat EO/IR Simulator 2.5
Threat Mine Simulator 1.2
Virtual Threat Simulator 4.0
Concepts Experimentation Program: Digital Information Technology Testbed 3.0
Army Test Ranges and Facilities: White Sands Missile Range 7.5
DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility: HELSTF 14.0
Munitions Standardization Effectiveness and Safety:
Contained Detonation Technology 3.0
Bluegrass Army Depot 2.5
Management Headquarters (R&D): Akamai research project 23.0
Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs: M–1 Large Area Flat Panel Displays 8
Digitization: Fort Hood Digitization Research 2.0
Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2): FBCB2 ..... 21.7
End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities:
Instrumental Factory For Gears (INFAC) 4.0
Totally Integrated Manufacturing Enterprise 10.0
Directive Report Language: Directs the Army and Marine Corps to develop a plan, and report on its implementation, for including the Rock Island arsenal in all aspects of howitzer design, development and production.

RDTE NAVY

Air and Surface Launched Weapons Technology: Pulsed Detonation Engine Technology 5.0
Ship, Submarine and Logistics Technology: Stainless Steel Double Hull 5.0
Marine Corps Landing Force Technology: Non-Traditional Military Operations 5.0
Communications, Command and Control, Intel Surveillance:
Hyperspectral Research 4.0
UESA Signal Processing Support 5.0
Human Systems Technology:
Coastal Cancer Control (MUSC) 5.0
Retinal Pigment Laser Damage 0.2
Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology:
Heatshield Research 2.0
Thermal Management Materials 2.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Photomagnetic Material Research 0.5
Silicon Carbide For Electronic Power Devices 2.0
Innovative Communications Materials 2.25
Advanced Material Processing Center 5.0
ADPICAS 1.15
Electronic Warfare Technology:
Free Electron Laser 10.0
Waveform Generator 3.0
Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology: Distributed Marine-Environment Forecast System 2.4
Undersea Warfare Weaponry Technology:
Computational Eng. Design 3.5
SAUVIM 1.5
Surface Ship and Submarine HM&E Advanced Technology:
Composite Helo Hangar 5.0
Reconfigurable Ship Simulation 2.5
Power Node Control Centers 3.0
Virtual Testbed For Advanced Electrical Systems 5.0
Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ADT):
BURRO 5.0
Advanced Light Weight Grenade 1.0
Project Albert 4.0
Vehicle Technology Demo 1.0
Medical Development (Advanced):
Naval Dental Research Institute 3.0
Prostate Cancer Immunotherapy 1.5
Manpower, Personnel and Training Adv Tech Dev:
Integrated Manufacturing Studies 3.0
T-Star 1.5
Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Technology: Visualization Of Technical Information (VTI) 3.0
Navy Technical Information Presentation System: Joint Experimentation 15.0
Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology: Terfenol-D 2.5
Mine and Expeditionalary Warfare Advanced Technology: Ocean Modeling 9.0
Advanced Technology Transition:
Low Observable Stack 10.0
Vector Thrusted Dusted Propeller 6.0
Advanced Trailer Research 6.0
Mine Countermeasures Ship 12.0
C3 Advanced Technology: National Technology Alliance 10.0
Surface and Shallow Ater Mine Countermeasures: Integrated Combat Weapons Systems (ICWS) 18.0
Shipboard System Component Development: Advanced Water Jet Technology 2.0
Pilot Fish 2.5
Advanced Submarine System Development: Enhanced Performance Motor Brush 2.3
Ship Concept Advanced Design: STEP Development—Navy CAE Technology 2.0
Advanced Surface Machinery Systems: Naval Ship Survivability 2.5

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Combat Systems Integration: Common Command And Decision Systems 5.0
Cooperative Engagement: CEC Space 15.0
Environmental Protection: Asbestos Conversion Pilot Program 4.0
Land Attack Technology: Continuous Processor, NSWC 6.3
Land Attack Technology: Extended Range Guided Munition 10
Non-Lethal Weapons—Dem/Val:
Innovation Initiatives 3.0
Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Arch/Eng Support: NAVCIITI 4.0
Other Helo Development:
Sentient Sensors 1.0
Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar 15.0
H–1 Upgrades: EMD Program 26.6
Aircrew Systems Development: Aircrew Systems 3.5
Surface Combatant Combat System Engineering: AEGIS Interoperability 25.0
Airborne MCM: CH–60 Upgrades .. 2.0
Air Control: ECARS 7.0
Enhanced Modular Signal Processor: ARCI/MPP 11.0
Swath (Small Waterplane are Twin Hull) Oceanographic Ship: SWATH 9.0
New Design SSN: Non-propulsion Electronic Systems 10.0
Ship Contract Design/Live Fire T&E: Smart Propulsor Product Model 2.0
Ship Self Defense—EMD: NULKA 4.4
Distributed Surveillance System: Advanced Deployable System ... 22.0
Major T&E Investment 5.0
Marine Corps Program Wide Support:
ChemBio Individual Sampler (CBIS) 4.8
Consequence Management Information System (CMIS) 1.2
Small Unit Biological Detector (SUBD) 4.0
F–18 Squadrons: Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System 5.0
Consolidated Training Systems Development: Battle Force Tactical Training System (BFTT) .. 7.5
Surface ASW Combat System Integration: High Dyn. Range, Towed Array Rec. & Sonar 8.0
Navy Science Assistance Program:
Lash 12.0
Airship/LASH Study for Range Enhancements 1.0
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems: Hyperspectral Modular Upgrades 4.0
Modeling and Simulation Support: SPAWAR Modeling and Simulation Initiative 3.0
Industrial Preparedness Mantech 10.0

RDTE AIR FORCE

Defense Research Sciences: National Solar Observatory 0.65
Materials:
Structural Monitoring of Aging Aircraft 1.5
Friction Stir Welding 2.0
Thermal Management For Space Structures 2.5
Titanium Matrix Composites ... 2.2

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Materials—High Temperature Ceramic Fibers	2.4
Resin Systems For AF Engine Applications	2.0
Metals Affordability Initiative Consortium	9.0
Electrochem Fatigue Sensor Dev & Field Use Tests	3.0
Human Effectiveness Applied Research:	
Solid Electrolyte Oxygen Separator	6.0
Behavioral Science Res Under AFRL	5.1
Aerospace Proulsion:	
High Thermal Stability Fuel Technology	1.0
KC–135 Variable Displacement Vane Pump	4.0
High Power, Advanced Low Mass Systems Prototype	6.0
More Electric Aircraft Program	3.0
Thermophotovoltaic (TPV)	2.0
ISSES/AFRL	0.775
Hypersonic Technology Program:	
Restore Hypersonic And High Speed Propulsion	16.0
Phillips Lab Exploratory Development:	
HAARP	10.0
Radio Frequency Applications Development	5.0
Tropo-Weather	2.5
Space Survivability	0.6
HIS Spectral Sensing	0.8
Command, Control and Communications: Electromagnetic Technology	9.3
Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems: Composite Space Launch Payload Dispensers	4.5
Aerospace Structures: Polymeric Foam Core	4.0
Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology: More Electric Aircraft Program	0.25
Personnel Training and Simulation Technology: Behaviorial Science Research & AFRL	1.8
Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology:	
Helmet Mounted Visual System Comp. & Mini-CRT	5.0
Panoramic Night Vision Goggles (PNVG)	3.0
Advanced Spacecraft Technology: Scorpius	5.0
MSTRS:	
Upper Stage Flight Experiment	15.0
Space Maneuver Vehicles	25.0
Advanced Weapons Technology:	
Laser Spark Missile Countermeasures Program	5.0
Field Laser, Radar Upgrades	6.0
Environmental Engineering Technology: E-Smart Environmental Monitoring Tool	5.0
Space Control Technology: Program Increase	5.0
Joint Strike Fighter: Alternative Engine Development	15.0
Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (Dem/Val): Quick Reaction Launch Demonstration Under RSLP	19.2
Space Based Laser: SBL Plan, Eng. And Design Of SBL Test Facility	10.0
B–2 Advanced Technology Bomber: B–2 Upgrades And Maintainability Enhancements	37.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

EW Development: Precision And Location & ID Prog. (PLAID) Upgrade	10.0
Submunitions: 3–D Advanced Track Acquisition And Imaging System	4.5
Life Support Systems: Life Support Systems	2.5
Computer Resource Technology Transition (CRTT): Asset Software Re-Use Program	2.8
Major T&E Investment: MARIAH II Hypersonic Wind Tunnel Program	6.0
Program Reduction: Big Crow Program Office	5.0
Space Test Program (STP): Micro Satellite Technology	10.0
F–16 Squadrons: ADV Identification Friend Or Foe (AIFF) For F–16	6.0
F–117A Squadrons: Pre-EMD And EMD Efforts On Block 3 Upgrades	20.0
Compass Cass: TRACS–F Upgrade	8.0
Theater Air Control Systems: Theater Air Control Systems (TACS)	6.0
Theater Battle Management (TBM) C41: Theater Battle Management Core Systems	5.0
Cobra Ball: Advanced Airborne Sensor	4.0
Information Systems Security Program: Lighthouse Cyber Security Program	10.0
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems: JSAF LBSS And HBSS	10.0
Manned Reconnaissance Systems:	
Prototype Pre-Processor	4.5
U–2 Dual Data-Link II Upgrade	8.0
Industrial Preparedness: Nickel-Metal Hydride Replacement Battery For F–16	1.33
Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain, Program OFC:	
Aging Aircraft Extension Program	7.0
Blade Repair Facility	7.0
Support Systems Development: Integrated Maintenance Data Systems	9.0
DEFENSE–WIDE, RDT&E	
Support Technologies—Applied Research:	
Wide Band Gap Materials	14.0
POAP	8.0
Laser Communications Experiment	3.0
Support Technologies—Advanced Technology Dev.	
Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT)	30.0
Excalibur	5.0
Scorpius	5.0
Silicon Thick Film Mirror Coatings	2.0
Joint Theater Missile Defense Program:	
Liquid Surrogate Target Development Program	5.0
PMRF TMD Upgrades	10.0
Optical-Electro Sensors	5.0
Kauai Test Facility	4.0
BMD Technical Operations: SMDC Adv. Research Center	3.0
Threat and Countermeasures:	
Comprehensive Advanced Radar Technology	4.0
Phase IV of Long Range Missile Feasibility	3.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Patriot PAC–3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition-EMD: Program Cost Growth	152.0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	
Defense Research Sciences: Spectral Hole Burning Applications	2.0
University Research Initiatives:	
Anticorrosion Studies	1.5
Advanced High Yield Software Development	1.5
Active Hyperspectral Imaging Sensor Research Program	
Chemical And Biological Defense Programs: Chemical And Biological Detection Programs	4.0
Medical Free Electron Laser	2.281
Re-Use Technology Adoption Program	3
Chemical And Biological Defense Program: Chemical And Biological Detection Programs	10.0
Tactical Technology: CEROS	7
Integrated Command And Control Technology: High Definition System (HDS)	10.0
Fabrication of 3–D Micro Structures	2
Biodegradable Plastics	1.5
Strategic Materials	2
WMD Related Technology:	
Thermionics	3.0
Nuclear Weapons Effects	7.0
Deep Digger	5.0
Explosives Demilitarization Technology: Explosives Demilitarization Technology	7.0
Counter Terror Technical Support:	
Facial Recognition Technology	3.0
Testing Of Air Blast And Improvised Explosives	4.0
Special Technical Support: Complex Systems Development	5.0
Verification Technology Demonstration: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Verification	1.5
Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations:	
Microelectronics	3.0
Computer Assisted Technology Transfer	6.0
Strategic Environmental Research Program: Biosystems Technology	6.0
Cooperative DOD/VA Medical Research	10.0
Advanced Electronics Technologies:	
Change Detection Technology	3
Defense Techlink	1.5
Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices	4
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations: Magnetic Bearing Cooling Turbine	4.0
High Performance Computing Modernization Program:	
Multi Thread Arch. System For High Per. Modem	4.0
High Performance Visualization Center	3.0
Large Millimeter Telescope	2
Joint Wargaming Simulations Management Office: Synthetic Range Study	1.0
Joint Robotics Program: Lightweight Robotic Vehicles	5.0
Advanced Sensor Applications Program:	
HAARP	5.0
Solid State Dye Laser Applications	6.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

CALS Initiative: CALS—Integrated Date Environment (IDE)	4.0
Chemical and Biological Defense program—Dem/Val:	
Bioadhesion Research To Combat Biological Warfare	2.0
M93 Al For Chemical Simulation Training Suites	5.0
Humanitarian Demining: Demining Technologies For Unexploded Land Mines	3.0
Joint Robotics Program EMD: Vehicle Teleoperations	5.0
Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization: Support Jamming AOA	10.0
Defense Technology Analysis: Commodity MGT System Consolidation	5.0
Information Systems Security Program: Trusted Rubix Database Guard	1.8
Defense Imagery and Mapping Program:	
Pacific Imagery Program for Exploitations	2.8
NIMA View Joint Mapping Tool	8.0
Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (Space): Pacific Disaster Center	6.0
Defense Health Program	
Operation and Maintenance:	
Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership	1.4
Graduate School of Nursing	2.3
Tri-Service Nursing Research Program	6.0
Pacific Island Health Care	5
Center for Disaster Management	5.0
Military Health Services Information Management	10
Brown Tree Snakes	1
PACMEDNET, Hawaii	12.0
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines	7.5
Outcome Driven Health Care and Info Systems	6.0
Research, development, test and evaluation:	
Breast Cancer Research Program	175.0
Prostate Cancer Research Program	75.0
Acute lung injury, advanced soft tissue modeling, alcohol abuse prevention, alcoholism, brain injury, childhood asthma, cognitive neuroscience, diabetes, digital mammography imaging, disease management demonstration, enzymatic wound disinfectants, neurofibromatosis, osteoporosis and bone disease, ovarian cancer, polynitroxylated hemoglobin, smoking cessation, stem cell, tissue regeneration research	50.0
Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities	
National Guard counterdrug support, New Jersey	20.0
Gulf States counterdrug computer upgrades in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana & Mississippi	10.0
Marijuana eradication	6.0
Counterdrug intelligence and infrastructure support	50.0
R–OTHR radar study	1.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Northeast Regional Counterdrug Training Center	2.0
Counternarcotics Center at Hammer	8.0
Total	4.887B

Some Examples of Protectionist Legislation

''Buy American'' anchor chains.

''Buy American'' carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate.

''Buy American'' ball and roller bearings.

''Buy American'' computers.

''Buy American'' coal for municipal district heat, Germany.

''Buy American'' food, speciality metals, hand tools, measuring tools, clothing, and fabrics (Berry Amendment).

BILL LANGUAGE

Operations and Maintenance, Army

Not less than $355 million shall be available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance.

Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract for an LHD–1 Amphibious Assault Ship which shall be funded on an incremental basis.

Chemical Agents and Munition Destruction, Army

$1 million shall be available until expended each year only for a Johnston Atoll off-island leave program.

Intelligence Community Management Account

$27 million shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center.

Kaho' olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund: $35 million.

Section 8022: $500,000 shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capitol Region.

Section 8029: Prohibition on the use of funds to reduce or disestablish the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, Keesler Air Force Base.

Section 8033: $26.4 million shall be available only for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation.

Section 8070: Restrictive employment practices for contractors that could increase the cost of the work to be performed.

Section 8071: The Army shall use the former George Air Force Base as the airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin.

Section 8083: Authorizes the Defense Department to waive reimbursement costs associated with the conduct of seminars, conferences and other activities at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Section 8098: Authorizes $255,333 for payment to Trans World Airlines to replace lost and canceled Treasury checks.

Section 8103: $5 million shall be transferred to the Department of Transportation to realign railroad track on Elmendorf Air Force Base.

Section 8105: Requires procurement of malt beverages and wine sold by nonappropriated fund activities of the Defense Department from commercial entities within the state in which the military installation resides.

Section 8107: Amends the Communications Act with respect to the bidding process involving the sale of the frequency spectrum. Mandates such bidding process be initiated during fiscal year 1999.

Section 8108: Reduces the amount available for national defense by $3.1 billion.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, it totals $5 billion. Self-restraint in fiduciary matters is a virtue, especially for a party that rose to majority status with the promise of reducing this type of practice.

But every year it is the same old story: More money for NULKA antiship decoy systems; more money for the plethora of laser projects that have proliferated at every lab in the country; more money for unrequested and unneeded aircraft; more money for automatic grenade launchers—we have got to have a stockpile of these things that will last forever—more money for research into double-hull technology, which shipbuilders are supposed to provide themselves per the requirements of the Oil Pollution Prevention Act.

There are millions every year for hyperspectral research that is not requested by the military. Earmarks like the one that requires the Army and Marine Corps to make the Rock Island arsenal the center of all future design, development and production activities related to artillery do not represent good public policy. What is it that forces us to designate Rock Island arsenal as a center for this? That's not public policy.

Medical research and environmental matters unrelated to combat ought to be carefully scrutinized when funded in the defense budget. We do just the opposite: we use the defense budget to fund pet projects that should be funded through nondefense agencies in nondefense spending bills. Osteoporosis is a serious problem, but in the defense budget? $3 million to fund phyto-remediation research and arid lands? In the defense budget? How can we take ourselves seriously—how can the public take us seriously, when we demonstrate absolutely no willingness to curtail the very spending practices that put this country so heavily in debt?

At the very time a consensus has formed around the proposition that the armed forces are being stretched perilously thin, a situation that will get worse when we send more than a brigade's worth of ground forces into Kosovo, it is incumbent upon those of us elected to represent the interests of the nation that we act with a modicum of self-restraint where the public treasure is concerned. Failing to do so will not only damage the treasure, it will most assuredly cost lives. This is, after all, national defense.

Let's review some recent examples of readiness shortcomings, shortcomings that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly emphasized pose a serious threat to both near and long-term readiness:

The nuclear carrier *U.S.S. Enterprise* (CVN–65) recently deployed to the Persian Gulf and Kosovo, undermanned by some 800 sailors.

We are losing pilots to the commercial airlines faster than we can train them.

The Navy has one-half the F/A–18 pilots, one-third of the S–3 pilots, and only one-quarter of the EA–6B pilots it needs.

Only 26 percent of the Air Force pilots have committed to stay beyond their current service agreement.

The Army says that five of its ten divisions lack enough majors, captains, senior enlisted personnel, tankers and gunners.

Again, the world watches as the Air Force's main bomber, the B–52, once again is called to duty to delivery air launched cruise missiles in combat. How many times has the Air Force called upon this 40-year old workhorse to deliver devastating firepower? The B–52 bomber was already old when I saw it fly in Vietnam, and yet the Air Force plan will carry the current bomber fleet through the next 40 years, with a replacement to the B–52 tentatively planned in 2037.

The Navy is struggling to maintain a fleet of 300 ships, down from over 500 in the early 1990s. The fiscal year 2000 budget will not support a Navy of even 200 ships.

The Marine Corps saves money in spare parts by retreading light trucks and Humvees, so as to afford small arms ammunition for forward deployed Marines.

Mr. President, the cumulative effect of these types of readiness problems will most assuredly translate into higher risks for the young men and women we send into harm's way to defend us and our country.

Mr. President, I understand what is going on here. We have a problem, and that is the existence of stringent budget caps designed to keep government spending in check. I support those who are resisting the urge to bust the budget by exceeding the spending allowed by the 1997 budget agreement.

I also understand that the Appropriations Committee has to balance the interests of those who favor domestic spending over defense spending, and I realize that compromises have to be made.

But we shouldn't be stuffing appropriations bills, defense or otherwise, full of pork-barrel spending. And we shouldn't be cutting defense, like this bill does, to set aside money to cover the excess pork-barrel spending that will inevitably show up in other domestic appropriations bills later in the process.

And I would just like to make the point that the money that was taken from this bill for later pork-barrel spending could just as easily be reallocated back into this bill, when this amendment is adopted.

We shouldn't be jeopardizing the readiness of our Armed Forces by cutting high-priority funding just to stay within the budget caps. We should do the right thing, and cut the pork instead of potentially putting our men and women in harm's way without the training and tools they need to defend themselves and our nation.

I was going through this list here. Some of them are interesting and some are amusing:

Under Defense Health Program is $1.4 billion for the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership; Tri-Service Nursing Research Program, $6 million—remember, this is out of Defense. I don't even know where the Tri-Service Nursing Research Program is. Then there is Pacific Island Health Care, $5 million; brown tree snakes—the perennial tree snakes—is only a million dollars this year. I would have thought that with all the millions and millions we have spent on brown tree snakes over the past years, we would have at least been able to defend a nation from them. Unfortunately, the spending for brown tree snakes continues, and probably will for a long time—at least in my lifetime.

Outcome Driven Health Care and Info Systems, $6 million; Breast Cancer Research Program, $175 million; Prostate Cancer Research Program, $75 million; Acute lung injury, advanced soft tissue modeling, et cetera, et cetera, $50 million. Then, of course, we have the usual protections in this legislation that requires us to ''buy American'' anchor chains, carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate, and ball and roller bearings. We have to buy American for computers this time. That is interesting. We have to buy American coal for municipal district heat in Germany. Talk about the old line about bringing coal to New Castle. Then, of course, we have to buy American food, specialty metals, hand tools, measuring tools, clothing and fabrics.

Then we have Ship Depot Operation Support at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, $23 million. I am very curious about that expenditure up in Philadelphia, which was supposed to be opened and going to be in private hands. Barrow landfill, $3 million; Professional Development/Education Asia Pacific Center, $1.7 million. I wonder whose profession is being developed there. Let's see. The list goes on.

I think I have made my point, as usual. Here is Counternarcotics Center at Hammer. Since I don't know where Hammer is, I probably should not comment on it. The list goes on. Here is one the military didn't request: A smart truck initiative. Perhaps we will have trucks that gas themselves, because $3.5 million is a pretty hefty sum to spend on smart trucks.

Here is Plasma Energy Pyrolysis system and Phyto-remediation in Arid Lands. Not to mention one of our important defense items, Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies. Then there is the University Partnering for Operations Support and Cold Regions R&D.

The list goes on. The point is that we now have 11,000 enlisted families that are on food stamps. We now have a shortage of air launch cruise missiles, which everybody knows about. We now have an incredible increase in the wear and tear of our equipment because of the dramatically increased operations regarding Kosovo. What do we do? We think that we spend the money the military needs for modernization and operations and maintenance? No, Mr. President. We spend $5 billion in unnecessary and unwanted things, which is up, by the way, from the supplemental. I think I only identified a little over $2 billion that was in the ''emergency'' supplemental, such as Dungeness crab fishermen, reindeer, and other ''vital emergencies'' that required our immediate attention.

So, I have very little confidence that this amendment will carry. I think it is important, however, that the American people know where their tax dollars are going, and sooner or later—perhaps later—they will demand that we stop doing this with their hard-earned tax dollars. It may be later, as I say. But I also have to say to my dear friends on the Appropriations Committee, I see increases in this kind of wasteful and unnecessary spending, not decreases. There is going to have to come a point where we are going to have to start having recorded votes on all this stuff. I am worried about brown tree snakes like everybody else, but I am much more worried about the men and women in the military who happen to be subsisting on food stamps today. I think a lot of Americans are growing rather weary of this procedure.

Mr. President, I will be glad to have a tabling motion vote or an up-or-down vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I regretfully must oppose Senator MCCAIN's amendment. I understand the amendment, but it takes a different approach to funding critical Department of Defense priorities for fiscal year 2000 than the committee has approved in this bill before the Senate.

Based upon the amounts that we provided in the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations for Kosovo and funds that were remaining from the 1999 supplemental for Bosnia, the committee determined—and I add that it was at my request—that at least $3.1 billion now available to the Department of Defense can and should be carried over to the year 2000. As a matter of fact, on the floor of the Senate I stated that our intent was to try and take care of some of the year 2000 obligations in that supplemental to

best reflect the needs of the Department and the pressures across the discretionary accounts under the 1997 budget agreement.

Our committee adjusted the totals in this bill to reflect those specific amounts that carry over from the 1999 appropriation into the year 2000. Having done so, having brought $3.1 billion more into this account, we then removed some of the moneys that we previously allocated to the account into the nondefense area. The discretion to do that gave us the ability to meet critical needs in the nondefense area.

We believe that we did address critical readiness problems in the supplemental, and we specifically anticipated some of those needs which could possibly have been incurred—the costs incurred—before September 30th of this year. Those now appear to be funds that will be required in the year 2000, and we have met those demands by moving forward with the money.

I know this has caused some anxiety to people within the Department of Defense who believe that we have cut the bill. We have not cut the bill. The bill is exactly the same amount of money originally under consideration by the committee, but we have found the moneys to pay those bills by carrying forward into the year 2000 some of the 1999 appropriations.

We believe we have met the needs of the military under this bill. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona strikes from the bill $3.1 billion, rather than carry forward with the money from 1999. I think that will have a detrimental impact on the priorities established by the committee and the priorities that some Members have presented not only in committee but on the floor.

For instance, the Senator's amendment would reduce nearly $270 million from the service operation and maintenance accounts, including $53.5 million from the Army National Guard alone. In procurement, the amendment pending would reduce or eliminate funding provided to replace the aging UH–1, the Huey helicopters, built in the 1960s, with the Army's modern standard, the UH–60 Blackhawk.

The amendment reduces funding for advance procurement of one of the Commandant of the Marine Corps' top priorities, the LHD–8 amphibious assault ship.

For the Air Force, funding for additional F–16, EC–130J and JStars aircraft would be deleted.

In research and development, funds added for the SBIRS satellite, national missile defense and the third arrow battery for Israel would be reduced.

For the Defense Health Program, the additional amounts provided for breast cancer research and prostate cancer research would be cut also by the Senator's amendment.

In response to Members' requests that the committee provide additional funds to fight the war on drugs, the committee did add funding for the gulf states counterdrug initiative, the National Guard counterdrug missions, and $50 million in response to the proposed Drug Free Century Act. Senator MCCAIN's amendment would delete $61.6 million of the funds added to the bill for those efforts.

The Senator from Arizona and I have discussed on many occasions that we do have different approaches to addressing the funding needs for the Armed Forces. I know Senator MCCAIN is a stalwart proponent of the men and women of the armed services and their families, and I believe I am also. We are just approaching the job from a different direction.

I believe that I must, on behalf of the committee, oppose the amendment. I truly believe the flexibility provided by the committee to the Department of Defense best accommodates the needs of the military, and ensures that funds are available in the accounts where necessary to accommodate readiness, quality of life, modernization and technology priorities. I can state categorically the accounts that are here to accommodate readiness, quality of life, modernization and technology priorities of the Department of Defense have been met by our bill.

The Senator mentioned some of the items in this bill that affect my State. The Point Barrow landfill was created by the Department of the Navy. It operated in Point Barrow for many, many years. As that installation was closed down, the Department of Navy did not remediate the landfill. It is a terrible problem in the Arctic, particularly in the summertime when that landfill becomes just a morass. The local people have asked, using Defense Department funds, that the job be completed. This bill does, in fact, provide moneys for that purpose.

The Senator mentioned the joint Federal telemedicine project that is going on in my State. Again, this is an initiative by the Department of Defense that has a substantial amount of communications capability in our State to deal with Federal agencies' needs and the needs of the services they provide throughout the State of Alaska to coordinate a delivery system for medicine using telemedicine techniques. We believe that is going to result in reducing the cost of health care delivery to Alaska Native people and the Indian Health Service to the military people throughout our State who serve on military bases and those who receive the benefits of Federal programs. It is not a general program for the population as a whole.

I say to the Senate, I understand the Senator's approach and I respect it, but I believe and our committee believes that there are instances where activities, which originated on military bases or caused by military occupation of specific portions of land within the individual States, do affect the local population and that those obligations of the Federal Government should be met with defense funds.

The basic problem, though—I go back to the beginning—we did not cut from other accounts in order to get the moneys to shift to other appropriations bills. For instance, we have shifted a substantial amount of money now through what we call the deficiency subcommittee—which was a subcommittee created specifically for that purpose—moneys from these accounts from the Department of Defense into the agriculture appropriations bill, but the way it was done does not reduce the amount of money that will be spent by the Department of Defense in the year 2000. A portion of the moneys really are carried over to be spent in the year 2000 rather than being spent in 1999, and that is what we intended when we asked the Congress to approve that supplemental appropriations bill. I hope the Senate will agree with us and will oppose this amendment and defeat it. It is a significant vote for us to determine.

Members will note the reports in the papers and in the media concerning the meetings that are taking place in the House of Representatives. They are deciding on an approach quite similar to ours to reduce the amount of money that will be spent through the fiscal year 2000 process and carry over some of the funds from 1999 to meet the obligations in the year 2000.

I think that is a legitimate way to use the money that is available to us and will enable us hopefully to stay under the caps in treating all of the bills that have to be passed by our committee. Thirteen separate bills have to be brought to this floor, and ours is the only committee which faces a point of order under the Budget Act if we exceed the caps. We are trying our best to live with that Budget Act. I think we will.

There is still a serious gap in money, but we will find that money somewhere within the agencies, either by reducing carryover funds or by eliminating funds that are now no longer high priority so we can meet the obligations of the year 2000 with the funds that will be available under the budget agreement. If we cannot do that, we will come to the Senate in September, and we will have to work out a way to solve our problem.

Right now, our goal—and I think it is a bipartisan goal—is to live with the Budget Act, stay within the caps, yet meet our obligations. What we have done in this bill is the initial key to opening up the door down that long corridor to comply with the Budget Act. I urge the Senate to disapprove the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

I yield to my friend if he has any comments to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I join my chairman, Mr. STEVENS, in opposition to the McCain amendment. In the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, he mentioned a brown tree snake, $1 million to either control or to rid the State of Hawaii of this menace.

The history of the brown tree snake is a rather simple one, and it has been documented. It was found in Solomon Islands and during the war, army transport vessels accidentally or otherwise carried several brown tree snakes from the Solomon Islands to Guam.

Within 2 years, seven species of birds have been wiped out on Guam, babies have been threatened, and there is a brownout almost once an evening because of brown tree snakes.

The State of Hawaii has no snakes unless they are brought in. It has been documented that the brown tree snake was brought in from Guam via the Air Force aircraft. Therefore, the Department of Defense, assuming some responsibility for this, has not disapproved this amount of $1 million to help the State of Hawaii rid itself of the brown tree snakes.

Hawaii's environment is such that it is rather fragile. We have no natural predators to control the snakes, and if it ever gets loose in my State, then all the beautiful birds of paradise will disappear.

I think the amount we have put in this bill represents the position on the part of the Department of Defense in assuming responsibility is a rather small one.

I hope my colleagues will join us in opposing the McCain amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my hope the Senate will agree that we can proceed on other amendments.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be set aside and hopefully we will vote on it sometime between 3:30 and 4. I request there be 2 minutes equally divided so the Senator from Arizona can state to the Senate again the purpose of the amendment before the final vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 549 AND 550 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have authority to withdraw Byrd amendments Nos. 549 and 550. They were modified and accepted in the managers' package to which we previously agreed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are withdrawn.

The amendments (Nos. 549 and 550) were withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 581 be taken up at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] proposes an amendment numbered 581.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

SEC. . (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Veterans Administration and Federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by Federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of government services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of these sections, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people, who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by both sides and the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. I ask that it be considered and passed.

With Chairman STEVENS' agreement, included in the managers' package of amendments is bill language that would provide authority to replicate the Federal Health Care Partnership that is now operating in the State of Alaska.

Pursuant to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, the Department of Defense (DoD), the Veterans' Administration (VA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS) have entered into memoranda of understanding in order to make the most efficient use of resources that are made available to each of these Federally-funded health care systems in the provision of health care services to their respective eligible beneficiaries. Initiated in April of 1995, under this partnership, health care services are being provided to eligible DoD, VA and IHS beneficiaries without regard to the designation of the health care service facility, and telemedicine technologies are being employed to provide access to health care services in remote rural areas.

The proposed bill language would provide authority for the Department of Defense to establish a similar arrangement with the Veterans' Administration and Federally-funded health care agencies providing health care services to Native Hawaiians in the State of Hawaii. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

The proposed bill language also provides authority for the Department of Defense to develop a consultation policy with regard to programs and activities which affect the Native Hawaiian community in Hawaii.

On May 14, 1998, President Clinton issued Executive Order 13084, directing every Federal agency to establish an effective process to provide for meaningful and timely consultation and coordination with Native Americans and Native American governments in the development of policies and practices that significantly or uniquely affect their communities. On October 20, 1998, the Secretary of the Department of Defense announced the issuance of the Department's consultation policy affecting two of the three constituent Native American groups—American Indians and Alaska Natives. The proposed bill language authorizes the Department of Defense to develop a similar consultation policy for the third constituent group of Native Americans—Native Hawaiians—for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community, consistent with the following findings of the Congress——

The United States recognizes and affirms that American Indian, Alaska

Native, and Native Hawaiian people, as the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States have a continuing right to autonomy in their own affairs and an ongoing right of self-determination and self-governance.

The Constitutional authority of the Congress to legislate in matters affecting the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States includes the authority to legislate in matters affecting the Native Hawaiian people, as aboriginal, indigenous, native people who have a special relationship with the United States.

The Federal policy of self-determination and self-governance of the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States is intended to maximize the participation of native people in the direction and administration of governmental services to their communities in order to make those services more responsive to the needs of the native people and their communities. In accordance with that policy, the Congress encourages Federal agency consultation with the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of Hawaii, Native Hawaiians, with regard to agency actions that uniquely or significantly affect them or their communities.

For purposes of these sections in the proposed bill language, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, ''occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.''

I thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, for his willingness to assure that the Department of Defense has a consistent policy as it relates to all Native Americans.

Mr. STEVENS. We are in agreement, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 581) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chair, and 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, though I see on the floor Mr. INOUYE and Mr. STEVENS, two Senators for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect, I rise to speak in opposition to the proposed increases in military spending contained in this defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

I have, I believe, been a strong supporter of our women and men in uniform, especially our veterans. I think we should provide the best possible training, equipment and preparations for our military forces. I understand and know full well that our forces have been asked in recent years to carry out a number of peacekeeping, humantarian and other missions.

I voted to support the airstrikes in Kosovo. I have raised questions throughout this conflict. I hope there will be a diplomatic solution, and I hope the Kosovars will be able to go back home. I think we are at the beginning of a huge challenge. In particular, I want us to remember the Kosovars and continue especially with humanitarian assistance.

So I think we need to adequately support these activities, and I also supported the supplemental budget for the cost of the campaign in Kosovo. But I am troubled—and I think I am probably one of only a few in the Senate, but I have the opportunity and the honor of being able to speak as a Senator from Minnesota, and so I will—by what I see as a stampede in this Congress toward even greater increases in Pentagon spending. I think the increase in spending in this legislation goes way beyond what we need to spend in the conflict in Kosovo and way beyond what I think a post-cold war defense budget should reflect.

This appropriations bill totals $264 billion, and we also appropriated a considerable amount more in the supplemental bill, the emergency bill. If you look at the cost of Kosovo, it will be a relatively small percentage of this overall budget. In terms of manpower or womanpower, even if we participate—and I believe we will—in the KFOR peace enforcement process, we will be contributing about 7,000 troops. The total armed force of the United States is roughly 1.5 million. So this is not a question of whether or not we go on and live up to our commitment in Kosovo. I think we can support that mission without this Pentagon budget at the level called for.

I fear that using Kosovo and also some vaguely defined set of ''threats'' will end up—and I want to talk about some of the doctrines that undergird this budget—giving a blank check to the Pentagon this year and in the years ahead. This budget accounts for a little over half of the discretionary spending in the annual budget. That is what troubles me. If you look at the peak of the cold war, currently we are spending, roughly speaking, just thinking about real dollar terms, close to 90 percent—about 86—of the cold war budget, and that is during the height of the cold war.

Now, most of the funds in this budget go to maintaining a force structure that is shaped by the requirement to fight two simultaneous, major conflicts and to counter what defense analysts refer to as ''uncertainty scenarios.''

I recognize that the United States faces a number of threats around the world and that those threats have changed during the cold war period—in particular, the threat of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If we look carefully at those threats, we can see that in this budget too much of the spending is not directly related to meeting those threats but, rather, continues with what I define as cold war priorities.

We continue to pour billions of dollars into unnecessary cold war era weapons programs. We continue to maintain a nuclear arsenal that is completely disproportionate to the arsenals maintained by our potential adversaries—an arsenal that could be substantially cut, resulting in dramatic savings, still providing for as strong a defense as we could ever need.

Congress has also skewed spending priorities by refusing to close military bases that the Pentagon acknowledges are unneeded and obsolete and which the Pentagon itself has pressed to close.

What is especially troubling about the spending in this budget is the Strategic Concepts—the two major regional conflicts concept and other uncertain scenarios—that are, I think, implausible and unlikely. I want to draw here on some excellent work done by analyst Carl Conetta and Charles Knight of the Project on Defense Alternatives in Cambridge, MA.

Beginning in the 1980s, the focus of defense planners moved away from ''clear and present danger'' of the Soviet power to the intractable problem of ''uncertainty.'' Along with the shift has come a new kind of Pentagon partisan—the ''uncertainty hawk.'' The uncertainty hawks are engaged in worst-case thinking. Among the sort of nonstandard scenarios, worst-case scenarios that are, for example, talked about with this kind of doctrine are defending the Ukraine or the Baltics against Russia, civil wars in Russia and Algeria, a variety of wars in China, contention with Germany, and wars aligning Iraq and Syria against Turkey, and Iraq and Iran against Saudi Arabia. The Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review, QDR, uses unnamed ''wild card'' scenarios to help define these requirements.

Now, although both the 1993 and 1997 Defense Reviews link the two-war requirements to the Korean and Persian Gulf scenarios, these were also described merely as examples of possible wars. Officially, the two-war requirement—that we have to be able to fight two wars simultaneously—is generic. It is not tied directly to Korea or the gulf. As the Quadrennial Defense Review puts it, ''We can never know with

certainty when or where the next major theater war will occur'' or ''who our next adversary will be.''

It is important to recognize, as opposed to appropriating moneys based upon this kind of strategic doctrine, that since 1945 the United States has fought only three major regional conflicts—one every 15 or 20 years. The regional great powers and peer competitors that currently enthrall planners are only hypothetical constructs, and the world changes all of the time.

I will give an example of a little bit more of this doctrine. The prime candidates, in addition to these uncertainty scenarios, worst-case scenarios, for future peer rival status, given current doctrine, are Russia and China. A dozen years of dedicated investment might resuscitate a significant portion of the Russian Armed Forces, but that certainly is not what we are looking at right now—a major military competitor, Russia. The Chinese ''threat,'' even given all of the developments we have been talking about over the last several weeks, is even more iffy. If China's economy holds out, in 30 years it might be able to mount a ''Soviet-style'' challenge.

Surveying the prospects worldwide, a Defense Intelligence Agency analyst concludes that ''no military or technical peer competitor to the United States is on the horizon for at least a couple of decades.''

As I have said, I believe we should maintain a strong defense. We face a number of credible threats in the world, including terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. But let's make sure we carefully identify the threats we face and tailor our defense spending to meet them. Let's not continue to maintain military spending based on hypothetical threats that may not arise for decades—if at all.

I will argue as we look at this budget, which again makes up about one-half of our discretionary spending, that we ought to consider this vote in the context of where we are heading with these budget caps. I say yes to a strong defense but no to some of the unnecessary spending that is in this budget; no to some of the scenarios that are laid out in this budget and some of the doctrines that undergird the spending in this budget, especially when we are talking about over 50 percent of discretionary spending going into this area.

Whatever happened to the discussions we once had about national security at home? If we are going to spend 50 percent of our discretionary budget on the Pentagon—and we are not going to do anything about these budget caps, and we will have to, in my view, take these caps off; there is no question about it. But on current course within this context of the budget we now have before us, we are going to spend over 50 percent of discretionary spending on the Pentagon. And, as a result, what are we not doing? We are not looking at the other part of our national defense. I argue that part of our real national security is the security of our local communities.

Whatever happened to the idea that we were going to focus on early childhood development? Whatever happened to the priority that we were talking about as being so important to our country that we had to invest in the health, skills, intellect, and character of our children? Whatever happened to the importance of affordable child care? Whatever happened to the importance of decent health care coverage for people?

In my State of Minnesota, 35 percent of senior citizens—that is it, 35 percent of senior citizens—have some prescription drug coverage. The other 65 percent have no coverage at all. Many of them are spending up to 40 percent of their budget just on these costs. Where is the funding going to be for that? Where is the funding going to be for the 44 million people who have no health insurance at all?

Yesterday, we had a White House conference dealing with mental health. I would add substance abuse. I have been doing work with Senator DOMENICI—and proud to do so—on trying to deal with some discrimination and making sure that people get decent mental health coverage.

How are we going to move forward to make sure there is decent health care coverage for people? How are we going to make sure there is affordable child care? What about affordable housing? How are we going to take the steps in our communities to reduce the violence and to be able to get to the kids—I think of the juvenile justice bill that we passed not more than a couple of weeks ago—before they get into trouble in the first place? How are we going to make sure that higher education is affordable? How are we going to make sure we have the best education for every child?

I just simply want to say I am going to vote against this bill, and I am going to vote against this bill for two reasons, neither of which has anything to do with the two very distinguished Senators who are managing this bill.

First of all, as I said, I think much of it goes beyond Kosovo. Much of it goes beyond our real national defense. I think too much of it is still based upon a cold war doctrine. I believe we can make cuts in the Pentagon budget and still have a strong defense. I have tried to lay out that case.

Second of all, I am going to vote against this bill—I don't think too many Senators are—because I view the vote on this appropriations bill in the context of the overall budget and where these appropriations bills are going. I view some of the dollars spent on the Pentagon as being dollars that we are not going to spend for affordable child care, that we are not going to spend to make sure there is decent education for our children, that we are not going to spend to make sure there is affordable housing.

I argue that somewhere in the debate in the Senate we have to also look at real national security as not just being a strong defense as defined in this budget, which I am for, although I think a strong defense doesn't necessitate all of the money we are spending, but, in addition, we have to think about real national security as the security of our local communities where—one more time, and I will finish on this—there is affordable child care—when are we going to get to that?—there is affordable housing, there is decent education, there is decent health care, where we don't have one out of every four children under the age of 3 growing up poor in our country, where we don't have one out of every two children of color under the age of 3 growing up poor in our country, and make sure that every child, no matter color of skin, or income, or rural, or urban, or boy or girl, can grow up dreaming to be President of the United States of America.

I think that has to be part of the definition of our real national security. I think we have to make more decisive investments in these areas of public life in our Nation.

I believe this appropriations bill, in the context of the budget, where these appropriations bills are going to, subtracts from that very important agenda as well.

Let me finish one more time by being one of the Members of the Senate—I don't know whether others will say—I think others will say this eventually—who says that right now we are in a fiscal straitjacket. We will not be able to live with these caps. We will be making a huge mistake if we don't make some of the decisive investments I am talking about on the floor today. This will be a very shortsighted vision. We need to do much better as a nation going into the next century. And it can't be just Pentagon spending; it always has to be to make sure that there is a peaceful opportunity for every child in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is about time to vote on the McCain amendment. We thought we would have another amendment offered by this time. But it has not been offered. I believe it is time we start voting on these amendments.

I will state for the Chair that it is my intention to find some way to call up these amendments in the order they were presented and dispose of them now as quickly as we can. There is a vote on cloture tomorrow on the Y2K

proposition. I assume that will carry. We certainly do not want to have this defense bill waiting around for the completion of a long process that is related to cloture.

I urge Members to cooperate with us. I will inquire of Members as they come to the floor now on this vote as to when they will be able to present their amendments to see if we can find some way to get some time limitations. It is possible, I believe, to finish this bill tonight with the cooperation of Members of the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 589, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. I call up amendment No. 589.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I send to the desk a second-degree amendment. It will modify this amendment in a way that is acceptable to both sides. I ask that this amendment, as modified, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 589), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test And Evaluation, Navy'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 588 AND 591, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate amendments Nos. 588 and 591, and I ask they be considered en bloc.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments (Nos. 588 and 591) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the chairman and ranking member spoke eloquently about the merits of several projects in this bill that affect their States. As I have said before, I don't pretend to judge the merit of each and every project on the list of objectionable materials. I do, however, object to the process by which these projects were added to this bill, the process that circumvented the normal and appropriate merit-based review for determining the highest priority not only in defense but across all appropriations bills.

I want to clarify something the chairman said: In this list, it does not—repeat, does not—include funding for the SBIRS program on the Israeli arrow missile defense program. There is no reduction in funding for those programs.

Finally, my colleagues know the military service chiefs testified to Congress earlier this year that they need more than $17 billion every year in order to redress several readiness shortfalls. This bill falls about $6 billion short of that goal. This amendment would restore $13 billion in high-priority readiness and modernization funds to help meet the services' needs, offsetting every time with low-priority spending cuts.

I emphasize they came over and said they needed $17 billion. We are not meeting that minimal request.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I must oppose the Senator's amendment. I think it will change the direction we are going in terms of how to meet the pressing needs of the Department of Defense and, at the same time, balance those needs against the rest of the needs of the country.

I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. 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 New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent due to a death in the family.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 81, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Allard	Gramm	McCain
Bayh	Grams	Robb
Brownback	Hagel	Torricelli
Edwards	Kerry	Wellstone
Feingold	Kyl	
Graham	Lugar	

NAYS—81

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Moynihan
Baucus	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Murray
Bingaman	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Hatch	Reid
Breaux	Helms	Roberts
Bryan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hutchinson	Roth
Burns	Hutchison	Santorum
Byrd	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Jeffords	Sessions
Cleland	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Coverdell	Landrieu	Specter
Craig	Lautenberg	Stevens
Daschle	Leahy	Thomas
DeWine	Levin	Thompson
Dodd	Lieberman	Thurmond
Domenici	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lott	Warner
Durbin	Mack	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	Gregg

The amendment (No. 584) was rejected.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bill Adkins, a legislative fellow on Senator ABRAHAM's staff, be granted privileges of the floor during the Senate's consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there are so many fellows being admitted that I am going to ask on the next one that comes up that all fellows that are working with Senators be limited to not more than 1 hour each on the floor during the consideration of this bill. Those chairs in the back of the Senate are for people who are working with us on this bill.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 541

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will take a little time to explain this amendment and to say that the primary coauthor of it is Senator HARKIN from Iowa. A cosponsor is Senator WYDEN.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD also be added as a cosponsor of the amendment and that his statement be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am happy to listen to the comments of the Senator. On the second page, it says, ''. . .and the relevancy of the missions of aircraft to warfighting requirements.''

It is the position of the committee that the aircraft we are talking about are for basically multimission functions and are really not designed for warfighting requirements. They are designed for transportation, basically to meet normal needs. If the Senator would delete that last clause, we will be happy to accept the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. I just want a moment, if I may confer with my friend.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been told there is an objection to my suggestion, so I withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President. I will look at this because I have not asked for the yeas and nays at this time. We may well delete that particular part of the amendment. As a matter of fact, we will probably take care of that problem.

Mr. President, this amendment is a very important amendment. We basically say that the provision in the bill for leasing six luxury executive jets for military generals will be essentially deleted. These are the same kinds of executive jets that are used by, frankly, billionaires, CEOs of the biggest multinational corporations. I think providing additional executive jets to the military's fleet of over 100 Gulfstream, Lear, and Cessna jets sends the wrong signal to our young men and women in the military and reflects misguided spending priorities by this Congress.

I want to tell you—and I know the Senator from Iowa would agree—it wasn't easy to find this gold-plated pork. To say it was buried in this bill is an understatement. It was like finding a needle in a haystack. It is so disguised, there is no direct mention of the Gulfstream aircraft anywhere in the bill. They are being leased for the first time, I think, because it disguises the cost, which is enormous—when I get into it, I will tell you. It is about $39 million for one of these executive jets, compared to the executive jet that is in the fleet now that costs $5.4 million, which is very fancy, and that one is the Cessna Citation Ultra. This one is the Gulfstream; this is the gold-plated version.

The New York Times points out that leasing these jets costs taxpayers about $145 million more than buying these jets. But I have to tell you, if you lease them, it is hard to find them in the bill.

In order to find out what is going to be leased, we had to call the Air Force and get a fact sheet that clearly says the jets will be leased, and they will be top-of-the-line Gulfstream V jets. Again, nowhere in this bill do you see Gulfstream V or a description of these jets. If you read page 142—that is where the authority comes from—this is what it says. This is literally the last page of this bill, page 142:

> Aircraft leasing. Inserts a provision to provide the Air Force the necessary authority to negotiate leases for support aircraft.

That is it. Support aircraft. No one would know that these were the Gulfstream jets that were stripped out of the emergency supplemental bill. You could not tell. But the Air Force told us right upfront and very honestly. They sent us over a fact sheet and we found out that is what these were about.

Many of us here in the Senate—myself included—have said we are willing to provide additional funds for the Defense Department to improve recruitment and retention to fix shortfalls in training and spare parts and address quality of life issues, including family housing and health care for our military personnel. I think the Senate has done a commendable job in addressing many of these shortfalls: A 4.8-percent pay increase, improving the retirement system, increasing retention benefits.

I strongly supported each and every one of those initiatives. However, we have more to do. It is shocking to some people to know that we have military people on food stamps. The Senator from Iowa led the fight in the authorization bill to point out that our personnel overseas needed to be part of the WIC Program—the Women, Infants and Children Program—to give their children cheese and milk to survive. So how do we now come up with almost, I might say, $½ million over the 10-year period to lease the fanciest executive jets that you can find? Until we are totally convinced—and from my point of view not even then—should we even consider this kind of an expenditure?

What is it for? So four-star generals can travel throughout the world in the greatest of comfort. I love to fly in comfort. I fly across the country almost every week. It is hard. I fly commercial and sometimes I sit in coach and sometimes I use my upgrades and sit in business class. It is wearing and hard, but it is fine. You don't need to spend $39 million on a plane, or lease it at even a higher cost to do the business the military requires you to do. It is really a question of priorities. We have done a lot for our enlisted personnel, but still we need to do more. Yet, we are doing this in this bill. I am very hopeful that the chairman—if we remove that one part from our amendment—will be able to join us in support of this amendment.

There may be some objection. But I hope we can agree to drop this.

Our military personnel often live in family housing that needs replacement or repair. This is a priority.

I was looking at the amendment offered by the Senate from Arizona. I almost supported it until the chairman explained to me exactly what was happening. Sometimes Members understand these things. We look in our own areas. We see the deficiencies. I think that if Members want to put something in to improve the quality of life of the people they represent in the military, it is appropriate. But I don't think this is appropriate.

Let me quote from the May 24 issue of Defense Week. This is talking about the emergency supplemental.

> The New York Times has exposed the bills' buried aircraft language . . . this raised lawmakers' concerns that appropriators would appear even softer on pork than they already seemed.

If the committee thought this was pork and did not belong in this emergency appropriations bill, then I say it is still pork now. It is just in another vehicle. But pork is pork.

What is especially troubling is that this leasing authority could cost more than buying the six aircraft outright. Again, the New York times says that leasing the jets costs $476 million—that is almost $.5 billion over 10 years—while buying them would cost $333 million. I do my subtraction. That is a $143 million difference.

Here is how the Gulfstream company described these particular jets. This is the company that would get the sale of these jets:

> The Gulfstream V includes an evolution in cabin design that minimizes the inherent strain of long-range travel. From the 100-percent fresh air control system, to the comfortably maintained 6,000-foot cabin altitude at 51,000 feet, to cabin size—the longest in the industry—the Gulfstream V provides an interior environment unmatched in transoceanic business travel.

Make no mistake, this is the top of the line in executive jets—$37 million per plane. For $30 million less per plane—for example, a Cessna Citation Ultra at $5.4 million—we could save a tremendous amount of money.

My amendment replaces this authority to lease executive jets with the request that the DOD provide some basic information about these aircraft. I will be happy to work with the chairman if he wants me to change some of that language. But we basically called for, in essence, a study to tell us why we would need these planes and what other planes could do the job that these planes do.

By the way, in Defense Week, they called this the ''Go to Meetings Plane.'' These planes are used to go to meetings. It is described that way in Defense Week.

We want to ask these questions:

How many of the missions require a top-of-the-line executive jet?

What wartime requirements make the number of jets needed so high?

We will be glad to drop that, if the chairman doesn't like that language, but a GAO study looked at the gulf war and found very few were used in that theater.

What is the cost comparison if we lease less expensive jets?

Are there existing aircraft in the fleet that can meet these mission requirements or that can be modified to meet these requirements?

On another level, and without having to bring it to the Senate, I am going to personally send GAO a letter to look at this as well.

I think we need to step back and reexamine our priorities. The 106th Congress is increasing defense at a fast rate. There are many people who make the case as to why that should be so. But I think since we are increasing the defense budget while we are decreasing the domestic budget, it really falls on us to make sure that what we spend is necessary.

I don't have to tell Chairman STEVENS, because he has to deal with the aggravation of these nondefense discretionary program cuts overall of $21 billion. I serve on the Budget Committee. I know how hard it is going to be when you get to the civilian side of the budget. Right now, a 9-percent decrease in domestic spending is going to be facing the appropriators. What does that 9-percent cut mean? It means devastating cuts in many programs. The Labor-HHS bill is cut 13 percent. This could hurt programs. We don't know where they are going to cut. But it could hurt programs like Head Start; the Centers for Disease Control; Job Corps; summer jobs, which helps keeps kids out of trouble in the summer months; and dislocated worker assistance.

The point is that we are cutting in other areas. We shouldn't be expending this kind of money—$.5 billion—over 10 years, on these jets.

The transportation bill already reported cripples the Federal Aviation Administration's program to increase safety and capacity. The bill cuts the modernization program by $273 million from the President's request, meaning that automation in radar systems will be delayed, at best, and perhaps will never happen at our civilian airports.

In addition, the Transportation Subcommittee rescinded $300 million from prior year funding for FAA modernization.

What am I saying?

On the civilian side, we are seeing America fail. We are not going to be providing the highest level of safety for our airports. But what do we do? We spend this kind of money.

I see my friend from Iowa is on his feet. I am going to finish in 60 seconds.

What do our veterans tell us? Our veterans tell us that they need more national cemeteries. The VA-HUD bill is cut by 15 percent.

I will tell you right now, I think it would be a wise thing if we cut these leased aircraft out and looked at these needs on the civilian side of Federal aviation and if we looked at the need to build new veterans cemeteries. It is actually reaching a crisis point. We note the D-Day invasion. We commemorate that anniversary. Yet, we don't do all we should in that area.

I think we should get real with this budget. I commend my colleagues on the committee. I am very fond of them. They do a good job. But I think this is one area where we could really save some large dollars, and I think we can do better things with those dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am joining with Senator BOXER in offering this amendment to strike the provision that allows the Pentagon to lease six of these executive aircraft. The military designation is C–37A. We know them as Gulfstreams in the civilian world. They are very lavish and very nice aircraft. In fact, I will show you what we are talking about.

This is a Gulfstream V. It is a very nice airplane. I am sure that millionaires who have made a lot of money in the stock market probably have those. Billionaires have them. I am sure they fly them around. It is a very nice, luxurious aircraft. All of the statistics are very good on that aircraft. It is quiet. It flies high. It goes long distances nonstop. It is quite luxurious on the inside.

As you can see, this is a very nice business executive jet. I wouldn't deny that it is a good tool for a lot of businesses to use in fact. I am not here to say that Gulfstream V is a bad aircraft, or that it shouldn't be built, or that there is no reason to have this in anybody's inventory—not in the least. This aircraft serves a very valuable purpose for a lot of businesses here and around the world. In fact, the Gulfstream corporation has to be a good corporation, for all I know, and builds a pretty darned good airplane. That is not our point.

Our point is—the more I have looked into this the more it has become apparent to me—that all branches of the military have become top-heavy, not only top-heavy in terms of the command structure itself but top-heavy in the number of executive jets they have to ferry them around from place to place. I am beginning to wonder if these are really all that necessary. Are they really for wartime use, or are they really more for just convenience?

For example—I will get more into this in detail later—we are told that a lot of these executive jets such as this can go 4,000 or 5,000 miles without refueling, as necessary to get to theaters of operation around the world. But the fact is, during the gulf war operations very few of these were used. We have to ask the question: Is it really for the benefit of generals to use for rapid movement during war, or is it more for convenience in peacetime?

As the Senator from California said, we have a lot of budget problems here at the military. I, for one, have been trying to do something about getting WIC programs, as the Senator said, for our military personnel overseas. It is a blot on our national character and on our military that we have military personnel on food stamps. That is not right. It is not right that we have enlisted personnel who need the Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Feeding Program.

Last year, the Senator from California and I tried to offer an amendment here that would say at least when they go overseas they get the same WIC Program as they got here. If I am not mistaken, I think it came to the grand total of right around $5 to $20 million. The military said they couldn't afford to do it, but they can afford $40 million for six of these aircraft. Something is wrong when the military says they can't afford it, that the Department of Agriculture has to pay for it; the Defense Department can't, but they can afford a business jet such as this. That got me when I saw that. Something has to be done about this.

I understand they want to lease several of these Gulfstream V aircraft. I would like to have one to go back and forth to Iowa. I wouldn't have to go through Chicago anymore—probably nonstop right to Iowa. The Senator from California could use one, get on the jet right here and go to any airport in California nonstop.

Let me show you the interior of the aircraft: A nice, luxurious interior. Lean back, have your own personal TV set, a glass of wine. That is pretty nice travel.

Again, I am not saying that we have to strip down everything, that a general has to ride in a harness on a side bucket strapped onto a C–130. That is not what I am saying. There probably is a need for some of these aircraft to transport these people rapidly. My question has to do with the number of aircraft.

For example, I note that there are now over 300 aircraft in inventory, over 150 jets. I can't quite get an accurate count. Last time I counted, there were 154 jets, 70 Learjets. Regarding the C–9, the same as a Douglas DC–9, the Navy has 27, the Marines have 2, and the Air Force has 5. Gulfstreams, we have 16 already. We have some Gulfstream IIIs and IVs, the predecessor to the Gulfstream V. They are about as nice, but they can't go as far. They are a good airplane. We have 70 Learjets total; 727s, we have 3. I am reading just the

jets. And I didn't realize we already have two Gulfstream Vs in our inventory. Cessna Citation 560, which is pictured here, is a pretty nice jet, not quite as big as the Gulfstream V and doesn't go as far, but we have 14 of those. The old Saberliners, we have three still in existence. We have seven 707s in our inventory.

There are quite a lot of jets to be flying around. Again, I am wondering, with the inventory that we have, why do we have to lease seven more? Or are we cutting back on some of the aircraft? Again, they may serve a legitimate purpose, but I am wondering, and I go back to a GAO report that the Senator referred to from 1995, ''Travel by Senior Officials,'' dated June 1995. One of the their recommendations in that report was to develop the appropriate mechanisms to ensure the availability of each service's aircraft to help fulfill the OSA, operation support needs, of other services. The third recommendation, reassign or otherwise dispose of excess OSA aircraft.

Now, the chairman and ranking member may know better than I, but it seems to me that a lot of the services have the aircraft and they just don't go from one service to the other. It seems to me what we really need is an effective structure in DOD that puts these business jets and other aircraft under one operational command that really works. If a senior officer in the Navy needed one for something, they should go to this command to get it; Marines the same, Air Force—all this would be the same. The Navy/Marine should go to one central structure to get the aircraft and have them assigned from that structure. That is how it should work.

It looks as though we are in the same old military gamesmanship: Air Force, ''I got mine''; Navy, ''I got mine.'' The Navy has Navy markings and the Air Force has Air Force markings and the Army has Army markings and never the twain shall meet.

I am curious as to how much money we waste and how much operational support aircraft we waste because we don't have that one effective integrated command structure working as it should. That was the suggestion made by GAO in 1995. If nothing else comes out of this, I hope we might move ahead in some way to provide an effective overall operational structure.

I said earlier that there is a DOD Directive 4500.43 that requires that OSA aircraft inventories must be based on wartime needs. However, few OSA aircraft were used in theater during the Persian Gulf war.

From the GAO report:

> Actual use of OSA aircraft during the Persian gulf war suggests that the primary role of OSA is not wartime support but peacetime support.

Again, I quoted that from the GAO report of June of 1995.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. I know the Senator was a pilot in the military and I know he understands aircraft.

Mr. HARKIN. I think I do.

Mrs. BOXER. And I know he understands that these jets we are talking about are not fighting machines; they are go-to-meetings machines.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might interrupt, these are what in common nomenclature would be called executive business jets, converted. For example, in military terms, they call it a C–37 but it is really a Gulfstream V.

Mrs. BOXER. My friend showed a couple of photos of the Gulfstream and then a photo of the Cessna Citation.

Mr. HARKIN. Cessna Citation Ultra. By the way, it is a very good plane.

Mrs. BOXER. It is my understanding that the Cessna Citation Ultra costs $5.4 million a copy, according to the Appropriations Committee, and that the cost on the Gulfstream V is about $39 million.

This is transportation for the highest level of military officers. My friend pointed out that we have a gap growing here between those at the bottom of the economic ladder in the military and those at the top. We know that will always be the case, but it seems to me it is exacerbated with this kind of situation.

I want to ask my friend if he believes that a top general could fly comfortably in a $5.4 million plane as opposed to a $39 million plane?

What we are doing is simply asking for a study to see if we can accommodate the needs of the generals in a cheaper way.

Mr. HARKIN. The basic answer to that is, yes—depending on the mission, of course.

Now, if a general or a four-star wanted to fly from here nonstop to Europe, they couldn't take this airplane which only has about a 2,000-mile leg. However, I might add, it could fly to Reykjavik and refuel. It can fly to Shannon and refuel. It will take an hour and a half or more; you have to land, refuel, and get out of there. But it is perfectly capable of doing that. A lot of businesses fly these overseas all the time. You just have to stop and refuel in one place, that is all. It even has a bathroom on board.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may ask my friend, isn't it possible to base some of these planes in Europe, base them in different places, which is what they do anyway, so it is more convenient to make the switch?

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate the Senator asking that question because I think it points up—first of all, I am not saying we do not need any of this; I am saying we do need some of these planes. I was talking with the chairman about this. Let's say a four-star officer has to go from Washington to Florida to Texas to Chicago for a series of meetings. He possibly cannot do it with a civilian plane. I understand that, if one has to go overseas for a certain meeting and get back. There are times when you cannot use civilian airplanes. But this type of a jet could be used for any kind of domestic travel in the continental United States. You might have to land and refuel. That does not bother me a whole heck of a lot.

I am saying with the Gulfstream Vs that we have now—which I said we have two or so right now in inventory, plus we have a number of Gulfstream IVs and Gulfstream IIIs—let's say a general needed to get from the Pentagon to someplace overseas in a big hurry for something. OK, requisition one of them and use it for that. But if they have to go to Florida and then to Texas and then to California and make all these meetings, use one of these smaller aircraft because they are going to land anyway, while they are at the meeting, they can refuel, take off and go. It is a much cheaper way of operating.

I seriously question whether we need six Gulfstream Vs for whatever purpose they are asking—I really question that—and I question whether or not other versions of aircraft like this or others can be used more for domestic travel.

I have a letter to Chairman STEVENS dated March 8, 1999, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Hamre, and General Ralston, U.S. Air Force. I was reading it over and was struck by a paragraph. It is an assessment of CINC support aircraft. This was required by the Senate Appropriations Committee report last year. I was struck by this paragraph which says:

> This study evaluated all military and representative commercial aircraft to determine which aircraft would both be configurable and available for CINC support airlift.

It goes on. This is the paragraph:

> The study revealed that when CINC—
>
> Commanders in Chief—
>
> requirements, combined long, unrefueled range—4,200 to 6,000 nautical miles—more than 18 passengers and short runway capabilities—5,000 to 7,000 feet—a modern commercial aircraft was needed.

I find it interesting. If you go to the CINCs and ask, ''What are your requirements?'' and they define their requirements, guess what. They meet the requirements of the Gulfstream V. If you ask me what my requirements are to fly around the United States, I bet I can come up with a set of determinants that I need a Gulfstream V: I travel a lot; I go to the coast once in a while; I am always in Iowa; sometimes I have to be in one place for a meeting and then another place for a meeting. I would love to have a Gulfstream V. And I have short runways, too, sometimes.

It is not surprising that we ask the CINCs, ''What do you need?'' and they

then define their needs and come up with Gulfstream Vs. It seems to me we ought to have someone else defining the needs rather than the commanders in chief, because they are the ones who use the aircraft.

They said:

> Based on historical CINC support aircraft usage and future requirements, and discounting the probable need of backup aircraft inventory, seven C–37A aircraft—

that is the Gulfstream V—

> should minimally satisfy the existing CINC requirements.

What I cannot figure out—does the Senator from California know?—is, how many CINCs are there? Do we know how many CINCs there are?

Mrs. BOXER. Nine.

Mr. HARKIN. There are nine CINCs, so we are getting seven Gulfstream Vs for nine CINCs.

Mrs. BOXER. Plus all the other aircraft that are in the inventory.

Mr. STEVENS. Regular order, Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. HARKIN. I asked the Senator to answer a question. I asked the Senator to respond to a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor, and he can only yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. I can ask a question of the Senator from California, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That requires the Senator from Iowa to yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask a question of my friend, since that is the rule and that is being strictly enforced today, and I appreciate that. Does the Senator not agree that adding six more of these luxury planes, which would give us a total of nine Gulfstream Vs—we would have nine Gulfstream Vs; that is, one for each of the commanders, plus an inventory of other planes that include Learjets and Cessnas—does he not believe that this is going overboard in terms of the priorities we should have?

I agree with my friend, and I ask him this question as well: We are saying that we are very willing to give the generals what they need, but it is a matter of whether you get the gold-plated version or a very solid version, and isn't that what we are really talking about?

Mr. HARKIN. I think the Senator has put her finger on it: We are willing to give the generals what they need but not what they want.

Mrs. BOXER. Interesting.

Mr. HARKIN. They may want to travel in this kind of luxury, but I am not certain we ought to just give it to them. There are nine CINCs. Each one now would have their own Gulfstream V. Do we know what the per-hour operating cost is of a Gulfstream V? As best I can determine, the per-hour operating cost is over $2,000. I think it is actually higher than that, because I do not think that takes into account depreciation; I think that is just fuel and other requirements.

Let's just say it is $2,000 an hour. A four-star officer gets on one of those Gulfstream Vs and flies 2 hours someplace for a meeting and 2 hours back; that is 4 hours, $8,000 just to go to a meeting someplace and come back. That is a good use of taxpayers' dollars?

I will lay you odds that 7 times out of 10 that four-star officer could go right out here to National Airport or Dulles, get on an airplane, and get a first-class ticket—How much is a first-class ticket?—fly to that meeting, and fly back for less than $1,000.

I ask you: When is the last time you ever got on a commercial aircraft in the United States flying anywhere and saw a general or admiral on that plane? I cannot remember when. I see a lot of lieutenants and commanders and captains, but I never see an admiral or general. Then again, why would you? They are on their Gulfstream Vs, jetting around.

I am not saying there is never a purpose—there may be—but I think this is just a little bit too much. There are about 36 four-star officers in the U.S. military, I am told—about 36 four-star officers—and for that, we have over 154 jets in inventory to fly people around. What is going on here?

In fact, I know our proposal only deals with the Gulfstreams, but if I am not mistaken, the bill also provides for the purchase of five additional C–35s.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Those are the Cessnas. We are already going to buy five of these, and we are going to lease six more of the Gulfstream Vs. So it is not just the Gulfstream Vs. The Navy already has six Gulfstreams, the Air Force already has Gulfstreams, and, as I said, 70 Learjets, C–21s.

I remember one time when I went on a congressional trip—was I still in the House or the Senate? I can't remember. I may have been in the Senate. We went to Central America. It was during that war in Central America.

We flew from here to Florida, to MacDill, refueled, and we were in a little Lear. There were about six or seven of us crammed into that thing with no bathroom. But obviously, because of my Senate duties, I had to get down there to go on a trip that could not be done commercially. So we went from here to MacDill, refueled, then went to Guatemala and Honduras; and then I think we went to El Salvador; then we went to Panama City, had to refuel again, fly to MacDill, refuel again, and then fly home.

I tell you, it was not that comfortable a flight if you are one of those in a little Lear, six or seven people crammed in there. For a Senator, that is fine. I bet you a general or admiral would never do that. But we had staff. We had committee staff along with us.

I am just saying, sometimes if you are going to do these things, sometimes you have to put up with that. There is no way I could have done it commercially, so I had to take a military aircraft. You do not have to go in elaborate luxury every single time.

That is my point. I do not think there is a critical shortage of these executive jets that should take precedence over the immediate needs of our military.

Besides the sheer numbers of aircraft in each of the armed services indicating there is no shortfall, again, I repeat from the 1995 GAO report that said the armed services should ''develop the appropriate mechanisms to ensure the availability of each service's aircraft to help fulfill the OSA needs of the other services.'' In other words, the GAO concluded the armed services needed to learn to share. This is a simple concept that should be used to relieve any conceivable strain on the number of executive aircraft.

The Pentagon counters this sensible solution by claiming that existing aircraft are being fully used. However, the GAO also found that DOD's operational support aircraft fleet ''far exceeds any possible wartime requirement.''

The Defense Week article that the Senator from California referred to of May 24, 1999, had some interesting things in it. They said:

> In particular, the article said, ''There are about 600 to 800 users in the DC area authorized to request SAM [VIP Special Air Mission] support for missions'' which meet prescribed criteria.

As I understand, that does not include Senators and Congressmen. At least that is what I am told. When I first read there are 600 to 800 authorized users for VIP special air missions, I thought that must include the 435 Members of the House and the 100 Senators. I am told that is not so.

I am wondering, who are these 600 to 800 people? I am wondering if some of these jets are being used for less than really vital needs and perhaps could be used to meet the needs of the military CINCs.

Again, quoting from the Defense Week article of May 24:

> Brig. Gen. Arthur Lichte, the Air Force's director of global-reach programs, says these support aircraft are all meeting other requirements [all these other aircraft that we have in inventory] so [they] could not be used by the commanders.

Again, I am wondering, why not? What are these other requirements? If the commanders cannot use them, who is using them?

> Hamre says most of these support aircraft are too small for commanders' staffs. Plus, the four-stars need to be able to fly non-stop intercontinental trips while staying in contact with the president.

I am not so certain about that. I am not certain that a refueling stop in Shannon is all that burdensome.

The article goes on to say:

Some on Capitol Hill respond that the CINCs could get by with smaller staffs on board and could live with refueling stops, but Hamre and Lichte don't agree.

I do not know why not. I know a lot of times we go on congressional fact-finding trips. We stop and refuel different places. I don't know why generals can't. They can still be in contact. That does not stop your contact with the White House, simply because you land and refuel—not at all.

What about the existing support fleet?

''No,'' Hamre said, ''we don't have aircraft that can fly from here to the Persian Gulf. I suppose you could go on a C–12. You could island-hop like you did in World War II, but I mean that doesn't make any sense. This big inventory of 500 [operational support aircraft]—most of them are tiny airplanes, four-passenger, six-passenger kind of airplanes.''

That is just not so. These are not four-passenger airplanes.

Mrs. BOXER. Isn't it eight?

Mr. HARKIN. These are eight right here. How much staff does a general have to take with him when he goes to a meeting? I would like to find that out.

He said, ''The CINCs aren't [even] happy they have to live with a 12 passenger aircraft.''

Again I ask, how much staff do they need to take to these meetings they go to?

So, again, the Senator from California and I have this amendment that says basically: We ought to put this lease aside. Let's take a look at this. Let's get a good report in. Do these really meet the warmaking needs of the Pentagon?

Plus, I do not know where the facts lie on this one, but I will just say that, according to the New York Times, the lease will cost the taxpayers more than $475 million over 10 years. Purchasing the planes may prove cheaper. Some say purchasing is going to cost more; some say it will cost less. But we do know that for these aircraft, for the cost of the aircraft, plus the operation of them over the next 10 years, it is going to come in at somewhere——

Mrs. BOXER. Over $400 million.

Mr. HARKIN. I think the lease is going to cost over $475 million. And then there are operational costs. Now you are up to $600 or $700 million over the next 10 years just for these aircraft. That may be small change to the Pentagon, which is used to operating with $270 billion budgets, but that is a lot of money for our taxpayers. I just do not know where the facts lie in whether or not leasing is better than purchasing.

We have seen very little information as to the cost tradeoffs of leasing versus purchasing. We have not seen a full report from the Pentagon covering all possible options to cover these CINCs' needs, nor do we have much information as to the needs of the military for all of these such aircraft. That is why our amendment requires a report detailing the requirements and options for such aircraft as an important first step. We do not have that.

Quite frankly, regardless of how our amendment fares, I say to the chairman, and others, I plan to come back to this issue, along with my colleague from California, year after year, until we get a clearer picture. How many flights do senior officers take with senior executive aircraft? We do not even know that. What are the costs? What are the per-hour costs? What are the costs for that trip? Could that trip have been utilized with an alternative such as commercial aircraft? At what cost savings? Could some of these aircraft be sold off as excess aircraft if we better managed the total number of executive aircraft that we have?

For example, we know that senior officials and officers fly from base to base and facility to facility. They fly from Andrews Air Force Base to NAS Jacksonville or to MacDill or to other air bases around the country. Could you utilize commercial aircraft for that? Sometimes yes; sometimes no. But we need to ensure that the DOD is looking for cheaper alternatives, including commercial airline alternatives. It may be slightly less convenient, but it sure would be a lot less costly, and it would free up existing DOD aircraft we have now for the unique missions for which they say they are needed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised by the length and specificity of the argument against this amendment. This amendment, on page 104 of the bill, would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to obtain transportation for the commanders in chief, the regional commanders, to lease aircraft. It does not mandate any leasing. It authorizes leasing.

Currently these commanders in chief, regional commanders, are already flying 707 aircraft built 30, 35 years ago. Commercially, those airlines had 250 seats. They have 45 seats on those aircraft now. They are big. They are old. They are costly to maintain. It is possible to have modern replacements now.

The Senators would have us replace one a year. We will keep operating these old dumbos at enormous cost for repair and replacement of engines, instead of moving out and accepting the fact that there are planes there now, American-built planes, and the Department estimates it will cost $750 million to operate and maintain the current support fleet over the next 10 years. We would reduce that cost and put our people immediately in more cost-effective, quiet, efficient planes.

Yes, they are small compared to what they have now. Today a commander in chief takes along with him up to 45 people. This will reduce that size; there is no question about that. Further, we reduce the number of aircraft from nine to seven. They didn't mention that. This has nothing to say about all those other aircraft.

I would like to have a study of the flights of these airplanes that are owned by the Federal Government, particularly those owned and flown by the White House. We tried to get that and couldn't get it. We would like to find out who flies in the State Department airplane. We couldn't get that.

Now, be my guest and go get those, but these are commanders of our military who are serving as regional commanders of forces. I wonder if the Senate knows there are forces of the American people in 91 different countries today. We are operating at about one-third the staff we had just 5 years ago. We are trying to carry out missions that are almost impossible. Our reenlistment rate of pilots is down to less than one-third of what it was just a year ago. The deployment of our forces is overwhelming. The degree of fatigue on our managers is overwhelming.

I really never expected this kind of argument about replacing the 707s. I do not think anyone wants to continue to fly on the 707s. If nothing else, they are just old.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. STEVENS. No. I am going to table this, follow this bill through, and get it done. I can't understand that an amendment like this would delay this bill, because it is only an authorization to lease. All we have heard today, talking about the number of aircraft, is immaterial. Those aircraft are out there. They are not going to be affected by this amendment at all.

What we are trying to do is say that these commanders who stand in for the President as regional commanders in chief should have the state of the art of American industry in terms of their transportation. That is what this is. What we are doing is trying to get them to lease them, because if we started replacing them, I have to tell you, there is not money in this bill to allow us to buy seven new aircraft for these commanders. We can give them the authority to lease them and replace them, and those leases can be options to buy later. We can fill that if we want to buy the planes later. We can't do it now, but these planes they are flying now are expensive, and they are too large. They are not what these commanders need.

A DOD report promised us a savings of $250 million over this 10-year period if they had this authority. It doesn't mandate them leasing it. It authorizes them to lease some, buy some, lease with an option to buy, whatever it might be, to get the best deal possible to replace these aircraft.

Now, in terms of maintenance alone, this option would save us a lot of

money. I think the problem of having dedicated aircraft is something we ought to look at.

The Senator says he hasn't seen many four-star admirals or four-star generals on airplanes. I see them. They do not wear their uniforms on airplanes. Why should they? They would automatically be a target. It is not what we want anyway. These people are known throughout the world. I think if anyone in the world needs protection, it is the commanders in chief of the regions. We do not provide that, but we can provide them the capability for security and safety as they move around the areas over which they have command.

Talk to the people in industry. Why do you think the big industries are leasing fleets of cars now? Because after the end of a year or so, they turn them back, get a new model—no maintenance, no replacement of parts. The vehicles are out on the civilian market with a good value, because they have only been used for a short while.

We could do the same thing with these aircraft if people would wake up and use the leasing operation. We are not talking about leasing combat aircraft; we are talking about leasing transportation that is vital to the regional commanders.

Again, our section only deals with transportation for the regional commanders, not for all the 684 people. If you want to know who they are, they are people in the State Department. We will be glad to give you a list. State Department, commanders of bases overseas, they are eligible for flight on these aircraft.

But above all, I am sort of taken aback by the fact that we are giving the Department of Defense the right to think about taxpayers' money as they provide this vital transportation link for these regional commanders.

This saves money. The study shows they save money. Before they can complete the lease, they have to come back and get the money to lease. There is no money in this bill to lease. As a practical matter, I really don't understand. Here we are trying to save money. We are trying to replace these antiquated airplanes. These places these people go, most of them have no commercial connections. They just do not.

I took a trip this last week to California and down to the desert in Arizona and back here on business, down at the border to look at some problems there. I will tell the Senate about that later. There were no connections to Douglas, AZ, commercially. I thought I would get down there and see that problem to determine whether we ought to spend taxpayers' money. They have the same problem. How can they tell us what they need in these remote places of the world under their command?

And how can they come to meetings and listen to the Commander in Chief or to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs? These planes are needed by these people. I think one of the great things brought about by the Goldwater-Nichols Act was, in fact, regional commanders. It gave us the kind of command and control we needed to maintain a very efficient military, with fewer people, and utilizing the talent of some very distinguished people. I have to tell you, the longer I am here, the greater respect I have for people who get four stars on their shoulders. That is what we are talking about—the people who have come through the services and have reached the point of ultimate command—and I mean ultimate. They can make decisions in lieu of the Commander in Chief in a time of crisis; I am talking about in lieu of the President. They have the power under that act to act in a crisis.

Now, what do you want to do—let them ride commercial planes? I challenge anybody who has been out in the Pacific and has gone from place to place, from island to island, where we have our military, to figure out how to do it commercially. Even in my State, if you want to go out to Adak, you can go out and come back 2 days later.

As a practical matter, this is transportation for the 21st century. If nothing else, this Senator doesn't want to see representatives of the Nation that leads the world in building aircraft to be traveling in 1960 airplanes in the years 2001, 2002, and 2003. That is what we are talking about. There is a lot here in terms of advertising America to the world. I want these people to be flying in the best we have, because they are demonstrating this country's ability to maintain its position in the world.

I cannot believe there would be this kind of dialog about giving the authority to use a system that American business has now used very efficiently for 40 years—the leasing of equipment as opposed to buying it. I hope to God they use this authority and save us some money and put our people in safe, modern, efficient transportation.

Does the Senator want to speak before I make a motion to table?

Mr. INOUYE. For just 2 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii for 2 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, most respectfully, I have been trying to——

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object—and I will not—I wonder if the Senator from Iowa and I may have a chance to ask a question of the Senator from Alaska so that we can make our point again, because I think he misconstrued what we were saying. I think it is important to set the record straight. May we have 4 minutes between us to simply ask a question?

Mr. STEVENS. I will be pleased to enter into that kind of agreement, following the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have been trying to follow this debate as closely as possible. The explanation the Senator from California has given is that this amendment would strike provisions in the bill which allow the Secretary of the Air Force to lease six Gulfstream V jets to transport the highest ranking military officials.

There is nothing in Section 8106 that speaks of six Gulfstream V jets, nor does it speak of the highest ranking military officials. I have no idea where that came from.

What this section says is:

> The Secretary of the Air Force may obtain transportation for operational support purposes, including transportation for combatant Commanders in Chief, by lease of aircraft, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, consistent with this section, through an operating lease consistent with OMB Circular A–11.

There is nothing about Gulfstreams. There is nothing about the highest ranking military officials. But even if we did say six Gulfstream V jets for the highest military officials, I join my chairman in objecting to this amendment. We should keep in mind that fewer than 1 percent of the population of these United States have stood up and said to the rest of the world they are willing to stand in harm's way in our defense and, if necessary, give their lives. Fewer than 1 percent of us have taken that oath. The least we can do is to give them the cutting edge, and this is the cutting edge that is necessary to differentiate between defeat and victory.

So, Mr. President, I will support a motion to table this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let me again say what we are trying to do. We believe under this amendment, by giving the authority to lease aircraft, we will be able to get at least six aircraft in less than 2 years to replace these aircraft that are now well over 30, 40 years old. We believe the savings in retiring these aging, expensive-to-maintain 707 aircraft will be cost effective. But what is more, this move will be very good for the Department, because by pooling these aircraft they will be able to use them efficiently. Nobody will have a dedicated aircraft that is underutilized. They will be able to be used by others when not being utilized under this plan.

We adopted a similar plan last year at my suggestion, and that is when we were going to have aircraft for FEMA, CIA, and the FBI. We formed a special unit, and they have pooled the aircraft and they are available to them. They will have them available for one or all of them, depending on the needs of the people involved. This is a cost-effective utilization of air transportation to meet the needs of our National Government. I hope we can defeat this amendment.

I am going to make a motion to table. I will be happy to consider time for the Senators to speak. They have spoken almost an hour and a half. I will honor their suggestion if they want some time before I make that motion.

Mr. HARKIN. I would be glad to do 10 minutes and wrap it up.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to complete it with 3 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa have not more than 10 minutes and the Senator from California not more than 5 minutes and I be recognized again to make a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has made a good point that the military should consider leasing and not consider purchasing. That is what our amendment does. Read our amendment. It says:

Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the inventory and status of operational support aircraft, Commander-in-Chief support aircraft, and command support aircraft of the Department of Defense. The report shall include a detailed discussion of the requirements for such aircraft, the foreseeable future requirements for such aircraft, the cost of leasing such aircraft, commercial alternatives to use of such aircraft, the cost of maintaining the aircraft, the capability and appropriateness of the aircraft to fulfill mission requirements, and the relevancy of the missions of the aircraft to warfighting requirements.

That is exactly what our amendment does. But we want to know, should we even lease them?

Mr. STEVENS. I have one question. The first sentence says to strike the provision on page 104.

Mr. HARKIN. Strike the provision——

Mr. STEVENS. To lease for another year.

Mr. HARKIN. It strikes the provision which allows the Department of Department to go ahead and lease. It says: Let's do a study before next March 1. What are our requirements? What are our alternatives? And let's examine the leasing versus the purchasing. We don't even have that documentation yet.

So I don't think there is such a need that we have to rush ahead and allow them to go ahead and enter these long-term leasing agreements before March 1 of next year. There is not that requirement there. They tried to put this into the supplemental appropriations bill, and that was knocked out because it wasn't an emergency. Now they have come back on the regular appropriations bill.

So all our amendment is saying, fine, leasing may be the best way to proceed, but we haven't gotten to that point yet. Do we even need these aircraft? We haven't gotten to that point yet. I make the point that I am not certain we need this. Let's take it one step at a time and see if these are really operational requirements.

The Senator also said that it would be costly; we have these old aircraft in inventory we have to repair and keep them up and put new engines in them and all that stuff. It is sort of like my old car. I have an old car, and it needs a new engine. I can put a new engine in that car, and it is going to cost me about $1,300. The car runs fine. In fact, it is a pretty darned nice car. It is just a little old and has a lot of miles on it. If I go out and buy a new car, it will cost me about $20,000. I ask you, which is the better alternative, if I am looking at it costwise? It is a lot cheaper for me to put a new engine in that old car.

These are 30-year-old, well-maintained aircraft. They are the best maintained aircraft in the world. They go through their periodic inspections, their 100-hour inspections, their annual inspections, and they have all kinds of new engines on them and everything. It is much cheaper to keep those flying, to repair them, and to keep them up than it is to go out and pay $40 million for one of these, I can assure you.

Second, my last point: The chairman says that this will not affect the number of aircraft that we have out there now. I beg to differ. It will affect the number of aircraft we have out there now, because if in fact the amendment of the Senator from California and myself is adopted, it is going to require them to take a really hard look at what they have in their inventory, at what their needs are, and at how they can better utilize them. That may affect the other aircraft out there. We may be able to meet the mission requirements of the CINCs with all of the Gulfstreams, the Learjets, the Citation jets, the 707s, the 757s, the 727s, and the DC–9s that we have out there if they are better utilized. That is the missing ingredient. We don't have that kind of an accounting. That is what our amendment calls for.

If it turns out that they really need these aircraft to meet the warmaking capabilities, and it proves that it is cheaper to do it this way than to repair and fix up the older aircraft—if that can be shown—I will be first in line to vote to make sure they get the aircraft.

But I am telling you, this Senator does not have adequate information right now to vote to spend probably upwards of $600 million to $700 million over the next 10 years to lease these Gulfstream Vs and operate them for that period of time.

That is why we need to just step back, take a deep breath, and have them to report back. One year is not going to be a big loss to them, if they have to wait one year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for the time that he has spent on working on this amendment with me and for his experience. His being in the military, I think, brings tremendous credibility to this discussion.

I thank the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii for their patience. I know that this is an amendment that they do not agree with. I know they are not thrilled that we have offered it, but they have shown great respect and have given us the time that we need to explain it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the more than 300 planes in the inventory. These are aircraft available for military administrative travel. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARY PLANES—CIVILIAN EQUIVALENT NAMES AND SPECS

C–9—military equivalent of McDonnell Douglas DC–9—twin-engine, T-tailed, medium-range, swept-wing jet aircraft. Used primarily for aeromedical evacuation missions.

Capacity: 40 litter patients, 40 ambulatory and four litter patients, or various combinations.

Number in the military: Total=34—Navy, 27; Marines, 2; Air Force, 5.

C–12 Huron—Beech Aircraft King Air, a twin turboprop passenger and cargo aircraft.

Built: Wichita, KS—Beech Aircraft Corp. (Raytheon).

Capacity: up to 8 passengers.

Number in the military Total=178—Army, 104; Navy, 51; Marines, 18; Air Force, 5.

C–20 series—Gulfstream Aerospace Gulfstream Series, these are jets.

Built: Savannah, GA—Gulfstream Aerospace Corp.

Capacity: maximum of 19.

Number in the military: Total=16—Navy, 6; Marines, 1; Air Force, 9.

C–20A—Gulfstream III.

C–20B—Gulfstream III.

C–20H—Gulfstream IV.

C–21—Learjet Series, cargo and passenger plane with turbofan jet engines.

Built: Wichita, KS—Learjet Corporation.

Capacity: 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=70—Air Force, 70.

C–22B—Boeing 727–100, primary medium-range aircraft used by the Air National Guard and National Guard Bureau to airlift personnel.

Number in the military: Total=3—Air National Guard, 3.

C–23—an all-freight version of the Shorts 330 regional airliner.

Built: Northern Ireland, UK—Short Brothers plc.

Number in the military: Total=32—Army, 32.

C–26—Fairchild Merlin/Metro, operated exclusively by the Air and Army National Guard, it is a propeller plane with quick change passenger, medivac, and cargo interiors.

Built: San Antonio, TX—Fairchild Aircraft Corp.

Number in the military: Total=10—Army, 10.

C–32A—Boeing 757–200, equipped with two wing-mounted Pratt & Whitney 2040 engines.

Capacity: 45 passengers and 16 crew.

Number in the military: Total=4; Air Force, 4.

C–37A—Gulfstream V.

Capacity: up to 12 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

C–38A—IAI Astra SPX, primarily for operational support and distinguished visitor transport and can be configured for medical evacuation and general cargo duties.

Capacity: 11 passengers and crew.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

C–137C—Boeing 707–300, provides transportation for the vice president, cabinet and congressional members, and other high-ranking U.S. and foreign officials. It also serves as a backup for Air Force One.

Capacity: 40–50 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

UC–35—Cessna Citation 560 Ultra V twin, medium range executive and priority cargo jet aircraft.

Capacity: up to 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=14—Army, 14.

CT–39G—Rockwell International, twin-jet engine, pressurized, fixed wing, monoplane.

Capacity: 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=3—Marines, 3.

VC–25—Boeing 757–200.

Capacity: 102.

Number in the Military: Total=2.

C–135—Boeing 707, jet airliner that has performed numerous transport and special-duty functions.

Number in the military: Total=5—Air Force, 5.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if we go through this list, you will see all of them: The C–20 series, the C–12 series, the C–21 series, the C–22B series, and it goes on and on with over 300 planes.

I thank Senator HARKIN's staff for their work in putting that together.

I want to make a point. We have an argument on the floor of the Senate. It is a very fair argument. One side says it is cheaper to lease these Gulfstreams, and others say that it may well be cheaper to buy them—forgetting about the fact that some of us think we don't need them at all. This is almost $½ billion over 10 years at a time when we are cutting virtually everything else but the military right now.

Let's face it. The FAA is almost being crippled with $300 million in rescinded funds to make our civilian skies safer. This is serious. This isn't a small piece of change.

If, as my friend says, the study comes back and shows we save money by buying these things, we will take a look at that.

I agree with the Senator from Alaska. I think there are times when of course—I know the Senator from Iowa agrees—we want to have certain planes set aside for the convenience and use of our top brass. That is not the question here. There are 300 planes in the military that they can use now. In this very bill, we are purchasing more of the Cessna Citation Ultras, which are beautiful planes that the Senator from Iowa has spoken about, to carry them around in luxury. Yes. They may have to stop to refuel, but they can keep in contact with the President of the United States. I have traveled with very impressive delegations where we have had to stop in the middle of very tenuous circumstances.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield, as an old military pilot myself, I must say that if the generals want to get someplace in a real hurry—it may be necessary—and if it is part of our warmaking capabilities, they can get in the back seat of an F–16, get inflight fueling, and they can be there a lot faster than any commercial aircraft or a Gulfstream or anything else. That is the fastest way to get there.

Mrs. BOXER. I reclaim my time. I have a brief amount of time left.

This isn't about hurting anyone in the military. My goodness. No one could respect the military more than the Senator from Iowa. I have to say that is not what this amendment is about. This amendment is about a very hard-nosed money question. Can we move these generals around in style but not in the Gulfstream version? Can we look to see what the best way to go is—leasing or purchasing? Then maybe we can save some money that we need desperately.

Our veterans need veterans cemeteries. They are being told that they have to have a 15-percent cut in the VA allocation. This includes VA hospitals. We could go on. We have military people. You want to talk about the military who have to go on food stamps or the WIC Program. The Senator from Iowa has led that charge. Maybe that is why we feel so strongly about this, that it is a matter of priorities. Respect for the generals? Absolutely. Respect for the enlisted people? Absolutely. Let's do the right thing.

All we are saying is a year's pause, have a good study done, come back together, see what the study shows, and then make the decision that is based more on fact than fiction.

Yes. The New York Times did a study. They said it is costing about $140 million more to go the leasing route. Let's see if they are right.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to stand in strong support for this amendment. This straightforward amendment to strike tens of million of dollars for luxury aircraft for military commanders, brought to the floor by Senators BOXER and HARKIN is about our men and women in uniform.

It is about the men and women that we have heard so much about over the past years, the central players in the services' readiness crisis. It is about the men and women whose lives are on the line in operations around the world. There is no question, Mr. President, that we must provide them with the necessary resources to defend themselves and the United States.

Just last year, there was a virtual consensus that the armed services were facing a readiness crisis. Last September, the Joint Chiefs testified that there was a dangerous readiness shortfall. General Henry Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, claimed that ''without relief, we will see a continuation of the downward trends in readiness . . . and shortfalls in critical skills.'' Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer stated that the military faces a ''hollow force'' without increased readiness spending. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson asserted that the Navy has a $6 billion readiness deficit. So it went for all the services.

To address the readiness shortfall, the Congress passed on emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The bill was well-intentioned in its support for the efforts of our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, something happened on the way to the front lines. The bill spent close to $9 billion, but just $1 billion of it went to address the readiness shortfall.

We added $1 billion for ballistic missile defense. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization still has not spent all that money, yet we have added another $3.5 billion for the BMDO in this bill. Last year's supplemental also added billions to what has become an expected emergency, that being our operations in Bosnia. That other unexpected emergency, the year 2000, received a billion dollars. And so it went. What happened to readiness?

It is with wonderment that the appropriations bill before us today would spend upwards of $40 million in the next fiscal year, and perhaps as much as half a billion dollars over the next ten years on luxury jets for four-star generals. Am I missing something or is this absurd? We actually have troops that qualify for food stamps and DOD can justify spending tens of millions of dollars next year for luxury jets.

This bill will allow the Air Force to lease executive business Gulfstream V jets for the military's unified and regional commanders in chief. This bill also spends $27 million for five UC–35 corporate aircraft that the Pentagon did not even ask for this year. How can this be?

According to John Hamre, the assistant secretary of defense, DOD has an inventory of almost 500 operational support airlift, or OSA, aircraft, including 70 Learjets. The Army owns 160 OSA aircraft, the Air Force 111 OSA

aircraft, the Navy 89 OSA aircraft; and the Marines 24. The General Accounting Office found that DOD's operational support fleet ''far exceeded any possible wartime requirement.'' Yet, the Air Force and certain members of Congress believe this to be a high military priority.

Mr. President, I would like my colleagues to close their eyes for a few minutes while I describe the jet that has become such a military priority. I take this directly from Gulfstream's website:

From the 100 percent fresh air control system, to the comfortably maintained 6,000 foot cabin altitude at 51,000 feet, to cabin size—a generous 1,669-cubic-feet and the longest in the industry—the Gulfstream V provides an interior environment unmatched in transoceanic business travel. The jet also offers a substantial outfitting allowance of 6,700 pounds—more than 12 percent greater than any other business aircraft current or planned—which affords owners and operators the freedom to select furnishings and equipment with minimum tradeoffs. Space-age titanium mufflers and vibration isolators eliminate hydraulic system noise. Plentiful insulation in the side panels reduces sound further, and we've even reengineered Gulfstream's trademark expansive, oval windows to lessen noise levels. The total effect is library-like science conducive to a productive trip.

Now I ask my colleagues to open their eyes and face reality. Supporting the Defense Department's misguided spending priorities is not synonymous with supporting the military. I urge my colleagues to look themselves in the mirror and credibly ask themselves if they can support corporate jets for generals while front-line troops muddle by on food stamps. Which is the higher priority?

I cannot vote to increase the defense budget by tens of billions of dollars, including tens of millions for corporate jets, which the budgets for veterans' health care, education, agriculture and other programs are facing deep cuts.

Throwing good money after bad is not tolerated at other Departments and agencies. Why is it tolerated with DOD? Defense Week reported just yesterday that the Navy has lost track of almost 1 billion dollars' worth of ammunition, arms and explosives. Additionally, DOD has yet to pass an audit. A 1998 GAO audit couldn't match more than $22 billion in DOD expenditures with obligations; it could not find over $9 billion in inventory; and it documented millions in overpayments to contractors. GAO concluded that ''no major part of DOD has been able to pass the test of an independent audit.''

Mr. President, we need some accountability in the Defense Department. Voting for the Boxer-Harkin amendment shows that the Senate supports our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I think it would be interesting for the Senator to know that the plane of our commander in Europe, General Clark, who we all see on the news—and we have met with him respectively, and our committee has twice—the C–9A, cannot land at half of the airfields in Europe because of environmental restrictions.

I don't understand why we can't move to make available the process that has been pioneered and developed by American industry and even States and cities. They lease their aircraft. They lease their fleets of cars. It is cost effective. We are giving them the authority to do this. We are not mandating them to do it by the provision of the bill.

But if people want this substitute amendment—the Senator from California would require a study for more than a year—we would be back here again.

But we faced this. People forget. In the current year appropriations bill, we required an assessment of consolidated CINC support aircraft. It was required to be submitted, and it was submitted by March 1. Here it is. It led to this provision. We have had a year. We had the study. They have told us what they need.

I hope the Senate will support the need as outlined, but the needs can be met by exercising the authority. We are not mandating anything in this bill.

I move to table the amendment, 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 to table amendment No. 541. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent due to a death in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Akaka	Craig	Hutchinson
Ashcroft	DeWine	Hutchison
Bennett	Dodd	Inhofe
Bond	Domenici	Inouye
Breaux	Dorgan	Jeffords
Brownback	Enzi	Kennedy
Bryan	Fitzgerald	Kerrey
Bunning	Frist	Kerry
Burns	Gorton	Kyl
Campbell	Gramm	Landrieu
Chafee	Gregg	Leahy
Cleland	Hagel	Lieberman
Cochran	Hatch	Lott
Collins	Helms	Lugar
Coverdell	Hollings	Mack
McConnell	Roberts	Specter
Moynihan	Roth	Stevens
Murkowski	Sessions	Thomas
Murray	Shelby	Thompson
Nickles	Smith (NH)	Thurmond
Reed	Smith (OR)	Voinovich
Reid	Snowe	Warner

NAYS—31

Abraham	Feingold	Mikulski
Allard	Feinstein	Robb
Baucus	Graham	Rockefeller
Bayh	Grams	Santorum
Bingaman	Grassley	Sarbanes
Boxer	Harkin	Schumer
Byrd	Johnson	Torricelli
Conrad	Kohl	Wellstone
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	McCain

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senate what we are going to do here. We have resolved, I tell the Senate, all outstanding issues now. I will offer here a package for myself and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and a series of colloquies, and then we will have final passage on the bill.

All of the remaining amendments—some that we thought would be controversial—have now been resolved. I do thank the Senators for their cooperation. I am waiting for just one item.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 578, the Roberts amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 602 TO AMENDMENT NO. 578

(Purpose: To provide for the suspension of certain sanctions against India and Pakistan)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator BROWNBACK and ask unanimous consent it be considered an amendment to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for Mr. BROWNBACK, proposes an amendment numbered 602 to amendment No. 578.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

TITLE—-SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST INDIA AND PAKISTAN

SEC. _1. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective for the period of five years commencing on the date of enactment of this Act, the sanctions contained in the following provisions of law shall not apply to India and Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under those provisions arising prior to that date:

(1) Section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa).

(2) Section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1) other than subsection (b)(2)(B), (C), or (G).

(3) Section 2(b)(4) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(4)).

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF DUAL-USE ARTICLES AND TECHNOLOGY.—The sanction contained in section 102(b)(2)(G) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)(2)(G)) shall not apply to India or Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of that sanction arising prior to the date of enactment of this Act if imposition of the sanction (but for this paragraph) would deny any license for the export of any dual-use article, or related dual-use technology (including software), listed on the Commerce Control List of the Export Administration Regulations that would not contribute directly to missile development or to a nuclear weapons program. For purposes of this subsection, an article or technology that is not primarily used for missile development or nuclear weapons programs.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS WAIVER OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The restriction on assistance in section 102(b)(2)(B), (C), or (G) of the Arms Export Control Act shall not apply if the President determines, and so certifies to Congress, that the application of the restriction would not be in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) no waiver under paragraph (1) should be invoked for section 102(b)(2)(B) or (C) of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to any party that initiates or supports activities that jeopardize peace and security in Jammu and Kashmir;

(B) the broad application of export controls to nearly 300 Indian and Pakistani entities is inconsistent with the specific national security interest of the United States and that this control list requires refinement.

(C) export controls should be applied only to those Indian and Pakistani entities that make direct and material contributions to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and only to those items that can contribute such programs.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees listing those Indian and Pakistani entities whose activities contribute directly and materially to missile programs or weapons of mass destruction programs.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—A license for the export of a defense article, defense service, or technology is subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review procedures described in that section.

(f) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—Upon the expiration of the initial five-year period of suspension of the sanctions contained in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the President may renew the suspension with respect to India, Pakistan, or both for additional periods of five years each if, not less than 30 days prior to each renewal of suspension, the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

(g) RESTRICTION.—The authority of subsection (a) may not be used to provide assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to economic support fund assistance) except for—

(1) assistance that supports the activities of nongovernmental organizations;

(2) assistance that supports democracy or the establishment of democratic institutions; or

(3) humanitarian assistance.

(h) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act prohibits the imposition of sanctions by the President under any provision of law specified in subsection (a) or (b) by reason of any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under that provision of law arising on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. __2. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 620E(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2375(e)).

(2) The India-Pakistan Relief Act (title IX of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as contained in section 101(a) of Public Law 105–277).

SEC. __3. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. These amendments pertain to the Pakistan issue that has been discussed. They have been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 602) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the underlying amendment itself, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 578), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 547.

AMENDMENT NO. 603 TO AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. STEVENS. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator BIDEN to that amendment and ask unanimous consent it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 603 to amendment No. 547.

The amendment is as follows:

In amendment No. 547, on page 1, line 5, strike ''shall'' and insert ''nay.''

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second-degree amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 603) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the underlying amendment itself, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 547), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator NICKLES' amendment No. 551. The amendment is acceptable to both sides. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 551) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 575, 580, 586, AND 590, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk modifications to four amendments. These are modifications to amendments currently pending on the list. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be modified and that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are modified and agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 575, 580, 586, and 590) were modified and agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 575, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $4,000,000 may be made available for the Advanced Helmet System Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 580, AS MODIFIED

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress recognizes and supports, as being fundamental to the national defense, the ability of the Armed Forces to test weapons and weapon systems thoroughly, and to train members of the Armed Forces in the use of weapons and weapon systems before the forces enter hostile military engagements.

(2) It is the policy of the United States that the Armed Forces at all times exercise the utmost degree of caution in the training with weapons and weapon systems in order to avoid endangering civilian populations and the environment.

(3) In the adherence to these policies, it is essential to the public safety that the Armed Forces not test weapons or weapon systems, or engage in training exercises with live ammunition, in close proximity to civilian populations unless there is no reasonable alternative available.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there should be a thorough investigation of the circumstances that led to the accidental death of a civilian employee of the Navy installation in Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the wounding of four other civilians during a live-ammunition weapons test at Vieques, including a reexamination of the adequacy of the measures that are in place to protect the civilian population during such training;

(2) the Secretary of Defense should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition training on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Congressional Defense Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is not available an alternative training site with no civilian population located in close proximity;

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the training be carried out;

(C) measures to provide the utmost level of safety to the civilian population are to be in place and maintained throughout the training; and

(D) training with ammunition containing radioactive materials that could cause environmental degradation should not be authorized.

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the Secretary of Defense decides to resume live-ammunition weapons training on the Island of Vieques, consult with the Governor on a regular basis regarding the measures being taken from time to time to protect civilians from harm from the training.

AMENDMENT NO. 586, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Army, up to $10,000,000 may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 590, AS MODIFIED

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'' (other than the funds appropriated for space launch facilities), up to $7,300,000 may be available, in addition to other funds appropriated under that heading for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for space launch facilities for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules.

(b) The funds set aside under subsection (a) may not be obligated for any purpose other than the purpose specified in subsection (a).

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 604

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 604.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 106, line 4, strike ''The Communications Act'' and insert ''(a) The Communications Act of 1934''.

On page 107, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(b)(1) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report which shall—

(A) set forth the anticipated schedule (including specific dates) for—

(i) preparing and conducting the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a); and

(ii) depositing the receipts of the competitive bidding process;

(B) set forth each significant milestone in the rulemaking process with respect to the competitive bidding process;

(C) include an explanation of the effect of each requirement in subsection (a) on the schedule for the competitive bidding process and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) when compared with the schedule for the competitive bidding and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) that would otherwise have occurred under section 337(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(b)(2)) if not for the enactment of subsection (a);

(D) set forth for each spectrum auction held by the Federal Communications Commission since 1993 information on—

(i) the time required for each stage of preparation for the auction;

(ii) the date of the commencement and of the completion of the auction;

(iii) the time which elapsed between the date of the completion of the auction and the date of the first deposit of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(iv) the dates of all subsequent deposits of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(E) include an assessment of how the stages of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a), including preparation, commencement and completion, and deposit of receipts, will differ from similar stages in the auctions referred to in subparagraph (D).

(2) Not later than October 5, 2000, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report which shall—

(A) describe the course of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a) through September 30, 2000, including the amount of any receipts from the competitive bidding process deposited in the Treasury as of September 30, 2000; and

(B) if the course of the competitive bidding process has included any deviations from the schedule set forth under paragraph (1)(A), an explanation for such deviations from the schedule.

(3) The Federal Communications Commission may not consult with the Director in the preparation and submittal of the reports required of the Commission by this subsection.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 604) was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 576 AND 585

Mr. STEVENS. I call up amendments Nos. 576 and 585 and ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent amendments Nos. 576 and 585 be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 576 and 585) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there is just one remaining item.

AMENDMENT NO. 574

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator HUTCHISON's amendment No. 574, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 574) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 582

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator KENNEDY's amendment No. 582.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator LOTT's name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 582) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SMITH

of New Hampshire be added as a cosponsor of the Kennedy amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. That is amendment No. 582, which we just adopted.

AMENDMENT NO. 548

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, have I called up amendment No. 548?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has not called up that amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge the adoption of that amendment. It has been cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 548) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 579 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment No. 579 by Mr. DURBIN, has that been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that that be withdrawn.

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

The amendment (No. 579) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 583 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Amendment No. 583 by Mr. LEVIN, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be withdrawn.

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

The amendment (No. 583) was withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator EDWARDS be added as a cosponsor of Biden amendment No. 547.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 587 AND 605 THROUGH 607, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment we had listed as No. 587, which is the remainder of the managers' package.

There is the amendment of Senator COVERDELL, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution; an amendment by myself for Senator BOND concerning procurement; an amendment pertaining to the McGregor Range Withdrawal Act in New Mexico for Senator DOMENICI; an amendment regarding military land withdrawals for myself. I ask that they be considered en bloc as the remainder of the managers' package. They should be separately numbered at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and on behalf of other Senators, proposes amendments en bloc numbered 587 and 605 through 607.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 587

(Purpose: To provide funds for the purchase of four (4) F–15E aircraft)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . In addition to funds appropriated elsewhere in this Act, the amount appropriated in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' is hereby increased by $220,000,000 only to procure four (4) F–15E aircraft; *Provided*, that the amount provided in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for National Missile Defense; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''National Guard and Reserve Equipment'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 on a pro-rata basis; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft procurement, Air Force'' is hereby reduced by $70,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts.

AMENDMENT NO. 605

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the investigation into the June 25, 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers)

At the appropriate place, insert:

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

(1) On June 25, 1996, a bomb detonated not more than 80 feet from the Air Force housing complex known as Khobar Towers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 members of the Air Force, and injuring hundreds more;

(2) An FBI investigation of the bombing, soon to enter its fourth year, has not yet determined who was responsible for the attack; and

(3) The Senate in S. Res. 273 in the 104th Congress condemned this terrorist attack in the strongest terms and urged the United States Government to use all reasonable means available to the Government of the United States to punish the parties responsible for the bombings.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) The United States Government must continue its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing until every terrorist involved is identified, held accountable, and punished;

(2) The FBI, together with the Department of State, should report to Congress no later than December 31, 1999, on the status of its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing; and

(3) Once responsibility for the attack has been established the United States Government must take steps to punish the parties involved.

(The text of the amendments (Nos. 606 and 607) is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 587 and 605 through 607) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, are there any further amendments that need to be disposed of that would qualify?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

STRATEGIC AIRLIFT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to address the question of strategic airlift. In this bill, the Managers have attempted to accelerate and increase funding for new modern programs, specifically the C–17, in lieu of investing scarce resources in older aircraft.

Mr. President, currently C–17s are only assigned to a few bases. We recognize some members are concerned that by focusing on the C–17, those strategic airlift bases without C–17s will suffer. I recognize this legitimate concern and want to ask the Chairman his views on the basing of C–17 aircraft. Would the Senator agree with me that C–17s should be assigned to additional bases to replace aging C–141 and C–5 aircraft?

Mr. STEVENS. I fully agree with the Senator's statement. I believe that C–17s should be used to replace many other strategic aircraft and that the basing strategy of the Air Force needs to take this into account.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Chairman agree that one of the bases that should have top priority for C–17s is Dover Air Force Base in Delaware?

Mr. STEVENS. I strongly agree. Dover is one of the key supply bases for all of our operations in Europe and the Middle East. I think it requires the C–17 as soon as possible. The bill before the Senate adds multi-year authority to purchase more C–17s and I think both our Pacific based forces and forces designated to supply Europe need C–17s to stay modern and ready.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator for his comments. He and I have both expressed support in the past for getting C–17s assigned to the Pacific. I am glad to hear him say that Dover Air Force Base is also a very high priority for C–17s.

I stand ready to work with the Senator on ensuring that our Pacific bases and Dover Air Force Base receive the C–17s as expeditiously as possible.

MARSHALL FOUNDATION AND JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I commend the Chairman for recognizing the importance of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, JROTC, for our nation's high schools through his support of the program in this bill.

I ask if the Chairman is familiar with the George C. Marshall Foundation, which assists in the training of ROTC cadets nationwide.

This foundation has worked for over 20 years to develop the Marshall ROTC award and seminar. The Marshall Foundation now wishes to adapt this leadership program for the JROTC.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my good friend from Hawaii asks an important question. I am familiar with the Marshall Foundation and am interested in the prospect of adapting this program to the Junior ROTC.

The committee would be interested in any support the Department of Defense could provide to this important mission. The Marshall Foundation has helped to promote ethical leadership for ROTC cadets and midshipmen, and we all know that any effort to improve citizenship in the nation's youth should be supported. The Department of Defense should support the Marshall Foundation.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chairman.

JOINT COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Will my friend, the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who also ably serves as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, the Senator from Alaska, yield for a colloquy?

Mr. STEVENS. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe the Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support, JCALS, program is one of the most successful joint defense programs in the information technology area. It was begun in 1991 to automate the acquisition and logistics processes that support the Defense Department's weapon systems—to provide a paperless acquisition and procurement process across all major defense agencies and commands. For example, at the Defense Logistics Agency, the Electronic Folderization Contract used to require 126 tons of paper and 100 days for an acquisition cycle. As a direct result of JCALS, the process is now paperless and the acquisition cycle takes just 15 days. The DOD estimates that JCALS will save $2.3 billion through 2014 just by digitizing documents that now are prepared in paper form.

Is my understanding correct that the FY 2000 Defense Appropriations bill now before the Senate contains the President's budget request of $154.1 million for JCALS, with $121.8 million in the Army Operations and Maintenance account and $32.3 million in the Army Other Procurement account?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman for his assurances. If I may inquire further, is it also my understanding that it is the committee's intent that all of these JCALS funds, including those in the Operations and Maintenance account allocated for defense information infrastructure (DII) purposes, are to be spent exclusively on activities directly related to JCALS?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct that it is our strong intention that all JCALS funds, including those allocated for so-called defense information infrastructure, be used exclusively for direct JCALS work, as provided in the budget request.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman. If he would yield for a final question, am I correct in my understanding that it is the Committee's further intent that all JCALS defense information infrastructure funds provided in the Army Operations & Maintenance account, approximately $20 million, are to be allocated to the JCALS southeast regional technical center currently located in Fairmont, West Virginia? I am advised that to the maximum extent practicable, the contractor plans to use these funds in Hinton, West Virginia, to further develop JCALS capabilities to support weapons systems.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for his clarification and assistance with this most important issue.

IMPROVED MATERIALS POWERTRAIN ARCHITECTURES FOR 21ST CENTURY TRUCKS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my request for $8 million for ''Improved HMMWV Research'' under Army RDT&E, ''Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology'' was incorporated in this year's defense appropriations bill. These funds are intended to initiate a third phase of the design, demonstration and validation of ultralight, steel-based structures and advanced powertrain architectures on high volume truck platforms.

This research effort, competitively selected by the Army in fiscal year 1999 subsequent to the submittal of the President's Budget is titled ''Improved Materials Powertrain Architectures for 21st Century Trucks,'' IMPACT. The full program will cover light/medium military payloads up to five tons, including applications with an open or closed bed configuration currently serviced by several of the Army's HMMWV variants.

Kentucky is a large commercial producer and Army base user of such vehicles, and now, through the University of Louisville's involvement in this effort, it will also play an important research role in their design and testing. The military should realize significant procurement and O&M cost savings as a result.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for correctly clarifying the intent of these funds.

SOUTH CAROLINA-NEW YORK CANCER PREVENTION AND TELEHEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President I would like the attention of my colleagues to point out a fine program worthy of funding in the Defense Appropriations bill. the South Carolina-New York Cancer Prevention and Telehealth Program design will build on the successful prostate cancer prevention, research, and telemedicine protocol which has already been established at the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) through the support of the Department of Defense. The current protocol will be expanded to employ real-time, state-of-the-art telemedicine training and technology to prevent, detect, and diagnose prostate cancer in our men in uniform. The program will utilize expertise of leading medical institutions such as MUSC and Sloan Kettering Memorial Cancer Center to provide our military servicemen with treatment at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Keller Army Community Hospital at the US Military Academy at West Point, and the Beaufort Naval Hospital.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I appreciate the distinguished Senator bringing this program to the Senate's attention. Last Year, I supported including the MUSC telehealth program in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that the continued expansion of this program should be included in this FY 2000 bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. I, too, supported this program, and as you know I am committed to promoting the best health care possible for the men and women who serve our country. Briefly Senator, would you explain who the primary beneficiaries of this program would be?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I appreciate the Chairman's support and would point out that past and present cancer research demonstrate that these telemedicine techniques would be beneficial to military populations. this telehealth program will replicate the success of the South Carolina model in New York. Once validation of this has been accomplished, a much broader application can be made to other types of cancers at military sites throughout the nation.

Mr. STEVENS. I assure my colleague that we will continue to work together as this bill moves forward.

SENSOR NETWORK DEMONSTRATION

Mr. COVERDELL . Mr. President, as the Chairman knows, the threat of chemical and biological warfare agent incidents due to accidents or acts of terrorism is real. I applaud the attention and support provided by the Committee in S. 1122 to research activities on detection and response technologies to these threats. It has come to my attention that interferometric sensors

are one of the most promising technologies for creating relatively inexpensive, small, adaptable, highly sensitive chemical detectors. Such sensors are ideally suited for deployment in domestic emergency warning networks when integrated with technologies such as geographic information systems. Is it the committee's intention that all promising detection technologies, including interferometric sensors, be part of the Department's chemical and biological defense research program?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, the committee directs the Department of Defense to explore all promising detector technologies including interferometric sensors.

Mr. COVERDELL. As the committee noted in its report on S. 1122, the Marine Corps' Chemical Biological Incident Response Force, also known as CBIRF, has an important responsibility in responding to chemical/biological threats and that their activities should be fully integrated with the Department's chemical-biological defense program. It is my understanding that the Marine Corps is prepared to conduct a coordinated civilian and military chemical incident demonstration that would integrate sophisticated sensor technology like that interferometric sensors I just mentioned, into a detection network. My area of the country would make an ideal place for such a demonstration because of the presence of chemical agents and demilitarization facilities in the region and because the region has been the target of terrorist activities in the past. Does the committee agree that such a joint civilian and military exercise is an appropriate part of developing chemical and biological detection technologies and can be funded out of the additional funds made available by the committee under Marine Corps Program Wide Support?

Mr. STEVENS. The committee agrees that such a demonstration by the Marine Corps CBIRF unit is an appropriate activity and should be considered through funding currently available in the bill.

FUEL CELL POWER SYSTEMS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, fuel and power logistics support are mission critical elements for the success of the Air Force ''Air Expeditionary Force Deployment'' concept. The Defense Department has long recognized that fuel cell power systems can reduce the logistics requirements for batteries and liquid fuels, and improve operational effectiveness of various military systems. The Air Force Research Laboratory is the original developer of a polymer membrane material that can improve performance and significantly lower the cost of fuel cells. Unfortunately, reductions in the FY 2000 Air Force Science and Technology budget threaten to terminate Air Force investments in fuel cell development.

I commend my good friend Chairman STEVENS and my good friend and colleague in the Senate, Senator INOUYE, the Ranking Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for the Committee's efforts to adequately fund the Air Force's Science and Technology programs.

I believe that the Air Force should continue to pursue improvements to polymer processing technique and to transition the membrane material for fuel cell production. There are several specific missions and applications that will benefit from fuel cell technology including Air Expeditionary Force Deployment (AEFD), Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE), Rapid Global Mobility (RGM) and battlefield computers that need to operate 16 to 32 times longer than heavy battery powered systems. In addition, future Air Force mission plans are based on space missions at or above the edge of the earth's stratosphere. In these missions fuel cells can play a major role in meeting the energy requirements and improving mission efficiency and effectiveness.

The commercial and military fuel cell market projections are significant—greater than $100 billion per year by the year 2006. Seldom is the opportunity for across the board dual use benefit for the government and commercial sector as vivid as it is for fuel cells. Chairman STEVENS, I'm sure that you will agree that the Air Force should pursue the prototype scale-up, optimization and full-scale demonstration of an advanced solid polymer electrolyte fuel cell that uses PBO based membranes.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank my good friend and colleague, Senator KENNEDY, for his kind remarks regarding this Committee's work on the FY 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill. I recognize the importance of investing in logistics technologies that can extend our military capabilities and can lower the logistics burden for the Air Expeditionary Force Deployment concept.

I agree with my colleague that development of the PBO fuel cell membrane material is important. The membrane is a critical component of the fuel cell, in terms of its performance and cost. Improvements to the fuel cell membrane will result in direct benefits to our military readiness.

Mr. STEVENS. I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his kind remarks about this important Defense spending bill. I share the Senator's concern about levels of investment by the Air Force in Science and Technology. In the past, wise investments in Science and Technology resulted in many of the military systems on which our men and women in the military depend today.

The Air Force Air Expeditionary Force Deployment concept is of great interest to the Committee. Fuel Cells can reduce the logistics burden for many military systems used in peace keeping and humanitarian relief operations, as well as for combat operations. I agree that the Air Force should consider the development of fuel cell membrane materials.

HIGH SECURITY LOCK PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is both important and timely—the security of our nation's secrets and classified material.

Two days ago a bipartisan committee released a report detailing a level of espionage that few Americans expected. American's most vital nuclear information was stolen from the very places that were supposed to be the most secure. I am not here to cast blame but, rather, wish to discuss a program designed to help reduce the risk of this type of travesty.

The Department of Defense has in place a Federal Specification, FF–L–2740, which sets the minimum requirements for locks to be used on any container storing classified materials. The Department, to its credit, is near completion of a program to retro-fit all containers which do not currently meet that specification.

However, there remains an area where our classified materials are vulnerable. As Senator STEVENS knows, contractors also store classified documents throughout the country. Unfortunately, they often do so in containers bearing locks which do not meet Federal Specification FF–L–2740. So, I would ask my colleague, Senator STEVENS, does he believe that our nation's classified documents should be properly stored, whether housed at a governmental agency or contractor's office?

Mr. STEVENS. I respond to the Senator from Kentucky that I absolutely support the safe storage of all classified documents. For this reason, I was happy to accommodate your request to include an additional $10 million dollars for the specific purpose of retrofitting security containers managed by contractors with locks which meet or exceed federal specification FF–L–2740.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator and applaud his leadership on this national security issue.

I also want to make the entire Senate aware of a letter written by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Senators SHELBY and KERREY wrote to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence and pointed out that ''It appears the outdated, non-compliant locks still employed by Defense contractors cannot adequately prevent surreptitious entry.'' They go on to state that ''FF–L–2740 compliant locks are more cost-effective than the devices currently in use.'' Finally, they

close by stating that they ''believe DOD should consider directing the retrofit of Defense contractors' equipment.''

I thank the Senator from Alaska for his support of the $10 million appropriation for this retrofit program. His leadership will help prevent the type of espionage that has dominated the news in recent days.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments.

TROOPS TO TEACHERS PROGRAM

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I have been concerned that the extension and improvement of the Troops-to-Teachers program recently authorized in the FY 2000 National Defense Authorization bill, S. 1059, Section 579, might not be funded this year. As my colleagues are well aware, this program will provide excellent assistance to retired military personnel in obtaining teaching credentials to enable them to make the transition from the military to the classroom in an expedited way. Retired military personnel are highly trained professionals, particularly in scientific and technical fields—an area in which the nation's school systems are in dire need of trained professionals. Troops-to-teachers offer stipends to personnel retiring from the military to obtain teaching credentials or vocational instruction certificates needed for primary through secondary schools. It's program by which everyone wins.

I am advised that the President's budget requests $18 million in funding for FY 2000 under the jurisdiction of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Since the Defense Authorization bill would extend Department of Defense management over the program until it transfers responsibility to the Department of Education at a date not later than October 1, 2001, it is essential that the funding be maintained during this period of transition.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his support for this initiative which I sponsored in this year's Defense Authorization bill. I agree that it is a critical program benefiting our nation's children and schools. While I recognize the Senator from New Mexico's concerns, I believe it is important to remember that the intent of this initiative is to transfer the Troops to Teachers program to the Department of Education. Funding to increase and strengthen this important program is meant to come from the Department of Education, not the Department of Defense. Furthermore, we agreed to delay transfer of this program from DOD to DOE until 2001 in order to ensure a smooth transition which affords minimal disruption to the current program and infrastructure. Our legislation clearly stipulates that expansion of this program through an infusion of funds is meant to be done at the Department of Education with Department of Education funds and not while the program is being transferred from the DOD. I am committed to working with my colleagues, including the Senator from New Mexico who is an original cosponsor of this measure, to ensure that the appropriate funds are allocated for the Department of Education allowing this agency to reform and strengthen the program as authorized by the Senate.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I fully support that view and appreciate his leadership on this important initiative. The Nation's schools and the Nation's students will be the better for it. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DDG–51 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT FUNDING

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to a funding provision of the FY 2000 Defense Authorization Bill that passed after the Appropriations Committee had completed its military budget mark-up last month. Title X of the Authorization Bill allows the Secretary of the Navy to expend no more than $190 million for the advance procurement of components to support the planned construction of DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers in Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003. The Navy, as the Chairman knows, has already written to Congress that it will need $371 million for this purpose by FY 2001, but the obligation of some of this amount next fiscal year may reduce programmatic risks.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair of the Senate Armed Services Seapower Subcommittee for highlighting the DDG–51 advance procurement provision of the FY 2000 Defense Authorization Bill. I am aware of this initiative and strongly support it as a means of providing the Secretary of the Navy with the flexibility to release up to 50% of the DDG–51 advance procurement budget in FY 2000 should he determine that vendor and supplier base stability warrants such expenditures.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his understanding and support of this critical shipbuilding amendment.

PROCUREMENT OF A 20TH LARGE, MEDIUM SPEED ROLL ON/ROLL OFF VESSEL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The Marine Corps has an unfunded requirement for one additional sealift ship to complete their Maritime Prepositioning Force Enhancement [MPF (E)] program. In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Lieutenant General Martin Steele concluded that ''obtaining a 20th Large, Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off vessel (LMSR) and converting an LMSR to meet all MPF (E) requirements is the best solution to our third ship requirement.'' General Steele also notes that the situation in Kosovo has highlighted the need for the additional ship. In light of these comments, I believe that it is essential that Congress fund the procurement of the 20th LMSR.

Mr. INOUYE. The Army has agreed to release an LMSR to the Marine Corps as long as Congress provides funding in the Fiscal Year 2000 defense budget for the construction of a new ship to replace the one given to the Marines. This presents us with an excellent opportunity to fulfill both requirements.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I agree. Funding the vessel will be a win, win, win proposition for the military. The Marine Corps will get their third MPF (E) in a timely manner and at minimal cost, the Army could reach an end state with all eight ships for prepositioning being identical, and the new ship would fill a current sealift shortage of 70,000 square feet of RO/RO in surge sealift. The previous LMSRs have been delivered ahead of schedule and under budget. Funding the 20th ship at this time will save taxpayer dollars in the long run, by keeping the production lien open.

Mr. STEVENS. There is a clear military requirement for the procurement of this ship. Unfortunately, we are working under tight budget restrictions. Should funds become available, I believe that Congress should give careful consideration to procuring a 20th LMSR to meet the Marine Corps' prepositioning needs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their willingness to work with me on this issue.

INNOVATIVE READINESS TRAINING

Mr. DORGAN. I understand that the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill contains $20 million for innovative readiness training. Under this program, the Department of Defense trains Active Duty, Guard and Reserve personnel by providing ''real world'' experience here in the US which is similar to what might be encountered in Overseas Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Programs. Under the Innovative Readiness Program, the Walking Shield American Indian Society has provided such training opportunities on American Indian reservations especially those located in the states of North and South Dakota and Montana. Without the support and cooperation of the Walking Shield American Indian Society, many of the engineering and medical projects conducted by the Department of Defense would not have been possible. This type of civilian-military program has a very positive impact on recruiting and retention and should be continued in FY 2000.

I understand that the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations bill for the Department of Defense notes that the Committee believes that the Department should expand the scope of readiness initiatives

to include Native American groups, when appropriate and compatible with mission requirements. Is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, it is.

Mr. DORGAN. Are you familiar with the work of Project Walking Shield and the Walking Shield American Indian Society which conduct health, housing, road construction and other projects suitable for military training on Indian Reservations?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I am familiar with the work of this excellent group and the benefits it provides not only to the military but to the tribes served by its activities.

Mr. DORGAN. Would you agree that this group provides the kinds of training opportunities envisioned for the Innovative Readiness Program and it should continue its partnership with the Department and its support and cooperation in Fiscal Year 2000?

Mr. STEVENS. This type of partnership is one we are trying to encourage.

Mr. INOUYE. I share my colleague's enthusiasm for this excellent program.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I agree that the Society's work is what we want to encourage in this account.

JROTC

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to engage the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, in a brief colloquy regarding the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program (JROTC).

As Chairman STEVENS may know, the Chicago Public Schools have developed and implemented a very successful JROTC program. Since the program began, it has served over 7,500 cadets from all four branches of the armed services and helped these students achieve better grades, attendance, conduct, and higher graduation rates. The Chicago Public Schools are now in need of expanding the successful JROTC program to an additional 10 high schools, including the Chicago Military Academy at Bronzeville. And, they are attempting to enter partnerships with all of the branches of the armed services in order to better serve interested students.

The Senate bill includes an increase for JROTC of $3.5 million. Is it the understanding of Chairman STEVENS that successful programs like the one in Chicago should be able to work with the Department of Defense and the various branches to receive funding?

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the fine work being done by the Chicago Public Schools in the area of JROTC. It is an example of a program that works. It is my understanding that a number of Chicago high schools would like to include JROTC as part of their curriculum. I believe that the level of funding for JROTC in the Senate bill would give programs like the one in the Chicago Public Schools an opportunity to work with the branches of the armed services in order to expand.

BANKING SERVICES ON DOMESTIC BASES

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the Department of Defense is currently drafting proposed regulations to establish a procedure on how military bases are to solicit and select bids from financial institutions to provide banking services on domestic military bases. The regulations are likely to be issued in June of this year. I understand that the regulations may establish a presumption in favor of bids received from local banks over the bids received from any other bank.

It is important that these new regulations not prevent base commanders from approving a bid from a financial institution that specializes in providing banking services to military personnel, if its bid would provide lower cost and more convenient banking services than a bid submitted by a local bank. There are several financial institutions in this country that have made it their business to provide banking services to our armed forces. Their ability to provide affordable and convenient banking services to our military personnel is evident from the bids they have won to establish branches at bases across the country. The Department of Defense should hold an open and competitive bidding process for the establishment of bank branches on military installations and should not shut out these specialized banks from the process.

I do not suggest that the location of a bank not be a consideration in the selection process. However, it should not be the primary criterion. The cost and convenience of banking services for our military personnel should be the overriding factor in determining the bid that is selected, regardless of whether it is a bid from a local bank or a specialized military bank. I intend to follow this regulation closely as it is developed. If it is not written in a manager that best serves the interests of our military personnel, I may seek a legislative change of this policy.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague from Missouri for bringing this issue to the attention of this body. I agree that it is an issue of concern, and I intend to work with my colleague should a legislative solution be necessary.

BIOENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS RESEARCH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Defense Department needs the capability to assess and prevent both the adverse impacts of its operations and training activities on the environment, as well as the adverse health effects of contaminated environments on its troops and employees. One particular area of interest is in bioenvironmental hazards research, which focuses on the development of biosensors and biomarkers of exposure for human and ecological system.

The Office of Naval Research (ONR) and the Naval Oceanographic Office (NAVOCEANO) are currently expanding existing research capabilities in basic and applied environmental sciences of aquatic systems. The purpose of this research is both to understand the processes of riverine and gulf systems and to understand the impacts of human development on estuaries and harbor systems throughout the world. This work complements other ''brown water'' research initiatives in ONR, particularly the STRATAFORM program which is looking at issues of sea level change, climate variability, and riverine runoff.

The joint technology development of the biosensors can be used in autonomous underwater vehicles, which have direct application in support of NAVOCEANO military surveys in the Littoral Zones and the pre-invasion mission to detect mines and obstacles for clearance/avoidance in the Very Shallow Water (VSW) and Surf Zone (SZ) approaches to the amphibious landing areas.

Specifically, the biosensor's role during military surveys conducted by NAVOCEANO will be to collect the natural ''background'' environmental harmful agents to personnel that work in the waters of the littoral zones. Development of this definitive database will support the intelligence requirements of the SEAL, EOD, and amphibious assault teams. Moreover, biosensors will improve the probability of mission success, endurance and survivability of SEAL swimmers through detection of harmful agents during the initial environmental surveys. This health-risk assessment will involve the prediction and monitoring of waters polluted (either naturally or by intention or both by the opposing forces) with heavy metals, microbial hazards, chemical hazards, environmental chemicals, toxic organisms, and areas of outflow from waste treatment plants prior to the hunt for mines and obstacles.

Congress should encourage the Defense Department and the Navy to pursue research and development of technologies and methods for better measuring and understanding the full range of impacts of biological hazards, including biological warfare, to humans (both military and civilian) and other living organisms. This will improve our ability to develop suitable preparations or responses to such hazards.

I would like to ask my colleague from Alaska, would he be willing to look at this need and, if appropriate, provide additional support for this research effort before we are asked to give final approval to the Defense Appropriations bill later this year?

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the senator from Louisiana for raising this issue. I understand why the Navy has a need to better understand the aquatic environment into which it will send its personnel and equipment. I am willing to look at the need to support additional

research in this area and to recommend an appropriate response if one is indicated.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank my colleague and I look forward to working with him to provide for a strong integrated bioenvironmental hazards research capability for the Navy.

DISTANCE LEARNING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to engage the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, in a brief colloquy regarding distance learning.

As Chairman STEVENS may know, the City Colleges of Chicago Europe has been providing college degree and certificate programs to the U.S. military service members and their families in Europe since 1969. In fact, the City Colleges of Chicago was one of the early pioneers in distance learning. Today, the program offers over 70 courses on the Internet and provides interactive television courses via satellite to U.S. peacekeeping forces stationed in the Sinai Desert, Bosnia, and Hungary.

The Senate bill includes an increase for distance learning of $45 million. Is it the understanding of Chairman STEVENS that successful programs like the City Colleges of Chicago Europe should be able to work with the Department of Defense to receive funding?

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the Center for Opening Learning at the City Colleges of Chicago—Harold Washington College. I believe that the level of funding for distance learning in the Senate bill would give programs like the Center for Opening Learning an opportunity to work with the Department of Defense in order to develop additional courses and enhance new learning technologies that will ultimately help military students stationed overseas.

ELECTRIC DRIVE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to inform the Senate of recent engineering breakthroughs in the area of naval propulsion. In the past few years, industry has been working hard to develop electric drive technology that could be used in a naval vessel. Electric drive would replace the traditional mechanical drive system, that turns the ship's propellers through a system of reduction gears, with a system that uses electricity directly to turn the engines and power the rest of the ship's systems.

Electric drive offers major benefits over mechanical drive. It is more efficient in terms of reduced fuel consumption and requires fewer crew to maintain. It can also generate more power than mechanical systems. Electric drive is also quieter, making it an attractive option for submarines, or any vessel concerned with stealth. Industry analysts believe electric drive could save the Navy $4.3 billion over the life of the new destroyer program, the DD–21, alone.

Last year the appropriations committee included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill asking the Navy to produce a report on the potential for electric drive. The Secretary of the Navy released the study in March, a study that was a powerful endorsement of the electric drive technology. This report points to electric drive as a technology that will no doubt have major implications for the future of naval ship design and engineering. I hope the Navy will continue its research efforts, and make every effort to include this technology in the next generation of destroyers, the DD–21. I also hope the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee will maintain its interest in the program and continue its support.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank Senator KOHL. I agree that the Navy should continue its research efforts into electric drive, and it should strongly consider the benefits it could bring to the DD–21 Class of destroyers. In addition, I am aware that this technology will also provide important benefits to other future Navy ships such as improved stealth for future submarines. By developing a modular, common integrated system, where major system elements can be used on all new Navy ship designs without any design changes, the Navy can also realize the multiple benefits of reduced training and logistics costs, as well as significant production cost savings.

Mr. INOUYE. I concur with the opinions of the chairman and of Senator KOHL. I consider it essential that our Navy be equipped with the most advanced technology in their future ships. Since electric drive not only offers significant operational benefits, but also significant savings, I most strongly urge the Navy to continue its research work and make every effort to ensure that this technology is deployed on DD–21.

Mr. KOHL. As I am sure the chairman and ranking member are aware, much of the research into this technology has been privately funded. General Dynamics and Eaton Corporation, among others, have been leaders in the field of electric drive and their efforts have been crucial to moving the development along. Their investment has presented the Navy and Congress with an excellent opportunity to take advantage of developments financed in the private sector. As the Navy continues to evaluate electric drive and the DD–21 program I hope the committee will be ready to capitalize on that investment.

Mr. INOUYE. I agree that this presents us with an excellent opportunity. The committee will certainly give the Navy consideration should it make an additional request for funding for electric drive research.

Mr. STEVENS. The potential of electric drive is certainly worth exploring, and the committee would be willing to consider a request from the Navy if they believe it is critical to the DD–21 design effort.

Mr. KOHL. I thank both Senators for their support of continuing research and evaluation of electric drive. Senators STEVENS and INOUYE have long been known for their clear vision when it comes to supporting cutting edge military technology, and that reputation is well deserved.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the bill before us today. I would like to sincerely thank Senators STEVENS and INOUYE for their strong leadership on the Defense Subcommittee. I also would like to recognize the hard work and diligence of the staff on this Committee.

Every year this Committee goes through the exercise of trying to allocate sufficient funds for the foremost priorities of providing for our nation's defense. Every year under the current funding constraints the difficulty of this task increases. This year is no exception.

I would like to briefly mention some of the most important aspects of our defense addressed in this spending package.

The bill provides $264.7 billion in new spending authority for the Department of Defense for FY 2000. This is $1.4 billion above the President's request. This recommendation meets the budget authority and outlay limits established in the 302(b) allocation.

In parallel with the Defense Authorization bill, the bill funds almost 1.4 million active duty military personnel. This bill fully funds a 4.8-percent pay raise for FY2000 and includes more than $1.838 billion in supplemental spending for military pay.

This legislation provides approximately $2.1 billion for overseas contingency operations in Southwest Asia and Bosnia. I and many others suspect we'll be forced to pass an additional emergency supplemental for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. As Chairman STEVENS has already indicated, it would be premature to speculate about those possible appropriations at this time.

The bill includes appropriations totaling $92 billion for operation and maintenance (O&M). This is $626.1 million above the Administration's request.

The bill supports the establishment of 17 Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams. And it provides $1.3 billion for combating terrorism. Within the funds for combating terrorism, the bill makes $79.6 million available to provide Army and Air National Guard full-time personnel to facilitate successful achievement of this mission.

I fully support the decision to appropriate $475.5 million for Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction programs.

These are important programs that address one of the most significant proliferation threats we face today. I also would like to voice my strong support for the decision that $25 million be used only to support Russian nuclear submarine dismantlement and disposal activities.

I also sincerely appreciate the Committee's effort to restore some of the funding required for research, development, test, and evaluation. The increase of $2.1 billion to the budget request will help prevent the loss of scientific and technical expertise within our defense infrastructure. Moreover, this will help ensure that the U.S. maintains its technological lead in its defense capabilities.

The Committee also funded several items that will ensure that New Mexico based defense installations and programs remain robust. I would like to briefly highlight some of the items that received funding in the appropriations bill.

Directed energy weapons provide the potential of low cost per kill ratios sought for our missile defense capabilities. In the area of directed energy, $14 million will go for the High Energy Laser Test Facility at White Sands, the Army's premier facility for directed energy programs. There is an additional $15 million for the Tactical High Energy Laser program. This joint program with Israel is very important to proving the concept of using lasers to achieve defenses against short and medium range missiles. After significant cuts and changes to its development plan last year, the Airborne Laser program is fully funded at $309 million.

The Committee added $40 million to the Warfighter Information Network program. Based at Laguna Industries, this program manufactures mobile command and control headquarters for a digital Army.

An additional $7.5 million was appropriated for modernization of testing equipment at White Sands Missile Range. Also, $6 million will be made available for much needed perimeter fencing to prevent further accidents from unexploded ordnances at the range.

$10 million is included for the Scorpius Low Cost Launch program. A significant portion of the research and development for this program is based at Phillips, and testing of the engines and the rocket itself is conducted at New Mexico Tech and White Sands. This is an important program both because of the implications to our national security that arise from exorbitant launch costs and due to potential cost savings to taxpayers by lower costs for getting payloads into orbit for U.S. defense programs.

Several other Phillips based programs also received additional support, including: $5 million for further research and development on radio frequency weapons, $25 million for military spaceplane efforts, $5 million for advanced countermeasures using solid state laser technologies.

At my and other member's request, an additional $10 million of funding will be made available for research and development of new technologies to counter chemical and biological threats. $4 million in support was included for the blast mitigation research of both military and nonmilitary explosives at New Mexico Tech.

Lastly, $10 million in additional funding was added for the Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility (TACCSF) at Kirtland Air Force Base. This will help a great deal in making this facility the world class training facility necessary to maintain combat readiness of our Air Force in the coming years.

I believe this bill demonstrates the balance required to best fund our armed forces under current fiscal constraints. Again, I am pleased by the hard work of my colleagues on this Committee and express, once again, my admiration for the hard work of Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUYE in achieving an appropriate spending package for our military men and women.

ASSEMBLED CHEMICAL WEAPONS ASSESSMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to address the issue of Chemical Weapons Demilitarization. I do so in order to point out that the Department of Defense has consistently ignored Congressional directive and intent.

In 1996, I offered and the Senate accepted an amendment which directed the Army to identify and demonstrate technologies other than baseline incineration which could be utilized in the destruction of America's chemical weapons stockpile. This program, which came to be known as the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment, or ACWA, enjoyed tremendous initial success. Through the involvement of the DoD, the Army, technology providers and citizens advocacy groups—disparate interests, indeed—agreement was reached on how the process should proceed as well as the criteria for success. It is also critical to point out that one area of consensus was that the timely destruction of the stockpiles remained a top priority. Nobody involved in this process advocates unnecessary delay in efforts to comply with the Chemical Weapons Convention 2007 deadline. Certainly, I never viewed my efforts as anything other than a safeguard to ensure that once the destruction of the stockpile located in Kentucky began, only the safest method available was utilized.

Unfortunately, this is where the good news ends.

After rigorous evaluation and discussions, the decision was announced that six separate methods met the technological criteria necessary in order to be tested as alternatives to baseline incineration. These six were the only proposals of the almost 20 originally submitted for consideration which were deemed capable of producing safer methods. Unfortunately the Army and the Department of Defense made the decision to move forward and evaluate only three of the qualified technologies, leaving three untested. Further, this decision was made not on the basis of what was technologically feasible, but solely on the basis on what was cost-efficient. Not in the interests of finding the safest manner available to destroy the weapons, but on satisfying the minimum requirements so that the incineration could continue regardless of the results of the testing.

To help ease this budget difficulty, I offered and the Senate accepted, an amendment to the FY99 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill which gave the Secretary of Defense the Authority to reprogram up to $25 million in order to fully test each of the technologies which met the criteria for selection as potential alternatives to incineration. This provision was included in the final version of the Defense bill, and was eventually signed into law.

Mr. President, despite this clear expression of Congressional intent, the Army, the Department and the Administration have consistently refused to allocate sufficient funds to complete the testing. As a result, the ACWA program is in danger of losing its credibility—the very quality that led to its initial successes. If the testing of the three technologies does not produce a viable alternative to incineration, then the legitimate question will be posed, ''What about the additional proposals which were viewed to have merit as alternatives to incineration?''

Not wishing to answer that question, I worked to encourage the administration to agree that further testing was cost effective and in the best interests of the country. Their responses, which I will submit for the RECORD, professed their strong support for the goals of the ACWA program, but claimed that the budget was simply too tight for the Department to reprogram funds for additional testing.

With all due respect, that contention is simply false. The truth is that the Department of Defense and the Army made a decision years ago that they would eliminate chemical weapons using incineration and have resisted considering other options since that time.

This year's report, Senate Report 105–53, states that ''the Committee is concerned with the lack of oversight afforded the Chemical Demilitarization Program within the executive branch.''

Further the Report states:

In a review of the program's funding, the Committee discovered that funds had systematically been obligated without being expended and in some instances funds were unobligated. Rather than facing a shortfall in funding, the program had over $200,000,000 of Operation and Maintenance funds unexpended at the end of fiscal year 1998. In light of the unobligated and unexpended balances available to the Department, the program growth in the budget request is not justified.

Mr. President, this language is a stinging indictment of the Department's mismanagement of the Chemical Demilitarization program. Further it demonstrates clearly that there is no truth to the assertion that there were not sufficient funds available to allow for the demonstration of all viable alternatives to baseline incineration.

I intend to continue to press the Army to test all six technologies so that the citizens who live near our stockpiles may be assured that only the safest methods available are employed to destroy chemical weapons.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, December 22, 1998.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: This responds to your interest in the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) Program. I regret any misunderstanding we may have had about responding to your concerns on this matter.

As you know, Congress has directed the Department to demonstrate and evaluate at least two alternatives to baseline incineration for the disposal of assembled chemical munitions. The ACWA Program actually identified six technologies, exceeding the original requirement, but was able to fund only three—the three that were ranked as the best value to the U.S. Government. We would like to go further, but the entire amount appropriated for support of ACWA in the Fiscal year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act will be required to complete demonstration testing and conduct a non-government independent evaluation of cost and schedule with regard to implementing an alternative technology.

The Act also provided authority to use up to an additional $25 million of the funds appropriated for the Chemical Demilitarization program in order to complete ACWA demonstrations. This language, however, addressed authority only; no additional funds were appropriated. While we will vigorously press for savings in the Chemical Demilitarization program, at this point, we are unable to exercise reprogramming authority without jeopardizing our ability to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention mandate of April 2007 for destruction of our chemical weapons stockpile. If, however, additional funding becomes available in the coming fiscal year to support the ACWA Program, we plan to expand the scope of demonstration testing beyond the three technologies already programmed.

Successful disposal of the chemical munitions stockpile and compliance with the Chemical Weapons Convention are among our highest national security priorities. The ACWA Program is a critical component of this effort. I want to thank you for your support of this important program. Again, I regret any misunderstanding concerning my response to your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN HAMRE.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 18, 1998.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: This is in reply to your letter to Secretary Cohen regarding the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program. In that letter you asked about the Department's plans for testing of alternative technologies.

As you may be aware, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997 mandated that we identify and demonstrate not less than two alternatives to the baseline incineration process for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions. In selecting three technologies to proceed to final demonstration testing we have exceeded that requirement. We recognize the intent of the Senate as evidenced in Sec. 8143 of the Senate passed FY 1999 DoD Appropriation Bill. If additional funding becomes available in the coming fiscal year to support the ACWA program, we plan to reexamine the scope of demonstration testing.

A similar letter has been sent to your colleagues who joined you in writing to Secretary Cohen regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. LYNN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
Washington DC, March 22, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Thank you for your letter about the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program. The President requested that I respond directly to your letter. The Administration shares your goals of safely disposing of our chemical weapons stockpile and has been supportive of your efforts to find environmentally sound alternatives to the baseline incineration system for destroying these chemical weapons.

As you know, the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1997 created the ACWA program and provided $40 million ''to identify and demonstrate not less than two alternatives to the baseline incineration process for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions.'' In time, the ACWA program identified six alternatives. Due to limitations of funds, only three alternative technologies were selected for further development and testing, one more than required by the 1977 Act. To fund the third alternative, funds had to be reprogrammed from the baseline Chemical Demilitarization program, which supports a safe and effective disposal process in order to fund research into an additional system that may or may not be selected at a future date for implementation.

As you pointed out in your letter, the FY 1999 Defense Appropriations Act provides authority to reprogram up to $25 million from the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense account to fund the demonstration of alternatives to baseline incineration. Unfortunately, the Act also reduced the President's request for the account by $78 million. This reduction will severely challenge the Army's ability to successfully destroy this Nation's chemical stockpile by April 29, 2007, as required by the Chemical Weapons Convention. As a result of the $78 million reduction, to date we have been unable to identify available funds in the Chemical Demilitarization program to reprogram to ACWA for additional demonstration projects.

The Administration's policy is to proceed as quickly as possible with the safe destruction of the Nation's chemical stockpile, while at the same time seeking even safer and more effective methods. The National Academy of Sciences concluded in its 1994 study that the baseline incineration system is a safe and effective disposal process for the stockpile. The Administration will continue to seek even safer methods. We look forward to working with you to that end.

Sincerely,

JACOB J. LEW,
Director.

THE GALLO RESEARCH CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to see language in the Department of Defense Appropriations report which recommends $300 million for medical research and development efforts to be used for life-saving medical projects, including breast cancer and prostate cancer research.

Of the $300 million, the Committee recommends that $50 million is to be made available for peer reviewed medical research grants and activities. Further, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the service of the Surgeons General, establish a process to select medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health. One of the projects listed as having scientific merit and direct relevance to military health is that of alcohol abuse and prevention research.

I believe that alcohol abuse and prevention efforts must be supported by Congress. We have all been witness to broken families, broken lives and lost opportunities attributed to alcoholism. To that end, I would like to share with my colleagues the promising research being conducted to combat alcoholism at the Gallo Center in San Francisco, California.

The mission of the Gallo Center is to identify genes that control brain responses to alcohol and other addicting agents and then develop new drugs to treat addiction. It is the only alcoholism research program in the country that is based with a department of neurology. The Gallo Center is fully equipped for research in cellular, molecular, and behavioral neuroscience and also invertebrate and human genetics.

I join my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, in her request for $11 million from the Medical Research activities budget in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to support alcoholism research at the Gallo Center located at the University of California, San Francisco Medical School. I believe that the important work conducted at the Gallo Center qualifies

under the medical research project directive as recommended by the Committee, and that it should be funded from the $50 million already made available for peer reviewed medical research grants and activities.

The Department of Defense Health Program has appropriately identified alcoholism research as a priority area. I believe that providing $11 million from the Medical Research activities budget in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for the Gallo Research Center at the University of California, San Francisco would prove to be a worthwhile investment in our efforts to learn more about alcoholism, it causes, and what we can do to fight it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, page 95 of the report accompanying S. 1122 contains language that encourages the Army to include Rock Island Arsenal in all aspects of the development, design and production of the Lightweight 155mm Towed Howitzer Program. This directive is problematic for many reasons. If followed, it would undermine industrial competition and conflict with the fair and competitive process that has occurred to date. It would preclude further competition for the 155mm Towed Howitzer and all future towed artillery programs. And the report language would potentially contradict several statutes, including the Army Industrial Facilities Act, the Working Capital Funds Act, and the Arsenal Act.

The contract for this program has already been awarded on a competitive basis. Vickers Shipbuilding and Engineering LTD developed the original design and owns background intellectual property in the current Lightweight 155mm system. Attempting now to direct the work to Rock Island would potentially detract from work done at Picatinny Arsenal in my home state of New Jersey, as well as potentially create all sorts of legal fights. While Rock Island should be encouraged to compete for a subcontract, all future awards should be made on a ''best-value'' basis. Any legislative micromanagement that compromises the competitive bidding process is inconsistent with legal and economic prudence. I urge such ill-advised acquisition guidance to be dropped when the Senate convenes with the House to conference this bill.

MCGREGOR RANGE WITHDRAWAL

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill would renew the withdrawal of the McGregor Range for use by the U.S. Army.

McGregor Range is one of six military parcels withdrawn from public domain in 1986. These parcels comprise nearly 30 percent of the Department of Defense's 25 million acres. The lands will revert to the public domain in 2001 unless Congress passes new legislation.

This amendment is specific to the 608,000 acres utilized by Fort Bliss and does not address any of the other renewals for other military installations.

McGregor Range comprises nearly 700,000 of Fort Bliss's 1.12 million acres. The Fort Bliss garrison is adjacent to El Paso, Texas, but the McGregor Range is located entirely in New Mexico.

Sections of McGregor are used for cattle grazing and other nonmilitary purposes such as hunting and recreation. The Bureau of Land Management manages the cattle-grazing program through close coordination with the Army. These cooperative efforts provide for efficient use of the lands as well as effective stewardship of the natural resources located there.

Recent studies of this issue provides a succinct summary of the most relevant policy issues surrounding the renewal of withdrawal for military purposes. Mr. President, allow me to briefly list the major findings of this study:

Fort Bliss has a critical role as a national center for air defense and McGregor Range is essential for fulfilling that role;

McGregor Range is the only range in the United States capable of training America's air and missile defense forces. Because all CONUS Patriot forces are stationed at Ft. Bliss they depend on McGregor for the training needed to ensure their full readiness prior to deployment.

Successive BRAC rounds have reduced the capability of the DOD to support both current and future training and testing requirements with the available infrastructure. Range complexes such as McGregor and White Sands Missile Range are critical now and will become more critical in the future as weapons systems and doctrine evolve which allow greater standoff distances and mobility in the future. These capabilities are wasted if we fail to train our forces to the maximum extent of their capabilities.

McGregor Range supports the U.S. Air Force in the training activities at Holloman Air Force Base.

The combined space of McGregor Range and White Sands can be leveraged to accommodate the needs of a more modern Army. Currently, the range supports specialized test operations by White Sands Missile Range which require additional safety buffer zones to ensure public safety.

Military training and testing requirements for McGregor Range are foreseen for at least the next 50 years based on weapons systems that are either currently fielded, such as Patriot, or are planned for fielding in the near future. Additionally, emerging doctrine and weapon systems part of the Army-After-Next will require large areas to fully train soldiers in the employment of these weapons systems. If the requirement is known for the next fifty years, then it is unclear why a shorter withdrawal period is reasonable.

The BLM's 1986 Wilderness Study made a ''No Wilderness'' recommendation regarding the Culp Canyon WSA. This recommendation was ''based on the low-quality wilderness value of the WSA and the potential conflicts with associated military use of the area.'' Without this portion of the range, the Army's ability to conduct Patriot and related air and missile defense training will be reduced by approximately one-third.

There is strong regional support for this renewal. 176 public comments expressed support for the Army's preferred alternative. An additional 26 expressed support for one of the other alternatives.

The Army's proposal will continue historic non-military uses of the range which include livestock grazing and hunting for 50 years.

The Army has already met its obligations with respect to performing an Environmental Impact Statement, holding public hearings, and submission of request for renewal to the Administration.

In sum, all of the legal requirements set forth by Congress have been met. Congressional action is now required to ensure that the Army retains its ability to test, simulate, and train for missions at Fort Bliss. Allowing the Army's continued access to these lands is critical to adequate training and readiness now and in the future.

One of the fundamental duties of Congress is the maintenance of the national defense. Nothing is more fundamental than the provision of training ranges, such as McGregor, in maintaining a trained and prepared military.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I do not object to my colleague's amendment to renew the public land withdrawal for the McGregor Range in New Mexico, however, I believe the preferable course of action is to follow the process the Senate agreed to just last month, and allow the Defense and Interior Departments the opportunity to jointly develop a legislative proposal.

The McGregor Range in southern New Mexico was one of several military ranges that was last withdrawn for military purposes in 1986 under Public Law 99–606. The withdrawal period for McGregor and the other ranges is for 15 years, and does not expire until November, 2001.

Last month, language was included in the Committee-reported version of S. 1059, the DOD Authorization bill, that would have extended public land withdrawals at four of the six military installations covered by Public Law 99–606: the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range in Arizona, the McGregor Range in New Mexico, and Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely in Alaska. During the consideration of the bill on the Senate floor, I offered an amendment which

replaced the withdrawal language with a ''sense of the Senate'' statement urging the Administration to submit legislative proposals for these four military withdrawals by July 1. I understand that both the Defense and Interior Departments are currently working on such a legislative proposal and that we still anticipate being able to incorporate legislative language in the conference report for the DOD Authorization bill.

With respect to the proposed amendment for the McGregor Range, I want to be clear that I recognize the critical role the range serves for our national defense training needs and I support their continued use for these purposes. In my opinion, however, I think it makes much more sense, and will result in less controversy in the long run, if we allow the normal process for the renewal of the public land withdrawals to be completed. In short, this means allowing the Interior Department the opportunity to review the Army's environmental impact statement, which I understand has only just been completed, and that following that review, the Administration has the opportunity to submit its legislative proposal for our consideration.

The McGregor withdrawal encompasses approximately 608,000 acres of land in New Mexico. The renewal of the withdrawal and future uses of the range are of interest not only to the Army, but also to area residents and other public land users. Although the amendment is not clear, I am concerned that it materially changes some of the withdrawal terms from the 1986 Act.

For example, the 1986 Act authorized a withdrawal period of 15 years. This amendment provides for a 50-year withdrawal. I understand that the military desires a longer withdrawal period than the current 15 years, and I am not opposed to considering a longer term. But meaningful periodic reviews and environmental analyses serve an important purpose. They provide local communities with an opportunity to raise issues about the way these lands are managed, and they allow us to consider new land management issues which may not have been present when the original withdrawals were made. I think it is a mistake to significantly change this policy without at least the opportunity for public hearings.

Another aspect of the amendment that seems to be a significant departure from past management practices is a requirement that the Secretary of the Army manage the withdrawn lands. Under current law, the lands are managed by the Bureau of Land Management for a variety of multiple use purposes, subject to the limitations of the military uses. For example, the 1986 Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to manage the lands in a manner permitting the continuation of grazing, the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, the control of predators, recreation, and the suppression of brush fires.

This amendment now provides for management by the Army, under the terms of a new agreement to be developed between the Army and the Interior Department, which is to provide for the proper management and protection of natural and cultural resources. It may very well be that such an agreement will adequately provide for other non-military uses and protect sensitive natural and cultural resources. However, there is no requirement that the lands be managed under existing law, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The amendment also appears to leave very important land management questions unanswered. For example, the BLM currently manages the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area within the McGregor Range, as well as an ''Area of Critical Environmental Concern.'' Under this amendment, is the Army required to manage those areas to the same degree of protection as required of the Secretary of the Interior? Again, at the very least, I think it is important that all interested parties should be heard on these issues before we decide how to proceed.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude by again urging the Administration to expeditiously complete its legislative proposal by the end of this month. Although I would prefer to hear the Administration's proposal, I am committed to seeing that the McGregor range renewal is enacted this year. If, however, a timely proposal is submitted by the Administration, I hope that we will be able to include appropriate legislative language to renew the withdrawal for McGregor and the other affected ranges as part of the conference report for the DOD Authorization bill.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the FY 2000 appropriations bill. This legislation demonstrates a strong commitment to America's defense and to our ability to meet future military challenges. I especially thank and acknowledge the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, Senator INOUYE, for their work and support of this legislation.

I am particularly pleased that the committee included $1 million for exciting new technology designed to make landmine detection safer and more effective. This technology, known as nonlinear technique for landmine detection, has been developed by engineers at the Davidson Laboratory of the Stevens Institute in my home State of New Jersey. This new method for detection of mines and other buried man-made objects has been devised in such a way as to differentiate between rocks, other solids and actual landmines through acoustics. This technology will increase our ability to meet our international obligations and dramatically improve the safety and security of our armed forces.

I also express my support for the committee's inclusion of an additional $121 million for the production of 11 new Black Hawk helicopters. A coalition of eight companies in my state manufacture critical components for the Black Hawk, which is the Army's premier tactical transport helicopter. First produced in 1977, it is used for combat assault, combat re-supply, battlefield command and control, electronic warfare and medical evacuation. Currently, the Black Hawk is providing critical support functions for our armed services in Kosovo. This funding will ensure that our military has the ability to continue its current operations and sustain readiness for future dangers.

I am also extremely pleased that this legislation represents a significant increase in our commitment to the Defense Health Program. The inclusion of $175 million for the breast cancer program, and the $75 million for the prostate cancer research programs, has special significance for the constituents I represent. New Jersey's breast cancer incidence rate is among the highest in the Nation; and, more than 1,400 of the 6,900 New Jersey men diagnosed with prostate cancer die each year. I am confident that these funding initiatives will bring us much closer to finding answers for the men and women of New Jersey and nationwide, who suffer from these devastating diseases.

Additionally, the pay raise of almost 5 percent for all members of the military included in this bill deals with serious concerns I have had regarding quality of life and morale of our soldiers. By addressing the inequities between military pay and civilian wages, this pay raise will go a long way toward reaching our goals of retaining highly trained personnel and assist in our ability to achieve recruiting goals.

Finally, while I am supportive of these important components of this legislation, I am extremely concerned with the committee's recommendation that the Army and the Marine Corps develop a plan to include the Rock Island Arsenal in all aspects of howitzer development, design, and production for the Lightweight 155mm.

Currently, critical research and development functions for the howitzer take place under the U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. The howitzer, as well as other important military systems, require sophisticated software which may only

be fielded by Picatinny Arsenal. If the committee's proposal is implemented, I fear that Rock Island Arsenal will ultimately assume important research and development responsibilities for the howitzer for which they have never before played a role and may be unqualified to preform. I encourage the committee to strongly consider these concerns which have similarly been expressed by the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I again thank Chairman STEVENS, Ranking Member BYRD, and Ranking Member INOUYE for their commitment and attention to these important issues.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Mr. President, it is almost painful to witness the way in which this Senate is abdicating its responsibility to scrutinize the Department of Defense. During debate on the fiscal year 2000 DoD authorization bill, we had exactly two amendments that called a multi-billion dollars weapons system into question. On this appropriations bill, we had exactly two amendments worthy of extensive debate. Two amendments, Mr. President. Here we have a defense policy that perpetuates a Cold War mentality into the 21st century, and the Senate has no questions.

Mr. President, on the heels of an authorization bill that exemplifies the Pentagon's utter failure to adapt its priorities to the post-Cold War era, the American taxpayer is left holding the bag paying for the mess. There are a number of theories that attempt to explain the difficulties faced by the armed services. There is a dearth of thoughtful solutions. The general consensus is that if we pour enough money into the Defense Department, the problems will go away. Unfortunately, effective problem-solving doesn't work that way.

The DoD has a weapons modernization strategy that makes it impossible to buy enough new weapons to replace all the old weapons on a timely basis, even though forces are much smaller than they were during the Cold War and modernization budgets are projected to return to Cold War levels. Consequently, the ratio of old weapons to new weapons in our active inventories will grow to unprecedented levels over the next decade.

Subsequently, that modernization strategy is driving up the operating budgets needed to maintain adequate readiness, even though the size of our forces is now smaller than it was during the Cold War. Each new generation of high complexity weapons costs much more to operate than its predecessor, and the low rate of replacement forces the longer retention and use of older weapons. Thus, as weapons get older, they become more expensive to operate, maintain, and supply.

Couple this with an accounting system that has failed each and every GAO audit since enactment of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, and you have a poorly managed, misguided strategy inviting disaster.

Instead of thoughtfully addressing these shortcomings, Mr. President, we proceed to spend the American taxpayers' money as we have in the past. No change. We continue to promote bigger and more expensive weapons systems at the expense of our men and women in uniform. No matter how much money we throw at this problem, we won't find a solution if we stay on this track.

For the past year, Mr. President, we've heard the call to address our military's readiness crisis from virtually all quarters. We were told that foremost among the readiness shortfalls were operations and maintenance as well as pay and allowances accounts.

Just last year, there was a virtual consensus that the armed services were facing a readiness crisis. Last September, the Joint Chiefs testified that there was a dangerous readiness shortfall. General Henry Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, claimed that ''without relief, we will see a continuation of the downward trends in readiness . . . and shortfalls in critical skills.'' Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer stated that the military faces a ''hollow force'' without increased readiness spending. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson asserted that the Navy has a $6 billion readiness deficit. So it went for all the services.

To address the readiness shortfall, Mr. President, the Congress passed an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The bill was well-intentioned in its support for the efforts of our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, something happened on the way to the front lines. The bill spent close to $9 billion, but just $1 billion of it went to address the readiness shortfall.

We added $1 billion for ballistic missile defense. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization still hasn't spent all that money, yet we've added another $3.5 billion for the BMDO in this bill. Last year's supplemental also added billions to what has become an expected emergency, that being our operations in Bosnia. That other unexpected emergency, the year 2000, received a billion dollars. And so it went. What happened to readiness?

One provision in this bill casts a pall over the readiness needs of our service members and highlights, in microcosm, the Defense Department's misguided priorities. This appropriations bill will spend upwards of $40 million in the next fiscal year, and perhaps as much as half a billion dollars over the next ten years on luxury jets for four-star generals. Am I missing something or is this absurd? We actually have more than 11,000 troops that qualify for food stamps and DoD can justify spending tens of millions of dollars next year for luxury jets. How can this be?

Mr. President, one concern goes to the heart of the entire debate on our national defense. The underlying question is this: Why should the Pentagon receive billions dollars more in funding when it has failed utterly to manage its budget? Throwing good money after bad isn't tolerated at other departments and agencies. Why is it tolerated with DoD?

Defense Week reported just yesterday that the Navy has lost track of almost $1 billion worth of ammunition, arms and explosives. Additionally, DoD has yet to pass an audit. A 1998 GAO audit couldn't match more than $22 billion in DoD expenditures with obligations; it could not find over $9 billion in inventory; and it documented millions in overpayments to contractors. GAO concluded that ''no major part of DoD has been able to pass the test of an independent audit.''

Mr. President, this bill also has some painful implications for other federal programs. Essentially, we are spending tax dollars on a wasteful and misguided defense strategy while domestic programs face steep spending cuts in the upcoming fiscal year.

The bill exceeds the Pentagon's request by $1.4 billion. It spends $1.4 billion more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe is sufficient to meet our national defense needs. And that additional money is coming out of vital domestic programs that were already facing spending cuts.

Mr. President, I cannot vote to increase the defense budget by tens of billions of dollars, including tens of millions for corporate jets, while the budgets for veterans health care, education, agriculture and other programs are facing deep cuts. Supporting the Defense Department's misguided spending priorities is not synonymous with supporting the military.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I strongly support S. 1122, the Defense appropriations bill for FY 2000. As scored with adjustments, the pending bill provides $264.9 billion in total budget authority and $176.9 billion in new outlays for the Department of Defense and related activities. When adjusted for outlays from prior years and other actions, the bill totals $263.9 billion in BA and $254.6 billion in outlays.

There are some major elements to this bill that are important for the Senate for review.

The bill is consistent with the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement and the discretionary spending cap. In fact, in both budget authority and outlays the bill is below the amount that the Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2000 would contemplate for the Defense Subcommittee's allocation. This is in recognition of the fact

that readiness items originally planned for fiscal year 2000 were accelerated into fiscal year 1999 in the 1999 Emergency Kosovo Supplemental, which the President has signed into law.

As a result, for budget authority, this bill is $3.1 billion below the allocation originally contemplated for it; for outlays it is $2.2 billion below. Because of this situation, the allocation approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for defense has been reduced and held for subsequent reallocation.

In addition, this year the defense budget is once again confronted with a serious mismatch between the DOD/OMB and the CBO estimates of the outlays needed to execute the programs in the budget request. CBO's estimate of outlays was $10.5 billion higher than OMB and DOD's estimate.

Because the President's proposed budget was over the discretionary cap by such a larch amount, compensating for the OMB and DOD undercount of outlays would require very large reductions in manpower, procurement, or readiness, or all three. Cuts like that are simply not acceptable, especially in view of the conflict in the Balkans. To enable this bill to be considered on a basis commensurate with the President's request, an outlay adjustment of that size is included in the scoring of this bill.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has assured me that this action reduces the 2000 outlays shortage to manageable dimensions and avoids the negative effect on readiness or modernization that would otherwise be necessary.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge its adoption. I want to compliment the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on his very skillful handling of this important legislation and for his statesmanlike approach to some serious and troubling issues in this year's defense budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Senate Budget Committee table displaying the budget impact of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1122, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000 SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618
1999 level:				
Budget authority	250,330	.....	197	250,527
Outlays	248,310	.....	197	248,507
President's request:				
Budget authority	264,896	.....	209	265,105
Outlays	258,610	.....	209	258,819
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
1999 level:				
Budget authority	13,392	.....	12	13,404
Outlays	6,099	.....	12	6,111
President's request:				
Budget authority	(1,174)	.....	.....	(1,174)
Outlays	(4,201)	.....	.....	(4,201)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, the Department of Defense appropriations bill will pass this chamber with my support. It is no small feat that a bill encompassing the size and gravity such as our national security can be addressed and passed through the U.S. Senate within the span of two days, with few amendments and little rancorous debate. The lion's share of the credit for this accomplishment goes to the managers of the bill, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and the Ranking Member, Senator INOUYE. Through their efforts, they have again done the work which is the first priority of our government: the defense of American independence, lives, and security around the world.

When programs have been consistently successful, it is easy to forget that national security and national defense are not a given in the political equation. But, national security doesn't just ''happen.'' We achieve our national security and defense goals because of the men and women honorably serving in our nation's Armed Forces. That security and defense is also achieved because Congress passes laws which authorize Defense programs and appropriate the funds to pay for them. Our contribution to the debate on these bills and our vote on these bills is an essential contribution to our nation's defense. It is our role in government's most solemn responsibility.

Given the importance of this responsibility, then, I am encouraged that in this bill as well as in the Defense Authorization, the Senate has responded to the increased strain on our military caused by today's heightened operation tempo. Kosovo adds another requirement to a long list of regions in which U.S. deployment or U.S. commitment is stretching our military forces and supporting intelligence resources to their limit. I have often argued on this floor for allocating our defense and intelligence resources on the basis of threat priorities, and applying the greatest effort to the most dangerous threat. In the same vein, we should avoid overcommitment to places or situations which do not present a direct threat to American independence, lives, or livelihoods. For example, I think it is a mistake to tie up a significant percentage of our Army and Marine combat power in Yugoslav peacekeeping operations long term, and I hope our European allies will take our places there before very long. But wherever those forces are, they must be ready and fully manned, like the air elements of the Air Force, Navy, and Marines who performed so brilliantly over Yugoslavia these last seven weeks. The Defense Appropriations bill supports them.

I would now like to take a few minutes to highlight some of the vitally important work that is being accomplished within this appropriations bill. These are provisions which illustrate that we are on the right track in providing for our military and for providing security for people back home in Nebraska, across the United States, and indeed, throughout the world.

The backbone of the United States Armed Forces is the men and women who choose to serve their country in our military. From the lowest grade enlisted soldier to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I salute those who serve out of love for their country. Earlier this year, I was proud to support S. 4, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines Bill of Rights Act of 1999, which began to address the problems of pay levels, recruitment, and retention facing our military today. S. 4 was a good beginning, most markedly by increasing base pay by 4.8 percent. The appropriations bill is consistent with that 4.8 percent pay increase outlined in S. 4, and I am pleased to have supported this provision which will directly and immediately better the lives of the personnel of our Armed Forces.

Another aspect of this appropriations bill which I would like to mention regards an important provision relating to nuclear weapons. During consideration of the Department of Defense Authorization bill for fiscal year 2000, I authored an amendment which would have lifted the restriction on strategic nuclear weapons levels, allowing the U.S. to lower the number of warheads below the START I level. It is my belief that my amendment would not only have increased U.S. security, but would have freed up billions of dollars for other high priority items. The Congressional Budget Office recently conducted a study in which it found we could save between $12.7 billion and $20.9 billion over the next ten years by reducing U.S. nuclear delivery systems within the overall limits of START II.

While I would like to thank the 43 of my colleagues who supported my amendment, it unfortunately did not pass. I do not want to return to that debate at this time. However, there is a related program which I have previously supported which also deals with national security and Russian nuclear weapons—the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction program, otherwise known as Nunn-Lugar. The

Nunn-Lugar program provides assistance to states of the former Soviet Union for safeguarding nuclear materials, dismantling missiles and other weapons, and other demilitarization measures. The DoD Appropriations bill funds Nunn-Lugar in the amount of $476 million. Additionally, this bill allocates $25 million of these funds to support the Russian nuclear submarine dismantlement and disposal activities started in FY 1998. This is an important program that in a very concrete and discernable way, increases our security, and I am happy to have supported it.

Along with programs of national concern, there are a number of provisions in this bill that directly allow Nebraska and Nebraskans to continue their vital work in safeguarding U.S. national security.

Offutt Air Force Base, located in Bellevue, Nebraska, is responsible for a number of missions which are particularly noteworthy. Offutt, with over 10,000 military and civilian personnel, is home to the United States Strategic Command, the joint command charged with deterring nuclear attacks on our country. There are many threats out there, but only one of them, Russian nuclear weapons, is capable of ending our national life. STRATCOM's mission may not be in the news that often, but it the most essential of all defense missions, and it is commanded from Nebraska.

Offutt Air Force Base also hosts the U.S. Air Force's premiere reconnaissance and command-and-control unit, the 55th Wing, the largest wing within the Air Force's Air Combat Command. The Fighting 55th's aircraft provide global situational awareness to military leaders and government officials. It is by now commonplace to say that we live in the Information Age. Information has become a precious commodity which often can mean the difference between success and defeat. The missions that Offutt specializes in focus on gathering this kind of critical information. In a variety of ways, Offutt's missions keep us more informed, more aware, and more safe. Here are some specifics on the various programs.

The 55th's workhorse aircraft is the RC–135, also known as Rivet Joint. The RC–135 mission conducts electronic reconnaissance, providing direct, near real-time information and electronic warfare support to theater commanders and combat forces monitoring. Rivet Joint has played an important role in a number of recent military missions, including Kosovo, Bosnia, and Iraq. Information gathered by the RC–135 is made available to theater commanders, the Department of Defense and National Command Authorities. Data is processed, analyzed and stored by Air Combat Command, the Air Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. I am pleased that the bill passed yesterday appropriates $220.4 million for the refurbishing and upgrading of these important aircraft. Reengining these aircraft is a particularly important improvement.

The WC–135 fulfills an air sampling mission in support of the Air Force Technical Applications Center at Patrick AFB, Florida, by verifying compliance with the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It gathers information on nuclear tests and conducts baseline air sampling. By collecting particles in the air during flight, the WC–135 is able to detect if and when nuclear tests are conducted or if a nuclear bomb is detonated, even from thousands of miles away. Considering the nuclear weapons testing last year of both India and Pakistan, it is clear that the WC–135 has not outlived its usefulness. The WC–135 is the only aircraft throughout the U.S. Air Force conducting this vital mission, and we in Nebraska are fortunate to have it based at home at Offutt Air Force Base.

The OC–135, or Open Skies, is tasked to complete photo reconnaissance flyovers. This mission supports the Defense Threat Reduction Agency by conducting observation flights in accord with the Open Skies Treaty. This treaty will allow the OC–135 to fly over Russian air space to monitor weapons reductions treaties. Although the Open Skies Treaty has not yet been ratified by all parties, the OC–135 has not been dormant. While the Open Skies Treaty awaits ratification, the OC–135 is heavily involved in additional photo reconnaissance projects, including missions such as weather observations of Hurricane Mitch. The Open Skies mission is fully funded through fiscal year 2004.

Additionally, E–4B aircraft also stationed at Offutt provide transport and command and control for the President, the Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State. Much more than simply a transport aircraft, the E–4B allows senior officials complete access to critical information and communications in a secure fashion, keeping the President and others ''in the loop,'' even while in mid-flight.

Along with Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska continues to make important contributions to our national security through components of the National Guard and the Reserves. Most recently, these components have played important roles in Kosovo alongside their active component counterparts.

The 155th Wing of the Nebraska Air National Guard has been very active during the Kosovo mission, flying KC–135s—fuel tanker planes—above and around Kosovo. These KC–135s perform the remarkable task of mid-air refueling for a variety of aircraft, including the B–52 Stratofortress and the E6. Indeed, over the last several months, the Nebraska unit led the KC–135 refueling effort, involving hundreds of aircraft, and also was the last volunteer unit engaged in the region before the reserve call-up was instituted. This has all been done, even though the 155th Wing is the smallest of all the Air Guard wings across the country. I applaud their efforts and their successes.

As well, the Nebraska Army National Guard is currently serving in a nine-month deployment in Bosnia as part of the NATO peace-keeping forces. The 24th Medical Company is working alongside Guard units from across the country to transport patients from the field to hospitals. At a time when a robust economy and opportunities in the private sector can pull people away from public service, I salute these men and women who continue to make sacrifices so that we may be safe.

The examples I have given here of the hard work being done by our Armed Forces are not the exception, but the rule. In a time of tight budgets and increased missions, I am proud to say that our Armed Forces are second to none around the globe. Even when we continue to ask more of our military men and women, they always rise to the challenge. We must never forget the risks they take for our sake and the freedoms they forego, and we must provide them the best support, conditions, equipment, and training possible in return. I am proud to have supported passage of the defense appropriations bill yesterday, and I hope and expect that we will continue the strong support of those who are willing to sacrifice all for the cause of your freedom and mine, the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I commend the able managers of this bill, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUYE, for producing a balanced and comprehensive bill that addresses some of the most pressing needs of the U.S. military.

Together with the emergency supplemental spending bill that Congress sent to the President last month, and the Defense authorization bill that the Senate passed prior to Memorial Day, this Defense appropriations bill marks a major commitment to our men and women in uniform by funding a wide array of vital defense programs. In acting quickly and decisively on these three bills, the Senate has sent a strong message of support to the military, particularly to those forces currently engaged in the air war over Yugoslavia. That support is richly deserved. Once again, America's military forces have demonstrated their superior skills and leadership in the Balkan conflict. We are indebted to them for their service and dedication to their country.

This appropriations bill represents a strong effort on the part of the managers to balance the very real needs of the Defense Department against the

pressing needs of other domestic programs in the budget. This is a tough year for the appropriators. We are working under very tight budget caps to meet a whole host of escalating infrastructure needs—both physical and human—in this nation. Senator STEVENS was able to trim slightly more than $3 billion from defense spending to allocate to other programs without damaging the integrity of this bill. Even so, it will be difficult to pass all 13 appropriations bills for Fiscal Year 2000 within the constraints of the current budget caps. I do not know what the resolution to this problem will be, but I commend Senator STEVENS for the steps he has taken so far, and I look forward to working with him on the remaining appropriations bills.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, inadvertently, at my request, the Senate adopted the Domenici amendment twice. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to vitiate the adoption of amendment No. 604. It is a duplicate of amendment No. 577.

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

Mr. STEVENS. The bill is ready to be advanced to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the third time.

The bill (S. 1122) was read the third time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I once again thank all Members of the Senate for their cooperation with us in handling this very controversial bill. I thank my constant companion and good friend, the cochairman of our Defense Subcommittee. I yield to him for any comment he might might make before I ask for the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I think you have once again established a new record.

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is absent due to a death in the family.

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—4

Boxer	Kohl
Feingold	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	McCain

The bill (S. 1122), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the bill managers. The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii always do a magnificent job. This is not a world record for them, but it certainly is a very fine accomplishment. I am very pleased that we have passed this Department of Defense appropriations bill in such good order. I congratulate the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. STEVENS. Once again, I thank all Members of the Senate and staff for handling this defense appropriations bill. There is a war going on. We thought it essential we act as expeditiously as possible. We thought it was necessary for us to defend the Senate's position to the fullest extent possible. That unanimous consent request is already in place.

Parliamentary inquiry: Is there anything else I need to do in order to handle it according to the prior agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 96

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled to occur with respect to S. 96, the Y2K liability bill, on Wednesday, be vitiated, and following the conclusion of the defense appropriations bill the Senate resume S. 96. I further ask that following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, all pending floor amendments and motions be withdrawn, and Senator MCCAIN be immediately recognized to modify the pending committee substitute with the text of S. 1138 and all remaining amendments in order to S. 96 be relevant to the Y2K issue.

Finally, I ask consent that there be 12 first-degree amendments in order for each side of the aisle, with relevant second-degree amendments, and one additional first-degree amendment in order for each leader under the same terms as outlined above.

This has been discussed with the Democratic leader and cleared on both sides of the aisle. I thank the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, for his help on this very important issue.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following list be printed in the RECORD with respect to the Y2K agreement and first-degree amendments on the Democratic side:

Mr. Hollings, 3 amendments;
Mr. Kerry (MA), 1 amendment;
Mrs. Boxer, 1 amendment;
Mrs. Feinstein, 1 amendment;
Mr. Feingold, 1 amendment;
Mr. Graham, 1 amendment;
Mr. Leahy, 1 amendment;
Mr. Dodd, 1 amendment;
Mr. Edwards, 2 amendments;
Mr. Daschle, 1 amendment.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators being permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL JEFF SEVERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the professional dedication, vision, and public service of Lieutenant Colonel Jeff Severs who is leaving the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office for assignment as the program manager for the Wind Corrected Munitions Dispenser Program at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. It is a privilege for me to recognize the many outstanding achievements he has provided for the Senate, the Air Force, and our great Nation.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs has served our country with distinction for nearly 14 years. After graduating from the University of Georgia in 1985, he embarked on his Air Force Career with a training assignment at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. He subsequently completed tours of duty at McClellan Air Force Base, California; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; Los Angeles Air Force Base, California; and back again to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In each of his Air Force assignments, Lieutenant Colonel Severs' performance has been outstanding.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs began his tour on Capitol Hill as a legislative fellow assigned to the office of my esteemed colleague from Oklahoma, Senator JIM INHOFE. During this assignment, he worked on the fiscal year 1998 Defense authorization bill. After his assignment with Senator INHOFE, Lieutenant Colonel Severs was reassigned to the Air Force Office of Legislative Liaison in the Pentagon.

Initially, he was responsible for acquisition and logistics issues and was responsible for preparing the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force for posture testimony. He was then selected to be the Executive Officer to the Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison followed shortly thereafter by his reassignment as Deputy Chief of the Air Force Senate Liaison Office.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs has earned the respect and trust of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His professional abilities and expertise enabled him to foster excellent working relationships that have served the Air Force and the Senate exceptionally well. As a liaison officer in the Senate, Lieutenant Colonel Severs has provided members and staff with informative and timely support regarding Air Force plans, programs, and constituent casework. His efforts have contributed greatly to maintaining the best trained, best equipped, and best prepared Air Force in the world.

Mr. President, Jeff Severs, his wife, Gay, and children, Hugh and Brooke, have made many sacrifices during his 14-year Air Force career. He continues to serve with a dedication and enthusiasm seen only in our Nation's best and brightest. He is a great credit to the Air Force and the country, and his efforts on behalf of members and staff of the Senate will be greatly missed. As he now departs for new challenges at Eglin Air Force Base, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize his service to the Senate and wish him well in his new assignment.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, June 7, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,606,738,885,838.87 (Five trillion, six hundred six billion, seven hundred thirty-eight million, eight hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred thirty-eight dollars and eighty-seven cents).

Five years ago, June 7, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,606,572,000,000 (Four trillion, six hundred six billion, five hundred seventy-two million).

Ten years ago, June 7, 1989, the federal debt stood at $2,795,983,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred ninety-five billion, nine hundred eighty-three million).

Fifteen years ago, June 7, 1984, the federal debt stood at $1,519,266,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred nineteen billion, two hundred sixty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, June 7, 1974, the federal debt stood at $471,794,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-one billion, seven hundred ninety-four million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,134,944,885,838.87 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, nine hundred forty-four million, eight hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred thirty-eight dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

S. 744

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to speak briefly on a bill reported out of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on May 19, 1999. S. 744 provides for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 744 is to provide Alaska's federal land grant college, the University of Alaska, with a federal land grant of at least 250,000 acres. S. 744 would also transfer to the federal government 29 inholdings currently owned by the University within conservation system units in Alaska.

When this bill was passed out of Committee it was done so with an amendment that clarified the lands the University was to relinquish under Section 3 of the bill. Those lands are listed in a document entitled ''The University of Alaska's Inholding and Reconveyance Document'' and dated May 17, 1999.

I ask unanimous consent a copy of this document be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA'S INHOLDING RECONVEYANCE DOCUMENT, MAY 17, 1999

Region	Area	UA ID Number	Booked value	Acres	Federal land type
South Central	Alaska Peninsula	AP.IH.001	$15,000	8	AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge.
South Central	Alaska Peninsula	AP.UL.001	36,000	360	AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge.
South Central	Alaska Peninsula	AP.UL.002	16,000	8	AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge.
South Central	Alaska Peninsula	AP.WB.001	373,200	622	AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge.
South Central	Alaska Peninsula	AP.WB.002	5,600	56	AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge.
South Central	Nuka Island	HM.NK.001	76,500	23	Kenai Fjords National Park.
South Central	Nuka Island	HM.NK.002	150,000	24	Kenai Fjords National Park.
Southeast	Brady Glacier	JU.BG.0001	15,000,000	400	Glacier Bay National Park.
South Central	Jack Bay	GU.JB.0001	600,000	942	Chugach National Forest.
Southeast	Cape Bingham	JU.CB.0001	1,650,000	835	Tongass National Forest.
South Central	Copper Basin	CB.CC.001	36,400	108	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Blackburn Subd	WR.BB.001	25,000	5	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Blackburn Subd	WR.BB.002	85,000	17	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Blackburn Subd	WR.BB.003	10,000	2	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Blackburn Subd	WR.BB.004	170,000	34	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy Creek Subdivison	WR.MC.001–094	2,015,775	867	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.003	614,466	1,058	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.004	192,000	320	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.005	1,344,000	2,240	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.006	384,000	640	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.007	240,000	400	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.008	223,200	372	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	McCarthy	WR.MY.009	240,000	400	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Strelna	WR.SN.001	240,000	400	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Strelna	WR.SN.002	871,200	1,452	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Strelna	WR.SN.004	254,400	424	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Wrangell Glaciers	WR.WG.001	800	20	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Wrangell Glaciers	WR.WG.002	5,439	136	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Wrangell Glaciers	WR.WG.003	100	103	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Wrangell Glaciers	WR.WG.004	100	82	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
South Central	Orange Hill	WR.OII.001	225,000	1,600	Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve.
		Totals	25,189,130	13,552	

SUMMARY

Federal conservation system unit	Values	Acres
AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge	$445,800	1,054
Chugach National Forest	600,000	942
Glacier Bay National Park	15,000,000	400

SUMMARY—Continued

Federal conservation system unit	Values	Acres
Kenai Fjords National Park	226,500	47
Tongass National Forest	1,690,000	835
Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve	7,226,880	10,680

SUMMARY—Continued

Federal conservation system unit	Values	Acres
Total	25,189,189	13,958

WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity today to call my colleagues' attention to the importance of women's health care issues. I came to know the importance of women's health early in life. Some of you may know that my mother suffered from tuberculosis. Back in those days, patients with TB had to be isolated, so my mother was living in a sanatorium. I could not see her in person, only through the windows.

In the past, women's health did not receive the attention it deserves. I believe it is time to change that. If we are to eliminate the diseases that especially afflict women today, we will need real dedication to the task of developing new treatments and prevention techniques.

And because women make many of the health care decisions for families, their decisions touch the health of many people—children, spouses, elderly parents and relatives. In this great country of ours, where we emphasize personal responsibility, good health care decisions are fundamental to quality health.

As medical science advances into new territory, expanded choices will give women unprecedented opportunities to live better and longer lives, and to affect the quality of health care in our country. Women will be called upon to take charge of their own health as well as to demand medical excellence for their families. Only with the help of such informed decision makers will we be able to develop policies which assure all Americans access to affordable, quality health care.

In an effort to highlight women's health care and to make women aware of the health care choices that are available to them, I recently co-hosted a forum, Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know, with our former colleague in the Senate, Hank Brown, now President of the University of Northern Colorado. The conference featured a number of panelists who discussed the latest research and treatment of various kinds of cancer as well as depression and eating disorders. Legislative initiatives and solutions were also part of the forum agenda.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the forum agenda and an article from the Greeley Tribune newspaper highlighting remarks of the keynote speaker Assistant Surgeon General Susan Blumenthal be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HEALTH CARE: WHAT EVERY WOMAN SHOULD KNOW

Sponsored by Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and the University of Northern Colorado)

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1999.

DEAR FRIENDS: Thank you for attending today's forum, Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know. I am honored to cohost this event with the University of Northern Colorado, and I hope today's forum provides you with knowledge to ensure a healthier life for you and your families.

I have always worked to ensure access to affordable, high quality health care. Women's health has historically received little attention and it is time that we correct that. Because women are the primary care givers and make most of the health care decisions for families, it is important to make women aware of the advances that are taking place in the areas of research, detection, treatment and prevention.

Personal health choices are fundamental to quality health care. Today's forum will highlight approaches that can lead to early intervention, less invasive and less expensive treatment and cost-saving strategies.

I sincerely hope you will use what you learn today to make positive health care choices.

Sincerely,

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senator.

AGENDA

8:30 a.m.—Registration Confirmation: Coffee, fruit, bagels.

9:00 a.m.—Welcome: UNC President Hank Brown and Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

9:15 a.m.—Panel I: Confronting the ''C'' Word—Moderator: Kim Christiansen, Channel 9 News Anchor.

Saving Your Skin: Skin Cancer—Jim Martin, PhD, GNP;

The Capricious Cancer: Breast Cancer—Alison Merrill, RN, MS;

The Silent Cancer: Ovarian Cancer—Susan Carter, MD;

Survival and Beyond: Cancer Rehabilitation—Susan Carter, MD.

10:20 a.m.—Break.

10:35 a.m.—Panel II: Mind and Body Connections—Moderator: Adele Arakawa, Channel 9 News Anchor—

Your Mind and Moods: Dealing with Depression—Maria deMontigny Korb, RN, PhD;

The Fear of Being Fat: Eating Disorders—Judy Stauter Huse, RD, MS;

How to Change with the Change of Life—Meredith Mayer, RN, MS, FNP.

11:35 a.m.—Getting the Best Care: How You Can Be An Advocate (Legislative Initiatives and Solutions)—Raissa Geary, MA, Professional Staff, U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

Noon—Lunch: Guest Speaker: Susan Blumenthal, MD, MPA, Assistant Surgeon General—''Critical Public Health Issues for Women in the 21st Century''.

1:00 p.m.—Closing Remarks: Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO,
Greeley, CO, June 1999.

GREETINGS: It is my pleasure to extend warm greetings and welcome you to this forum on Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know. The University is proud to cosponsor this event with Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and the College of Health and Human Sciences. The College is dedicated to improving the human condition through its educational programs and fosters a desire of ''giving back'' to the community.

This is a special occasion for the University of Northern Colorado and a sign of our commitment to be an educational partner with other community. I would like to acknowledge the North Colorado Medical Center, Inc. and the Western Plains Health Network who serve as partners in this important forum. We hope to expand our partnerships with other institutions and communities to truly reflect our University mission in teaching, research, and service throughout the State of Colorado.

The forum is designed to help you: recognize the warning signs and be aware of factors that affect your well-being; take responsibility for making wise decisions about your treatment and recovery; and, how to be an active, well-informed partner in health care. Your attitude, knowledge and involvement in the health care partnership can influence the progress of treatment and rehabilitation. This forum can help you make a difference.

We hope you will find this forum a fine resource for the knowledge necessary to dispel old myths, quiet new anxieties, and provide information that all women need about their health care.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN,
President.

MODERATORS

Adele Arakawa is an anchor for Channel 9 News, the Gannett-owned NBC affiliate. She attended Tennessee Tech University and the University of Tennessee and has been in broadcasting since the age of 16. She won best-anchor in 1997 for coverage of the Oklahoma City Bombing Trial and has received a total of 7 Emmy nominations.

Kim Christiansen is an anchor and reporter for Channel 9 News, the Gannett-owned NBC affiliate. She received a degree in Journalism from the University of Colorado in Boulder. Kim is devoted to the fight against breast cancer and serves as the spokesperson for the Buddy Check 9 program at 9 News, which was nominated for a national community service Emmy Award. She received three heartland region Emmy awards for news writing and outstanding general news.

SPEAKERS

Susan J. Blumenthal, MD, MPA is a national expert in women's health and mental illness. Dr. Blumenthal serves as U.S. Assistant Surgeon General, Rear Admiral, and Senior Science Advisor in the Department of Health and Human Services. She is also a Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Georgetown School of Medicine and Tufts University Medical Center. For 12 years prior to her appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, she directed major national research programs at the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Blumenthal writes a monthly health column for Elle magazine.

Raissa Geary is a professional staff member for the U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. She received a BA from the University of Connecticut and holds a Master's Degree in Comparative Politics from American University. Ms. Geary develops and drafts health legislation and agency directives and advises the committee on all health issues. Her work during the 106th Congress includes Managed Care Reform and Medical Records Confidentiality.

PANELISTS

Susan Carter is a gynecologic surgeon, specializing in women's health issues. She received a BA from the University of Texas, Austin and an MD from the University of

Texas Medical Branch in Galveston. Dr. Carter is Director of the Regional Breast Center of North Colorado and Medical Director of the Rocky Mountain Cancer Rehabilitation Institute.

Jan Martin has worked with the University of Northern Colorado School of Nursing for over 14 years. She received a BS in nursing from Northwestern Louisiana University; an MS in nursing and GNP from the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center; and a PhD in Higher Education Administration from the University of Denver.

Alison S. Merrill teaches nursing at the University of Northern Colorado and is a Clinical Nurse Specialist in Oncology. She received a BS in Nursing from the University of Rhode Island and an MS in Nursing from the University of Michigan.

Meredith Mayer is a nurse practitioner and faculty member at the North Colorado Family Medicine Residency Training program in Greeley, CO. She received a BS in psychology at the University of Colorado in Boulder and an MS in Nursing at Pace University in Briarcliff Manor, NY.

Judy Stauter Huse is a Health Education and Nutrition Consultant, specializing in wellness and eating disorders. She received her BS and MS from Iowa State University and has taught nutrition at the North Colorado Medical center and the University of Northern Colorado.

Maria deMontigny Korb is on faculty at the University of Northern Colorado Department of Nursing. She studied for a Master's Degree and PhD in Transcultural Nursing at the University of Utah and has worked and taught in the clinical area of psychiatric nursing.

WOMEN'S HEALTH GETS MORE ATTENTION—ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL SPEAKS ON ADVANCES

(By Adam Silverman)

Although mammograms are responsible for saving the lives of thousands of women every year, the technology is 40 years old and still misses crucial early warning signs of breast cancer.

That was the challenge facing Susan Blumenthal, assistant surgeon general of the United States. Rather than waiting for new technology to be developed, she called the CIA. Together with NASA and the CIA, Blumenthal used spy-satellite technology to improve the success of mammograms.

''Some of the same imaging technology used to find tanks camouflaged behind trees can now be used to find cancer cells,'' she said. Blumenthal was in Greeley on Thursday to deliver the keynote address at a conference about women's health.

The conference, held at the University of Northern Colorado, featured a variety of panelists who discussed everything from anorexia to breast cancer to political action.

Blumenthal delivered a ''report card'' on women's health in the country today: The biggest problem facing women isn't any one disease, but instead is a lack of focus on women's health.

''We must address these issues if we want to safeguard women's health,'' she said.

The problem stems from the fact that women's health issues also are political issues, said Raissa Geary, a member of the U.S. Senate's Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

''This is more politically charged than almost anything we do,'' she said. ''We're treated as a political issue when it comes to health care. We have wonderful, pure approaches to women's health care policy, but it's not in a vacuum.''

Although women's health is not being discussed as often as most women would like, awareness of health problems facing women has increased in the past century, Blumenthal said.

For many years, serious health problems such as heart disease and lung cancer were thought only to occur in men. But through increasing research in women's health issues, Blumenthal said, concerns such as these are being discussed.

Also, it's important to include women and minorities in all research projects relating to health issues that affect women as well as men, Blumenthal said. Programs that don't include women will lose their federal funding.

Marianne Dinges attended the conference Thursday and said the experience was valuable. She said she was impressed with the quality of the speakers and the topics they were scheduled to discuss.

''It appeared we were going to see a full gamut of issues and their political relevance,'' she said. ''A lot of us are involved in women's issues and hear a lot about this, but we all got new information.''

The conference was sponsored by UNC and U.S. Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, R-Colo. Campbell said his staff pitched the idea to UNC after receiving many calls from women about health issues.

''It came from the community activists who wanted me to do it,'' he said.

The issues addressed at the conference need to be at the forefront of public debate, Campbell said.

He said he will take the information back to Washington, D.C., and enter it into the Congressional Record. He also wants to start a series of forums like the one Thursday to further address the issues.

''We just touched the surface of women's health,'' he said. ''The time to endure is passed. It's time to fight back.''

HEALTHY LIVING

Susan Blumenthal, assistant U.S. surgeon general, gave these tips for healthy lives:

Find a doctor who respects you.

Know your family health history; many diseases are genetic and run in families.

If you smoke, stop. If you don't, never do. It's the No. 1 preventable cause of health problems among women.

Exercise or do some other sort of physical activity at least 30 minutes every day. This could be as simple as riding a bike or walking up stairs rather than using the elevator.

Eat smart.

Get annual physical exams, and make sure to include routine women's health tests such as pap smears.

Know your health care plan and make sure to read the fine print.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, information we received at the forum will be helpful in my work on the Appropriations Committee as we consider funding priorities in the women's health area.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

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 Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:00 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. 1259. An act to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

H.R. 1915. An act to provide grants to the States to improve the reporting of unidentified and missing persons.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 435) to make miscellaneous and technical changes to various trade laws, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 334(b)(1) of Public Law 105–220 and the order of the House of Thursday, May 27, 1999, and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, the Speaker appoints the following member on the part of the House to the Twenty-First Century Workforce Commission: Mr. David L. Stewart of St. Louis, Missouri.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman, appointed on February 11, 1999: Mr. GILMAN of New York, Vice Chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota, Mr. SHAW of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. UPTON of Michigan, Mr. STEARNS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. DANNER of Missouri, Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide grants to the States to improve the reporting of unidentified and missing persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3385. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Thomson, GA: Docket No. 99–ASO–45–17 (5–17)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0176), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3386. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22), Amdt. No. 1931/5–21 (5–24)'' (RIN2120–AA65) (1999–0026), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3387. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (65), Amdt. No. 1930/5–21 (5–24)'' (RIN2120–AA65) (1999–0025), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3388. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Streamlining of Radio Technical Rules in Parts 73 and 74 of the Commission's Rules-First Report and Order'' [MM Docket No. 98–93), (RIN3060–AG81), (FCC 99–55), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3389. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. [Meyersdale, Pennsylvania; Richwood, West Virginia; Newell, Iowa; Superior, Wyoming; LaCenter, Kentucky; Lovell, Wyoming; Royal City, Washington)'' [MM Docket Nos. 98–28; 98–33, 98–71; 98–109; 98–114; 98–116; 98–150), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3390. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Memorandum Opinion and Order—Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act'' [MM Docket No. 97–234, CG Docket No. 92–52 and Gen Docket No. 90–264), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3391. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 72.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (East Brewton, Alabama and Navarre, Florida)'' [MM Docket No. 97–233, received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3392. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 72.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ely and Carlin, NV)'' [MM Docket No. 98–185), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3393. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice, Procedure, and Evidence for Administrative Proceedings of the Coast Guard (USCG–1998–3472)'' (RIN2115–AF59), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3394. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, TX (CGD–08–99–034)'' (RIN2115–AE479)(1999–0011), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3395. A communication from the Senior Regulations Analyst, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR: Cape Fear River, Wilmington, North Carolina (CGD–05–98–106)'' (RIN2115–AE46)(1999–0010), received April 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3396. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Means of Compliance for the Pilot-In-Command; Night Takeoff and Landing; Recent Flight Experience Requirements; Final Rule'' (RIN2120–AG77), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3397. A communication from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Revision to Regulations Governing Transportation and Unloading of Liquified Compressed Gas Service'' (RIN2137–AD07), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3398. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Governing the Taking of Marine Mammals by Alaskan Natives; Marking and Reporting of Beluga Whales Harvested in Cook Inlet'' (RIN0648–AM57), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3399. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''American Meteorological Society's Industry/Government Scholarship and Fellowship Program'' (RIN0648–ZA61), received May 14, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3400. A communication from the Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Availability of Funds for Cooperative Agreements to Provide Fellowships for Undergraduate, Graduate, and Post-Graduate Students'' (RIN0693–ZA29), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3401. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Gulf of Alaska to Directed Fishing for Groundfish by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear'', received May 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3402. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States—Announcement That the 1999 Summer Flounder Commercial Quota Has Been Harvested for Maine'', received April 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3403. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Licensing, Financial Responsibility Requirements, and General Duties for Ocean Transportation Intermediaries'' (Docket No. 98–28), received April 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3404. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carrier Automated Tariff Systems'' (FMC Docket No. 98–29), received April 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3405. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Order on Reconsideration: In the Matter of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Commercial Availability of Navigational Devices'' (CS Docket No. 97–80; FCC 99–95), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3406. A communication from the Program Support Analyst, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; S.N. CENTAIR 101 Series Gliders; Docket No. 98–CE–50–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3407. A communication from the Program Support Analyst, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Request for Comments: Eurocopter France Model SA341G and SA342J Helicopters; Docket No. 99 SW 03–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3408. A communication from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3409. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3410. A communication from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period

October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3411. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the HHS section of the Office of Inspector General's semiannual report for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3412. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Office of Government Ethics Freedom of Information Act Regulations'' (RIN3209–AA22), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3413. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the actuarial reports on the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System, and the Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement System for the plan year ending September 30, 1996; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3414. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A for the Period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3415. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a certification of a proposed Manufacturing and Technical Assistance Agreement for the Netherlands and Germany; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3416. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the employment of Americans by the United Nations during calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3417. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a certification of a proposed manufacturing license for the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3418. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3419. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Reserve Forces Policy Board annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3420. A communication from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–307)'' (RIN0790–AG68), received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3421. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Work Stoppage Report'' (DFARS Case 99–D003), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3422. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contracts Crossing Fiscal Years'' (DFARS Case 99–D008), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3423. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Entity List: Addition of Entities Located in the People's Republic of China; and Correction to Spelling of One Indian Entity Name'' (RIN0694–AB60), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3424. A communication from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organization and Functions, Availability and Release of Information, Contracting Outreach Program'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3425. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exemption of the Securities of the Kingdom of Sweden under the Securities Act of 1934 for Purposes of Trading Futures Contracts on Those Securities'' (RIN3235–AH68), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3426. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26692, 05/17/99'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3427. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26694, 05/17/99'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3428. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26690, 05/17/99 (FEMA Doc. #7284)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3429. A communication from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Consumer Report for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3430. A communication from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Programs Guaranteed Loans'' (RIN0575–AC17), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3431. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas'' (APHIS Docket No. 99–033–1), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3432. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rev. Rul. 99–26, BLS–LIFO Department Store Indexes-April 1999'' (Rev. Rul. 99–26), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3433. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled the ''Self-Employment Assistance Program''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3434. A communication from the Register of Copyrights, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Copyright and Digital Distance Education''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3435. A communication from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Willow Creek Dam, Sun River Project, Montana; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3436. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs'' for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3437. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Fuel Transportation Program'' (RIN1904–AA99) (10CFR Part 490), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3438. A communication from the Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 800)'' (RIN3010–AA04), received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3439. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'' (98F–0730), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3440. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'' (98F–0368), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3441. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3442. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3443. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conforming Regulations Regarding Removal of Section 507 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act; Confirmation of Effective Date'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3444. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations for in Vivo Radiopharmaceuticals Used for Diagnosis and Monitoring'' (RIN0910–AB52), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3445. A communication from the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled ''Implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994'' and ''1998 State Profiles''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3446. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitative Research'' (84.133), received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3447. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Final Annual Performance Plan for Fiscal Year 2000''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3448. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crocket, TX; Docket No. 99–ASW–03 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0184), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3449. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model AS 3321.2 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Project No. 98–SW–61 [5/26 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0232), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3450. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model SA–365N, N1, N2, N3, and SA–366G1 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Project No. 98–SW–47 [5/26 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0231), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3451. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Mooney Aircraft Corporation Model M20R Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99–CE–14 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0230), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3452. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98–NM–383 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0229), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3453. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–68–AD; Amendment 39–11165; AD 99–10–12'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3454. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–337–AD; Amendment 39–11132; AD 99–08–23'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3455. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped With General Electric Model CF6–45 or –50 Series Engines; or Pratt and Whitney Model JT9D–3, –7, or –70 Series Engines; and 747–E4B (Military) Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–49–AD; Amendment 39–11144; AD 99–09–11'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3456. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–59–AD; Amendment 39–11136; AD 99–09–04'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3457. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–44–AD; Amendment 39–11135; AD 99–09–03'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3458. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–43–AD; Amendment 39–11134; AD 99–09–02'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3459. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Request for Comments; Eurocopter France Model AS–350B, B1, B2, B3 BA, and D Helicopters and Model AS 355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters; Docket No. 98–SW–44–AD;'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3460. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems Model 369E, 369FF, 500N, and 600H Helicopters; Docket No. 99–SW–11–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3461. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98–NM–199–AD; Amendment 39–11147; AD 99–09–14'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3462. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Empressa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–145 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–104–AD; Amendment 39–11172; AD 99–11–01'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3463. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) and CL–600–2B16 (CL–601–3R and CL–604) Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–99–AD; Amendment 39–11170; AD 99–09–52'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3464. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Mitsubishi Model YS–11 Series Airplanes; DOT Docket No. 97–NM–92–AD; Amendment 39–11169; AD 99–10–16'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3465. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P–180 Airplanes; Docket No. 98–CE–96–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3466. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Beech Models 65–90, 65–A90, 65–A90–1, –2, –3, –4, B90, C90, C90A, E90, H90 and F90 Airplanes; Final Rule; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99–CE–18–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3467. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Docket No. 97–ANE–58–AD, Amendment 39–11173; AD 99–11–02; Pratt and Whitney R–1340 Series Reciprocating Engines'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3468. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of five rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and Rhode Island; Nitrogen Oxides Budget and Allowance Trading Program (FRL #6080–4)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Amendments to Air Pollution Control Regulation Number 9 (FRL #6346–6)'', ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Generic Maximum Achievable Control Technology (Generic MACT) (FRL #6346–9)'', ''OMB Approvals under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Technical Amendments (FRL #6056–6)'' and ''Underground Storage Tank Program: Approved State Petroleum Program for Tennessee (FRL #6334–7), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3469. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio (FRL #6337–5)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3470. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) Addressing Sulfur Dioxide in Harris County (FRL #6349–9)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3471. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Group-Term Insurance; Uniform Premiums'' (RIN1545–AN54) (TD 8821), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3472. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Secured Employee Benefits Settlement Initiative'' (Revenue Procedure 99–26), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3473. A communication from the Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3474. A communication from the Chair, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Selected Medicare Issues'', dated June 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3475. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–3476. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers; Correction'' (92F–0285), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3477. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Direct Food Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe: Cellulase Enzyme Preparation Derived from Trichoderma Longibrachiatum for Use in Processing Food'' (79G–0372), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3478. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Infertility and Sexually Transmitted Diseases'', dated March 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3479. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pennsylvania Regulatory Program—Final Rule; Correction'' (SPATS #PA–125–FOR), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3480. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficient and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Biodiesel Fuel Use Credit'' (RIN1904–AB00) (10 CFR part 490), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3481. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Macau to the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AB89), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3482. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Flood Insurance Program; Determining the Write-Your-Own Expense Allowance 64 FR 27705, 05/21/99'' (RIN6067–AC92), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3483. A communication from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, a report relative to export controls imposed on the Portuguese Colony of Macau; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3484. A communication from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3485. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the authorization request for fiscal years 2000 and 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3486. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of User Fees for 1999 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers—Final Rule'' (Docket No. CN–99–001), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3487. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Difenoconazole Pesticide Tolerance (FRL #6081–5), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3488. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3489. A communication from the Director, Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reemployment Rights of Employees Performing Military Duty'' (RIN3206–AG02), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3490. A communication from the Director, Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Statutory Bar to Appointment of Persons Who Fail to Register Under Selective Service Law'' (RIN3206–AI72), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3491. A communication from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Status; Continued Validity of Nonimmigrant Status, Unexpired Employment Authorization, and Travel Authorization for Certain Applicants Maintaining Nonimmigrant H or L Status'' (RIN1115–AE96) (INS No. 1881–97), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3492. A communication from the Chairwoman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999 and the Commission's Management Report for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3493. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3494. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3495. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3496. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3497. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Additions to the Procurement List'', received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3498. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3499. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Palestine Liberation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3500. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the employment of Americans by the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the payment of danger pay to civilian employees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3502. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada State Implementation Plan Revision, Clark County (FRL #6350–5)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3503. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; South Dakota Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills (FRL #6351–8)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3504. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Incorporation of Montreal Protocol Adjustments for a 1999 Interim Reduction in Class I, Group VI Controlled Substances (FRL #6351–6)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3505. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of New Source Review Provisions Implementation Plan for Nevada State Clark County Air Pollution Control Division (FRL #6336–5)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3506. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Approval in Part and Disapproval in Part, Section 1112(l), State of Alaska: Amendment and Clarification (FRL #6317–7)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3507. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group I Polymers and Resins and Group IV Polymers and Resins and Standards of Performance for Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions from the Polymer Manufacturing Industry (FRL #6338–3)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3508. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Availability of Funds for Source Water Protection (FRL #6336–7)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3509. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Minnesota (FRL #6339–5)'', received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3510. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two rules entitled ''Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit (FRL #6343–2)'' and ''Withdrawal of Direct Final Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit (FRL #6343–1)'', received May 11, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3511. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries; 1999 ABC, OY, and Tribal and Nontribal Allocations for Pacific Whiting'' (RIN0648–AM12), received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3512. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reduction of Cod Landing Limit (under the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan)'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3513. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Unity Electric Company Fireworks Display, Shinnecock Bay, Hampton Bays, NY (CGD01-99–038)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0022), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3514. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Fire Island Tourist Bureau Fireworks Display, Great South Bay, Cherry Grove, NY (CGD01–99–047)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0023), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3515. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA (CGD01–99–053)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0024), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3516. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: San Pedro Bay, CA (COTP LA/LB 99–003)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0025), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3517. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Ground; Safety Zone; Speed Limit; Tongass Narrows and Ketchikan, AK (CGD17–99–002)'' (RIN2115–AF81), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3518. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mandatory Ship Reporting System Off the Northeast and Southeast Coasts of the United States (USCG–1999–5525)'' (RIN2115–AF82), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3519. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Harvard-Yale Regatta, Thames River, New London, CT (CGD01–99–054)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0015), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3520. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Lake Pontchartrain, LA (CGD08–99–032)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0012), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3521. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Massalina Bayou, FL (CGD08–99–033)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0012), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3522. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Muskingum River, OH (CGD08–99–020)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0017), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3523. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Harvey Canal, LA (CGD08–99–029)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0016), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3524. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Falgout Canal, LA (CGD08–99–035)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0015), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3525. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Lake Champlain, NY and VT (CGD01–98–032)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0014), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3526. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Groton Long Point Yacht Club Fireworks Display, Main Beach, Groton Point, CT (CGD01–99–039)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0021), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3527. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled the ''Sixteenth Annual Report of Accomplishments under the Airport Improvement Program'' for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3528. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Hudson Valley Triathalon, Hudson River, Kingston, NY (CGD01–98–155)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0016), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3529. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Fleet's Albany Riverfest, Hudson River, NY (CGD01–98–163)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0017), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3530. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; River Rouge (Short-Cut Canal), MI (CGD09–98–055)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0013), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3531. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; 4th of July Celebration Fireworks Display; Great South Bay, Sayville, NY (CGD01–99–040)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0020), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3532. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 1999''; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

EC–3533. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to support to civil authorities for combating terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3534. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Economic Development Conveyances of Base Closure Property''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3535. A communication from the Deputy Assistant for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to National Discovery Trails; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3536. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fuel Economy Calculations'' (RIN2127–AG95), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3537. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''High-Theft Lines for Model Year 2000'' (RIN2127–AH36), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3538. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pelvic Restraints'' (RIN2127–AG48), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3539. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Information on Tire Grading'' (RIN2127–AG67), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3540. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Rochester, MN; Docket No. 99–AGL–13 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0178), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3541. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Minot, ND; Docket No. 99–AGL–12 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0177), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3542. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Wilmington, OH; Docket No. 99–AGL–14 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0179), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3543. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Jackson, MI; Docket No. 99–AGL–15 (5–27/5–25)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0180), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3544. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Muskegon, MI; Docket No. 99–AGL–16 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0181), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3545. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Chico, CA; Docket No. 99–AWP–98 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0182), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3546. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Pampa, TX, Direct Final Rule, Confirmation of Effective Date; Docket No. 98–ASW–57 (5–24/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0185), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3547. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class D Airspace and Modification of Class E Airspace, Bozeman, MT; Correction; Docket No. 98–ANM–19 (5–24/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0183), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3548. A communication from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (La Fayette, Georgia)'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3549. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disaster Assistance; Cost-Share Adjustment, 64 FR 19496, 04/21/99'' (RIN3067–AC72), received April 30, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3550. A communication from the Chief, Operations Division, Directorate of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule Establishing an Administrative Appeal Process for the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers'' (RIN0710–AA41), received May 11,

1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3551. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Radiological Protection for DOE Activities'' (DOE N 441.4), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3552. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities'' (DOE O 425.1A), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3553. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safeguards and Security Independent Oversight Program'' (DOE O 470.2), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3554. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit Assistance for Surface Transportation Projects'' (RIN2125–AE49), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3555. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1997 relative to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3556. A communication from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3557. A communication from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to a working capital fund for the Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3558. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Office of Law Enforcement, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting: Regulations Regulating Baiting And Baited Areas'' (RIN1018–AD74), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3559. A communication from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to abnormal occurrences for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3560. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Quality Assurance Project Plan for the PM2.5 Performance Evaluation Program''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3561. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Revised Policy for Amending Form R and Form A Submissions; Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Reporting: Community Right-to-Know''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3562. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision: Kern County Air Pollution Control District, Mudoc County Air Pollution Control District, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District (FRL #6331–8)''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3563. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Regulated Substances and Thresholds for Accidental Release Prevention; Stay of Effectiveness for Flammable Hydrocarbon Fuels (FRL #6351–1)'', received May 25, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3564. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of three rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama (FRL #6352–5)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Florida (FRL #6352–7)'' and ''Grant Application Guidance to Improve Small Business Assistance (FRL #)'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3565. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of three rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan for South Coast Air Quality Management District (FRL #6335–3)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: North Dakota; Control of Emissions from Existing Hazardous/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators (FRL #6340–6)'' and ''Revisions to the Permits and Sulfur Dioxis=de Allowance System Regulations under Title IV of the Clean Air Act: Compliance Determination (FRL #6341–2)'', received May 7, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3566. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Ellis Island Medals of Honor Fireworks, New York Harbor, Upper Bay (CGD01–99–034)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0018), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3567. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations: Hutchinson River, NY (CGD01–99–031)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0008), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3568. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3569. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to Vietnam; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3570. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to the Republic of Belarus; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3571. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuing humanitarian crisis in the Kosovo region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3572. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regional Haze Regulations'' (FRL #6353–4), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3573. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants; Measurement of Mercury in Water (EPA Method 1631, Revision B); Final Rule'' (FRL #6354–3), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3574. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Progress on Superfund Implementation in Fiscal Year 1998''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM—138. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to the temporary visa waiver program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, the United States Congress passed the Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1986 that established a temporary visa waiver program to pave the way toward better international relations and increased visitor travel between the United States and certain participating foreign countries; and

Whereas, the temporary visa waiver program expired in September, 1996, and has since been extended on a year-to-year basis, with the current extension expiring in September, 1999; and

Whereas, the visa waiver program allows persons with waivers to enter the United States for a period of up to ninety days without a visa; and

Whereas, twenty-one countries were participating in the visa waiver program with

the United States as of 1996, with more being added since then; and

Whereas, the visa waiver program is critical to boosting the number of international arrivals in Hawaii, with an estimated eighty percent of all international visitors arriving at Honolulu International Airport being under the visa waiver program; and

Whereas, the addition of Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the visa waiver program by the United States would further boost Hawaii's economy because of the huge numbers of travelers to Hawaii from these countries; and

Whereas, despite the success of the visa waiver program, the United States Congress has not made the program permanent, instead preferring to extend it on a year-to-year basis; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999, the Senate concurring, that the United States Congress is urged to:

(1) Make the visa waiver program permanent; and

(2) Add Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the visa waiver program;

and

Be it Further Resolved that members of Hawaii's congressional delegation are urged to exert efforts to make the visa waiver program permanent and add Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the program; and

Be it Further Resolved that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation.

POM–139. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the threat of terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 28

Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

Whereas, the threat of terrorism in the United States is a real and complex phenomenon that can strike any community, state or geographic region of our nation; and

Whereas, threats incorporating the use of nuclear, radiological, biological, chemical and cyber weapons or combination thereof, may be used against critical infrastructures and the nation's food supply, of which the state of Idaho is a major producer; and

Whereas, because terrorist incidents would occur in local communities within the states, it is imperative that planning, training, exercises, equipping and funding strategies for state and local response forces be included in any national strategy; and

Whereas, the Legislature joins with the National Governors' Association and the National Emergency Management Association to affirm its commitment to ensuring a coordinated response and recovery to major emergencies and disasters, including incidents of terrorism and the use of weapons of mass destruction; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we recommend the following actions be taken to improve the nation's preparedness, and to more effectively prepare for, respond to, and recover from consequences of terrorism at the state and local level that:

(1) The White House and the Congress should consult and coordinate with the nation's governors and their states to develop and implement a national strategy that initiates and sustains activities for domestic preparedness at the state and local level. One hundred percent federally funded state and local assistance, previously granted to the states for civil defense, should be provided to the states for preparedness activities for crisis and consequence management as the result of the increasing potential for acts of terrorism and use of weapons of mass destruction.

(2) The federal government recognizes that the short and long-term consequences of domestic terrorism is among the responsibilities of state and local government supplemented by the resources of the federal government. Federal agencies that are tasked with providing assistance to state and local government must be required to recognize and use the state's emergency management systems that have effectively responded to state and local emergencies and disasters for over fifty years.

(3) The National Guard of each state and territory is a critical state resource during emergencies and disasters. As such, the role of the National Guard and the Department of Defense must be better defined in preparing for acts of terrorism. Furthermore, the National Guard must be funded, trained, equipped and well exercised if it is to have a viable role in the response and recovery to the use of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

(4) The nation's public health and medical system capabilities must be significantly improved and fully integrated into the evolving domestic preparedness program. As a health matter, specific attention must be placed on the nation's food supply, both that which has been harvested, and that which is yet to be developed.

(5) The government at all levels must ensure that the protection of civil liberties and states' rights will remain the highest priority within the context of national security as the United States prepares for and addresses the consequences of terrorism. The White House and the Congress should specifically develop methods to eliminate unauthorized activity in the name of expedience and national security.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the state of Idaho recognizes and supports the efforts of the U.S. Department of Justice to accomplish the much needed program coordination through the creation of the National Domestic Preparedness Office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to the U.S. Department of Justice, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–140. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa relative to Health Care Financing Administration rules; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 24

Whereas, rules recently promulgated by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services requiring Outcome and Assessment Information Set (OASIS) assessment and follow-up reports for all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies and health departments, whether or not the patient is a recipient of Medicare; and

Whereas, the OASIS system requires an 18-page initial assessment which must be completed by a registered nurse, and a 13-page follow-up assessment which is required to be completed every sixty days; and

Whereas, the requirement for computer software necessary for preparation and transmission of the OASIS system assessments and reports is essentially an unfunded federal mandate; and

Whereas, the HCFA requirement necessitates costly reporting for patients who receive services not paid through Medicare and the reporting is duplicative of existing assessment and reporting requirements; and

Whereas, in the small-scale home health care organization environment in Iowa, it is not feasible to provide services through separate organizations based upon whether the patient is a recipient of Medicare; and

Whereas, the HCFA rules would result in Medicare-certified organizations only providing services to recipients of Medicare, thereby reducing the availability of preventive home services to older Iowans who are not recipients of Medicare, increasing in-hospital admissions and Medicare costs, and increasing nursing home admissions and Medicaid costs; and

Whereas, OASIS appears to be solely a research project of HCFA, totally unfunded by federal sources, and accomplished with loss of funds by reporting agencies and loss of services to older Iowans; now; therefore,

Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress of the United States is encouraged to amend the OASIS system requirements to apply them only to patients who are recipients of Medicare and not to all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House is directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Minority Leaders of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to each member of Iowa's congressional delegation.

POM–141. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to Health Care Financing Administration rules; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5041

Whereas, New rules made by HCFA require OASIS assessment and follow-up reports for all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies and health departments whether or not the personal or attendant care for such patients is paid from Medicare, and

Whereas, The new HCFA report requires an 18-page initial assessment, which must be completed by a registered nurse, with a 13 page follow-up assessment being required every 60 days; and

Whereas, The requirement for computer software for the preparation and transmission of such assessments and follow-up reports is another unfunded mandate of the federal government; and

Whereas, The HCFA requirement requires costly unfunded reporting of those who receive services which are not paid by Medicare—which reporting duplicates existing assessment and reporting requirements of the Kansas Department on Aging; and

Whereas, In the environment of the small, home health care services existing in Kansas, it is not feasible to create separate organizations to provide services for non-Medicare customers. The end result of the HCFA

rules is that Medicare-certified agencies will no longer be able to provide in-home services to non-Medicare customers. Consequently, with lower levels of preventive home services being available to older Kansans there will be an increase in hospital admissions, thus increasing Medicare costs, and an increase in nursing home admissions, thus increasing Medicaid costs; and

Whereas, OASIS appears to be solely a research project of HCFA, totally unfunded by federal sources, and accomplished with loss of funds by reporting agencies and loss of services for Kansas seniors: now; therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to require the Health Care Financing Administration OASIS reporting and data reporting requirements to apply only to Medicare patients and not to all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies; and

Be it further resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to provide an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Secretary of Health and Human Services, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, minority leaders of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Kansas Congressional delegation.

POM–142. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

We, your Memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho assembled in the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas, the estate and gift tax is the federal government's least significant revenue source contributing approximately 1.1% of total federal revenue and in 1998 just 1.66% of adult deaths in the United States are expected to result in taxable estates; and

Whereas, a rationale for the estate and gift tax is that only the very wealthy pay it, but in 1995, 54% of all estate tax revenue came from estates under five million dollars and estate taxes that year fell for those with estates over twenty million dollars; and

Whereas, the reason for the preceding is that careful estate planning can virtually eliminate the tax, however many estate planning techniques are costly and require long lead-times to implement, making the burden of the estate tax often falling on those with recently acquired modest wealth such as farmers and small businesses; and

Whereas, the tax can be devastating on small businesses and agricultural operations and protecting these ventures from estate taxes can be costly and drain resources that could be better used by the owners to upgrade and expand their operations; and

Whereas, the estate and gift tax may be having unintended environmental consequences as America's nonindustrial private forest owners (who own 58% of America's forest land) face the untimely timber harvest and disruption of established forest management programs because of the federal estate tax and this is counterproductive to society's goals of sustainable forestry and environmental quality and the tax may also have the unintended consequence of forcing a decedent's estate to subdivide or sell all or portions of the family land, that otherwise might be managed in a sustainable manner, in order to meet the estate tax obligation; and

Whereas, Canada, Australia and Israel have repealed their estate taxes with three policy reasons given that more people were becoming subject to the tax, the relative tiny portion of revenue raised and arguments by economists that the tax is counterproductive; and

Whereas, the inheritance tax is applied to property and goods that have already been taxed and some economists have indicated that the gross domestic product over the next seven years would be $80 billion higher if the estate and gift tax were repealed; now; therefore,

Be it resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we respectfully request that members of Congress take a serious look at repealing the estate and gift tax or, at the very least, to increasing the exemption substantially.

Be it further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congress delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–143. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to tobacco settlement funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, on November 23, 1998, representatives from forty-six states signed a settlement agreement with the five largest tobacco manufacturers, which settled lawsuits seeking to recoup the states' costs of treating smokers; and

Whereas, the Attorneys General Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement culminated legal action that began in 1994 when states began filing lawsuits against the tobacco industry; and

Whereas, currently, the respective states are in the process of finalizing the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement and are making initial fiscal determinations relative to the most responsible ways and means to utilize the settlement funds; and

Whereas, under the terms of the agreement, tobacco manufacturers will pay $206,000,000,000 over the next twenty-five years to the respective states in up-front and annual payments; and

Whereas, under the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement, Hawaii is projected to receive $1,179,165,923.07 through the year 2025; and

Whereas, because many state lawsuits sought to recover Medicaid funds spent to treat illnesses caused by tobacco use, the U.S. Health Care Financing Administration contends that it is authorized and obligated under the Social Security Act, to collect its share of any tobacco settlement funds that are attributable to Medicaid; and

Whereas, the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement does not address the Medicaid recoupment issue, and thus, the Social Security Act must be amended to resolve the recoupment issue so that the moneys from the settlement remain with the respective states; and

Whereas, in addition to the recoupment issue, there is also considerable interest in earmarking state tobacco settlement fund expenditures at both the state and national levels; and

Whereas, as the final approval of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement nears, it is imperative that the states retain their rightful full share of the tobacco settlement funds; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999, That the U.S. Congress is urged to enact legislation that amends the Social Security Act to prohibit the federal government from receiving any share of the funds awarded in the tobacco settlement that was reached in 1998 between the states and the tobacco industry; and be it further *Resolved* that the respective state legislatures retain complete autonomy over the appropriation and expenditure of their respective tobacco settlement funds; and be it further *Resolved* that the U.S. Congress oppose any efforts by the federal government to earmark or impose any other restrictions on the respective states' use of the state tobacco settlement funds; and be it further *Resolved* that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the members of Hawaii's Congressional Delegation.

POM–144. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Rockwood, Michigan relative to imported trash; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–145. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Vermont relative to the United Nations Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Whereas, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 15, 1979, and

Whereas, it became an international treaty on September 3, 1981, and by October 1986, 154 countries had consented to be bound by the Convention's provisions, and

Whereas, the Convention provides a comprehensive framework for challenging various forces that have created and sustained gender-based discrimination against one-half of the world's population, and

Whereas, the Convention banning discrimination against women guarantees women's rights across many fields, including employment, education, voting, nationality, marriage and divorce, health care and equality before the law, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont shares the goals of the Convention, namely affirming faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of all human beings and in the equal rights of women, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont has a history of supporting efforts to end gender-based employment discrimination and, in 1972, ratified the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution, and

Whereas, although women have made major gains throughout the 20th century in the struggle for equality in social, business, political, legal, health, educational and other fields, there remains much yet to be accomplished, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont recognizes the fact that other countries still engage in practices of gender apartheid—many African countries practice female genital mutilation; Afghanistan's Taliban militia does not permit women to work, go to school or even leave the confines of their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative, and are

prohibited from going to most hospitals or seeking care from male doctors, which leads to women and girls dying from easily treatable diseases; and sex tourism (the trafficking of women and girls) is practiced in Asia and is supported by organizations in the United States, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont recognizes the greatly increased interdependence of the people of the world in this age of the global village and global telecommunications, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont enacted a joint resolution urging the United States Congress to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which has not been ratified to date by the United States Congress, and

Whereas, the United States is one of only 22 countries that have not ratified the Convention, now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Vermont House of Representatives urges the United States Congress to consider ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to send a copy of this resolution to President Bill Clinton, Vice President Al Gore, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, U.S. Senator Jesse Helms, Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

POM–146. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to a national veterans cemetery in Idaho; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Whereas, Idaho is the only state in the nation without either a national veterans cemetery or a state veterans cemetery; and

Whereas, the majority of the states without a national cemetery are located in the Northwest; and

Whereas, only one of the six states bordering Idaho has a national cemetery; and

Whereas, Idaho is centrally located for a regional cemetery in the Northwest; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper that a grateful nation should provide a burial site within a reasonable distance from the homes of those Idahoans and others residing in the northwestern states who honorably served their country in a time of emergency.

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein*, That we respectfully and urgently request members of Idaho's congressional delegation to support funding for a national veterans cemetery in Idaho to serve veterans in the northwestern states, and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–147. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota relative to the Superior National Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, pursuant to the Organic, Enabling, and other acts relating to the establishment of the state of Minnesota, land commonly referred to as school trust land has been granted to the state of Minnesota for public school and other purposes and has been constitutionally accepted and dedicated by the citizens of the state for such purposes by applying these lands to the production of income for the state's permanent school fund, all as described in detail in Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, subdivision 2; and

Whereas, pursuant to the federal Enabling Act authorizing the establishment of the state of Minnesota, on an equal footing with the original 13 states, and the Constitution of Minnesota, by which the citizens of Minnesota accepted the terms and conditions of the Enabling Act, the ownership of navigable waters and their beds was transferred to the state of Minnesota, all as described in detail in Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, subdivision 1; and

Whereas, approximately 100,000 acres of state-owned land (mostly school grant land) and approximately 172,000 acres of state-owned waters, or a total of over 272,000 state-owned acres, make up one-quarter of the 1,078,000 acres that are included within that portion of the Superior National Forest that has been designated by Congress as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness; and

Whereas, the extraordinary nature of the land and waters located in this wilderness area has been described by the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals as follows in its decision in *State of Minnesota by Alexander* v. *Block*, 449 F. Supp. 1223 (D. Minn. 1980), 660 F.2d 1240 (8th Cir. 1981), Cert. denied 431 U.S. 939 (1982):

''The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is the largest wilderness area east of the Rocky Mountains and the second largest in our wilderness system. It is our Nation's only lakeland canoe wilderness—a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages which served as the highway of fur traders who followed water routes pioneered by Sioux and Chippewa Indians. Despite extensive logging, the BWCA still contains 540,000 acres of virgin forests, by far the largest such area in the eastern United States.

''This last remnant of the old 'northwoods' is remarkable not only for its lakes and virgin forests, but also for its wildlife. . . . [M]any western wilderness areas lack such complete food chains. This natural ecosystem is a valuable educational and scientific resource; it has been the focal point of important research in wildlife behavior, forest ecology, nutrient cycles, lake systems, and vegetation history.''; and

Whereas, within this wilderness that contains a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages and a land surface that is crowned with a forest which includes 540,000 acres of virgin or ''old growth'' timber that hosts unique plant and animal ecosystems such as that of the timber wolf, the state of Minnesota's school grant and other lands are scattered in a checkerboard fashion across the entire area, a consequence of the fact that the lands were granted almost entirely in Sections 16 and 36 in most townships in what now is designated as a federal wilderness; and

Whereas, as a consequence of decisions by the federal courts in the above cited case of State of Minnesota by Alexander v. Block, where the state unsuccessfully challenged the unilateral action by Congress of extending federal jurisdiction from federally owned land to state-owned water, the state's free exercise of authority over its state-owned lands and waters was severely diminished; and

Whereas, in the 18 years since the federal courts upheld this congressional extension of federal authority over state water, the only revenue earned on school and other state grant lands from wilderness users has been derived from a token campground reservation fee that is reappropriated for necessary campground maintenance and therefore adds nothing to the permanent school fund, the fund constitutionally established to support public schools of the state out of income derived from school and other grant land sale and natural resource management revenues; and

Whereas, continuance of state land ownership within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness not only defeats the purpose for which the state school grant lands were granted and dedicated, it also unnecessarily handicaps federal management duties relating to the wilderness area; and

Whereas, the Minnesota Constitution, article XI, sections 8 and 10, provide that school and other grant lands may be sold only at public auction or exchanged; and

Whereas, consolidation of federal land ownership within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness through an exchange of Superior National Forest land that is located outside the wilderness area for state land that is located within the wilderness area will mutually benefit both the federal and state governments by simplifying federal wilderness area management activities through efficiencies arising from single land ownership and by enabling the state to properly manage its school trust lands for the purposes for which these lands were granted and dedicated, as was first contemplated for these lands by the Minnesota legislature in the enactment of Laws 1917, chapter 448, which created the Minnesota state forests in the counties of Cook, Lake, and St. Louis, the first state forests established in Minnesota; and

Whereas, there appears, preliminarily, to be sufficient acreage of federal land that is located within the exterior boundaries of the Superior National Forest, exclusive of lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, to exchange for the high value state-owned school grant and other land inholdings located within the wilderness area; now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, By the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that Congress is requested to speedily enact laws that would expedite the exchange of federally owned land located within the Superior National Forest that lies outside of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for land owned by the state of Minnesota located within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and Be it Further *Resolved*, That in its deliberations concerning this request, Congress is requested to be especially cognizant that the legal title of the state of Minnesota to its school and other grant lands located within this wilderness area has been preserved, relatively unaltered, since being separated by grant from the federal public domain at statehood, and that the state of Minnesota's checkerboard land ownership pattern gives these lands a unique value because the lands are an integral part of what the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals recognized in State of Minnesota by Alexander v. Block as ''. . . our Nation's only lakeland canoe wilderness—a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages which served as the highway of fur traders . . .'' and which ''. . . still contains 540,000 acres of virgin [old growth] forests, by far the largest such area in the eastern United States.'' And

be it further *Resolved,* That Congress also be cognizant that the Minnesota Constitution, article XI, section 10, relating to the exchange of school grant and other state lands, requires the state to reserve mineral and water power rights in lands transferred by the state and, in addition, that Minnesota has never leased any state-owned minerals located on lands within the area that is federally designated as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and further, that since 1976, under Minnesota Statutes, section 84.523, state law prohibits, except when needed in a national emergency declared by Congress, the exploration and mining of state-owned minerals and the harvesting of state-owned peat, and Be it further

Resolved, That while the state of Minnesota is cognizant of the fact that Congress may authorize the federal government to acquire state-owned school grant and other lands by eminent domain proceedings brought in federal courts, a procedure which entails congressional appropriation of the substantial amount of money necessary to pay Minnesota the market value of these lands as approved by the federal courts, the state hereby affirms that the mutual best interests of both the federal and state governments are best served by land exchange as a solution to the long-standing problem of intermingled land ownership within the Superior National Forest, and Be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota is directed to prepare copies of this memorial and transmit them to the President of the United States, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the chair of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the chair of the House Committee on Resources, and to each of Minnesota's Senators and Representatives in Congress for the purpose of assisting those members in the discharge of duties imposed by Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, especially those duties set forth in subdivision 3 relating to land exchange.

POM–148. A petition from a citizen of the U.S. Virgin Islands relative to a shoppers visa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–149. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana relative to full funding of payments in lieu of taxes on federal land in Montana; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the stability of Montana's economy has historically been dependent on use of our abundant natural resources; and

Whereas, the natural resource harvest has contributed billions of dollars to Montana's economy by providing employment opportunities to members of our communities and by supporting our business communities; and

Whereas, revenue from industries related to natural resource harvest has produced taxes for the support of local and state governments; and

Whereas, the federal government has long recognized the importance of supporting local governments in counties where the United States controls management of public lands by reimbursing state and local governments by payments in lieu of taxes (PILT); and

Whereas, a variety of federal legislation, such as the Forest Reserve Act of 1890 sought to make equitable distribution to counties and to the education system of 25% of net proceeds derived by the sale of resources harvested on federal land; and

Whereas, the federal government is now reducing the volume of timber cut in relation to the allowable sale quotas (ASQ), redistributing funds historically contained in the 25% fund (outfitter fees), reducing its commitment to full funding of PILT, which was reduced from 100% in 1994 to 53% in 1998, and redefining its commitment to states and counties (a decoupling effort to overturn the 1890 Forest Reserve Act); and

Whereas, this effort has and will cause irreparable financial harm to state and local governments, our natural resource industries, and employment opportunities for Montanans.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana: That the legislature of the State of Montana petition the U.S. Congress to ensure a full commitment by the federal government to full funding of PILT, a commitment toward the proper harvest of the natural resource base by way of already adopted ASQ, and a renewal of its compact with states and local governments to contribute the federal government's fair share in taxes on land present in Montana but retained by the federal government, and

Resolved, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Western Governors' Association, and the Montana Congressional Delegation.

POM–150. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Midland, Texas relative to incentives for the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–151. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Midland, Texas relative to incentives for the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–152. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana relative to water resource policies and issues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the western states of the United States are critically dependent upon present and future water resources for their quality of life and economic base; and

Whereas, the western states are geographically, hydrologically, and economically diverse and distinct from each other and from the eastern states; and

Whereas, the western states have developed a customized system of water allocation under the prior appropriation doctrine in response to the arid conditions of the region; and

Whereas, water resources in many of the major interstate river basins in the West are apportioned and administered through interstate and other compacts or court decrees between two or more states; and

Whereas, there has been a long-standing policy of federal deference to the states in the areas of water resources administration, management, allocation, and protection; and

Whereas, the western states have extensive experience in managing water resources, both surface and ground water supplies, and recognize the importance of protecting their water resources for present and future beneficial uses; and

Whereas, all western states have a system of law for allocation of water rights, and there is broad consensus within the federal system that states should continue to have the exclusive responsibility to create and administer water rights; and

Whereas, state water law provides for public participation and is based upon the allocation, transfer, and protection of water resources in the public interest; and

Whereas, the number of federal agencies involved in some aspect of water policy or management continues to increase, adding duplication, confusion, and conflicting missions to the historic state systems; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress often considers legislation related to water resources management, some of which contains elements that could increase the federal role in water administration and conflict with the state's responsibility for water programs; now

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That Montana's Congressional Delegation be respectfully requested to advocate to the appropriate federal agencies that any new or revised federal legislation or policy should:

(1) Recognize that water resources administration, management, allocation, and protection are primarily the responsibility of the states and that federal policy should be supportive of this role of the western states;

(2) provides flexibility for states to continue to develop and refine water resource programs appropriate for their own circumstances, taking into consideration items such as hydrology, existing water rights, potential development of the area, interstate and other compact obligations, and the public interest;

(3) require all federal agencies to conduct their activities in accordance with, and in support of, state water resource programs and state water law; and

(4) recognize and cooperate with the states' prerogative and ability to manage, administer, and develop their water resources; be it

Further Resolved, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and the Montana Congressional Delegation.

POM–153. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Whereas, the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund was created in 1965 to provide matching funds to encourage and assist local and state government in urban and rural areas to develop parks and to ensure accessibility to local outdoor recreation resources; and

Whereas, the state of Idaho has invested more than $32 million in Federal Land and Water Conservation funds, which were matched by local and state funds, donated labor and materials, and community force accounts, to produce eighty percent of Idaho's local recreation facilities and nearly all of our state parks; and

Whereas, the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund was the primary source of funding for Idaho's greenbelts, exercise trails, neighborhood parks, swimming facilities, state parks, multipurpose sports fields, boating facilities, golf courses, camping areas, equestrian arenas, fishing accesses, zoo facilities, amphitheaters and scenic areas; and

Whereas, since 1980, Idaho's allocation of Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds

for grants has diminished from $1.9 million to its total elimination in 1995; and

Whereas, the elimination of Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund allocations has adversely affected Idaho's outdoor recreation infrastructure, greatly reduced the ability of Idaho's cities and counties to meet the needs of our rapidly increasing populations, and created a backlog of upgrades, renovations and repairs to outdoor recreation facilities exceed $270 million; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation provides important economic, social, personal and resources benefits to the citizens of Idaho; and

Whereas, it has been determined that four out of every five Americans utilize local and state government recreation and park services; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation reduces crime by providing positive alternatives and experiences for Idaho's citizens; and

Whereas, the United States Congress is currently considering various bills and amendments concerning stateside funding for the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund generated from Outer Continental Shelf oil royalties; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the First Regular Sessions of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass legislation reallocating funding to the states from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, be it

Further Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Dirk Kempthorne, Governor of the State of Idaho.

POM–154. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 4

Whereas, under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Managemenbt Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the United States Forest Service pays to counties through the state treasurer twenty-five percent of gross revenues from timber sales, grazing permits and leases, recreation fees, power line rights-of-way, special use permits and other programs; and

Whereas, the payments are made to states from each national forest, then are apportioned to counties according to the proportion of acreage of each national forest in each county; and

Whereas, counties have few sources of revenue and rely on these payments to maintain their public roads and their public schools; and

Whereas, the Forest Service payments have become unpredictable due to market fluctuations and the volatility of the public debate on timber harvests on national forests, and generally have declined because of reduced timber harvest on national forests; and

Whereas, demands on counties to provide good public roads and public schools have increased due to increases in resident population and tourism; and

Whereas, stabilizing payments required by the 1908 Forest Service law is essential for responsible fiscal planning by the counties; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, That we strongly support stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service to county governments through the state treasurer and urge our congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support legislation that will stabilize payments made by the United States Forest Service to the counties of the state of Idaho; be it

Further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–155. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 5

Whereas, under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Management Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the United States Forest Service pays to counties through the State Treasurer twenty-five percent of gross revenues from timber sales, grazing permits and leases, recreation fees, power line rights-of-way, special use permits and other programs; and

Whereas, the payments are made to states from each national forest, then are apportioned to counties according to the proportion of acreage of each national forest in each county; and

Whereas, the law mandates that these funds be used for public roads and public schools; and

Whereas, counties with large amounts of federal lands have few sources of revenue and rely on these payments to maintain their public roads and their public schools; and

Whereas, the Forest Service payments have become unpredictable due to forest planning processes over the past ten years that have reduced timber harvests on national forests; and

Whereas, demands on counties to provide necessary services such as good public roads, public schools, sanitation services, and search and rescue have increased; and

Whereas, stabilizing payments required by the 1908 Forest Service law is essential for responsible fiscal planning by the counties; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, That we strongly support stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service to county governments through the State Treasurer and urge our congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support legislation that will stabilize payments made by the United States Forest Service to the counties of the state of Idaho by increasing the annual timber harvest from federal lands within the state of Idaho to the allowable sales quantity levels outlined in the current forest plans and by increasing to fifty percent the amount of federal funds returned to the counties from the sale of federal timber under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Management Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act; be it

Further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM–156. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to the Appalachian Development Highway System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 523

Whereas, the construction of the Coalfields Expressway is anticipated to begin in 1999; and

Whereas, the estimated cost of completing the Coalfields Expressway is $1.5 billion; and

Whereas, through federal taxes on motor fuels and special fuels, motorists in the Commonwealth of Virginia contribute significantly to the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, the Appalachian Development Highway System was created by the United States Congress for the purpose of stimulating the economic development of the entire Appalachian Region and is now funded directly through the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, a recently completed study of the Appalachian Development Highway System concluded that, upon its completion, this system will provide the region through which it passes with 42,000 new jobs, 84,000 new residents, $2.9 billion in new wages, and $6.9 billion in value added business; and

Whereas, the Coalfields Expressway, when completed, will traverse a portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia characterized by chronic unemployment and pockets of intractable poverty; and

Whereas, the Coalfields Expressway is not presently a portion of the Appalachian Development Highway System, but receives its federal funding through special congressional appropriations made in unpredictable amounts at irregular intervals; and

Whereas, federal funding of the Coalfields Expressway to date consists of only two appropriations: one of $50 million in 1991 and another of $22.7 million in 1998; and

Whereas, inclusion of the Coalfields Expressway into the Appalachian Development Highway System would allow it to be funded more fully and more reliably; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Congress of the United States be urged to include the Coalfields Expressway in the Appalachian Development Highway System; and, be it

Resolved Further, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the Virginia General Assembly in this matter.

POM–157. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Inkster, Michigan relative to state and local land use zoning authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–158. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas, The economy of the State of Nevada is dependent upon tourism; and

Whereas, Canada and Mexico rank No. 1 and No. 7, respectively, among Nevada's sources of international tourism, sending more than 1.5 million Canadian visitors and more than 104,000 Mexican visitors to this state per year; and

Whereas, Visitors from Canada and Mexico comprise a major economic contribution to the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, the United States has entered into international trade agreements with its neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to foster, encourage and stimulate the exchange of goods and products for mutual economic gain; and

Whereas, The United States does not currently require departing tourists returning to Canada and Mexico to be stopped and identified at border crossings; and

Whereas, Section 100 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 requires that a new entry-exit control system be implemented to track all foreign visitors entering and leaving the United States but does not provide any law enforcement benefits; and

Whereas, The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 would impose new border inspection requirements for the gathering of data at entry and departure points for vehicular traffic from Canada and Mexico where none currently exist; and

Whereas, The new border entry-exit system does not provide for any enhancement of provisions for apprehending or removing illegal immigrants, drug traffickers, terrorists or other criminals and would not curtail illegal immigration at the borders; and

Whereas, No inspection stations or other facilities for departing foreign travelers have been constructed; and

Whereas, This system would be implemented at enormous expense to the taxpayers of the United States with no tangible benefits; and

Whereas, Congress has held hearings at various sites along the Canadian border to consider exempting that country from the provisions of the Act, but no such hearings have been held or are scheduled in the Mexican border states; and

Whereas, Mexican and Canadian tourists who enter the United States for business and recreational travel are not immigrants; and

Whereas, These nonimmigrant Mexican and Canadian business and leisure travelers who will already be required to present travel documents to enter the United States, would be subjected to inspections and queries upon departure that would cause travel delays and inconveniences to those tourists; and

Whereas, Such delays and inconveniences would discourage tourism in the United States by Mexican and Canadian citizens, delay commerce and create an economic downturn; and

Whereas, The borders with Canada and Mexico should be kept reasonably free of governmental over-involvement in order to encourage tourism, trade and legitimate economic activity that benefit all three countries; and

Whereas, The National Governors' Association at its meeting in Washington in February 1998 determined that the entry-exit control system may have ''unintended negative consequences on international trade, tourism and the economy''; and

Whereas, The National Governors' Association urged suspension of implementing the entry-exit control system until Congress and the President can ensure that any such system will not disrupt tourism, trade or other legitimate traffic entering the United States; and

Whereas, Congress passed legislation in October 1998 delaying imposition of the implementation of the provisions of Section 110 until March 31, 2001, but allowing the exit system to take effect at the airports of international entry in the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That Congress is hereby urged permanently to mitigate the consequences of the provisions of Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress is encouraged to keep the borders between the United States and Canada and Mexico reasonably free of governmental over-involvement and to impose no new restrictions until infrastructure is available that can collect data and detect illegal and unwanted immigration without disrupting legitimate tourist travel; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and approval.

POM–159. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan relative to prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 55

Whereas, The 48th Annual National Day of Prayer was observed on May 6, 1999, and the United States of America was founded by men and women with varied religious beliefs and ideals; and

Whereas, The First Amendment to the United States Constitution states that ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .,'' which means that the government is prohibited from establishing a state religion. However, no barriers shall be erected against the practice of any religion; and

Whereas, The establishment clause of the First Amendment was not drafted to protect Americans from religion, rather, its purpose was clearly to protect Americans from governmental mandates with respect to religion; and

Whereas, The Michigan Legislature strongly believes that reaffirming a right to voluntary, individual, unorganized, and nonmandated prayer in public schools is an important element of religious choice guaranteed by the Constitution, and will reaffirm those religious rights and beliefs upon which the nation was founded; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body memorialize the Congress of the United States to strongly support voluntary, individual, unorganized, and non-mandatory prayer in the public schools of this nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–160. A resolution adopted by the St. Francis Assisi Parish of Houston, Texas relative to capital punishment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–161. A resolution adopted by the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, D.C. relative to hate crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–162. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington relative to the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4012

To the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, Washington state contains a rich diversity of forests, rivers, seacoasts, grasslands, deserts, and other habitats, and an equally diverse population of fish and wildlife, all of which require by law some level of protection and responsible management by federal, state, and local agencies; and

Whereas, Washington state also contains a large number and variety of outstanding recreational facilities and opportunities, including three national parks, a national volcanic monument, one hundred twenty-five state parks, and many local parks, trails, water access areas, swimming pools, and sports fields; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation and wildlife enjoyment are important elements of the Northwest way of life. A large majority of Washington's residents and visitors actively pursue and enjoy a range of outdoor recreation activities, from active sports such as soccer, softball, swimming, and bicycling, to outdoor and wildlife-related pursuits such as hiking, camping, canoeing, and wildlife observation; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation and wildlife enjoyment are also important elements of Washington's economy. For example, a 1996 survey conducted by the United States fish and wildlife service showed that annual wildlife-related recreation expenditures exceeded one hundred billion dollars, almost three billion dollars spent in Washington state. Wildlife viewing alone accounts for more than twenty-one thousand jobs in Washington state; and

Whereas, Washington's population is one of the fastest-growing in the United States, with an even faster-growing public demand for wildlife conservation, wildlife-related recreation, and outdoor recreation facilities; and

Whereas, the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was created in 1965 to preserve, develop, and assure that all Americans have access to quality outdoor recreation. In the thirty years since its creation, LWCF has funded the acquisition of almost seven million acres of parkland, water resources, wildlife habitat open space, and the development of more than thirty-seven thousand state, municipal, and local parks and recreation projects. In recent years, LWCF funding for federal projects has been reduced by more than half and funding

for state projects has been entirely eliminated; and

Whereas, Washington and other states lack adequate, dedicated funding for fish and wildlife protection and management, especially for those species which are not hunted and fished and which are not listed as threatened or endangered. In 1980, Congress passed the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (P.L. 96–366) which was intended to address the protection and management of nonhunted wildlife species, but the act was never funded, leaving the entire responsibility to the states;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that Congress pass legislation to restore and revitalize federal funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Lands shall be open for public use and enjoyment. We pray that Congress create a new dedicated fund for state-level fish and wildlife management, which would be administered by the United States fish and wildlife service; be it

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

POM–163. A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, Ohio relative to the Ryan White Care Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

POM–164. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 219

Whereas, the State of Alaska received an increase in its Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) from 50 percent to 59.8 percent in consideration of the high cost of living in Alaska by an amendment to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, United States Senator Daniel K. Akaka, United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye, United States Representative Neil Abercrombie, and United States Representative Patsy T. Mink have recently introduced federal legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase Hawaii's FMAP in consideration of Hawaii's high cost of living; and

Whereas, federal financial participation for the medicaid program is based on the FMAP which is calculated according to a formula based on per capita income in the individual state in relation to the per capita income of the United States; and

Whereas, the FMAP is calculated as the quotient of the per capita income of the United States, times a multiplier, the state income is determined as a designated portion of the national income as determined at the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) and the per capita income of Hawaii is an amount that is derived at the BEA as a portion of national income statistics; and

Whereas, because of its island location and other factors, the cost of living in Hawaii greatly exceeds the cost of living in the mainland states, so that per capita income is a poor measure of its relative ability to bear the cost of medical services; and

Whereas, a study conducted by the Taubman Center for State and Local Government at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government and the Office of United States Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, established that if per capita income is measured in real terms, considering cost of living factors, Hawaii ranked 47th at $19,755 compared to the national average $24,231 and Alaska is ranked 34th with a real per capita income level of $21,592; and

Whereas, the Harvard/Moynihan study cites Hawaii with one of the highest poverty rates in the nation—Hawaii ranks eighth in the country with a poverty rate of 16.9 percent as compared to the national average of 14.7 percent—and on a per capita basis state revenues and expenditures are far higher in Hawaii, as well as Alaska, than in the other 48 mainland states, but Alaska's 10.6 percent poverty rate is lower than the national average, placing it 39th in the country; and

Whereas, Hawaii has not participated in the economic rebound that has benefited most of the rest of the nation in the past several years, in part because of its heavy dependence on international tourism and trade, and Hawaii continues to suffer from the drop in value in the Japanese yen, its unemployment rate is above the national average, and its tax revenues have fallen short of estimates; and

Whereas, based on Hawaii's current medicaid spending level of approximately $700 million, each percentage point increase in its FMAP rate would provide approximately $7 million annually in additional federal funds; and

Whereas, the State of Hawaii is seeking to have its medicaid program funded in dollars equal to its tax contributions based on its higher per capita income and one that recognizes its true costs, as was done for Alaska; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999 (the Senate concurring), That this body hereby urges the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services to support United States Senator Daniel K. Akaka, United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye, United States Representative Neil Abercrombie, and United States Representative Patsy T. Mink's federal legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase Hawaii's FMAP in consideration of our high cost of living; and be it further

Resolved That certified copies of the Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the members of the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

POM–165. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Vermont relative to Social Security; to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas, the purpose of Social Security is to provide a strong, simple and efficient form of basic insurance against the adversities of old age, disability and dependency, and

Whereas, for 60 years Social Security has provided a stable platform of retirement, disability and survivor annuity benefits to protect working Americans and their dependents, and

Whereas, the costs to administer Social Security are less than one percent of the benefits delivered, and

Whereas, the American and world economies continue to encounter periods of high uncertainty and volatility that make it as important as ever to preserve a basic and continuing safety net of protections guaranteed by our society's largest guarantor of risk, the federal government, and

Whereas, Social Security affords protections to rich and poor alike and no citizen, no matter how well-off today, can foretell tomorrow's adversities, and

Whereas, average life expectancies are increasing and people are commonly living into their 80's and 90's, making it more important than ever that each of us be fully protected by defined retirement benefits, and

Whereas, medical scientists are continually developing new ways to maintain and enhance the lives of people with severe disabilities, thus making it more important that each of us to be protected against the risk of dependency, institutionalization and impoverishment, and

Whereas, the lives of wage earners and their spouses are seldom coterminous; one often outlives the other by decades, making it crucial to preserve a secure base of protection for children and other family members dependent on a wage earner who may die or become disabled, and

Whereas, Social Security, in current form, reinforces family cohesiveness and enhances the value of work in our society, and

Whereas, Congress currently has proposals to shift a portion of Social Security contributions from insurance to personal investment accounts for each wage earner, and

Whereas, Social Security, our largest and most fundamental insurance system, cannot fulfill its protective function if it is splintered into individualized stock accounts and must create and manage millions of small risk-bearing investments out of a stream of contributions intended as insurance, and

Whereas, private accounts cannot be substituted for Social Security without eroding basic protections for working families, since such protections, to be strong, must be insulated from economic uncertainty and be backed by the entity best capable of spreading risk, the federal government, and

Whereas, the diversion of contributions to private investment accounts would dramatically increase financial shortfalls to the Social Security trust fund and require major reductions in the defined benefits upon which millions of Americans depend, and

Whereas, to administer 150 million separate investment accounts would require a larger bureaucracy, and the resulting expense and the cost of converting each account to an annuity upon retirement would consume much of the profit or exacerbate the loss realized by each participant, and

Whereas, the question of whether part of the Social Security Trust Fund should be diversified into investments other than government bonds so that, while still invested collectively at low expense, returns may be increased, thus enhancing the capacity of the fund to meet its obligations to pay benefits while spreading the risk across the entire spectrum of Social Security participants, is entirely different from that of splintering its millions of accounts, and

Whereas, creating an array of winners and losers would be contrary to the basic principles of insurance and risk distribution, thus defeating the purpose of this part of our retirement system, and

Whereas, Congress amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide a full menu of provisions that enables working Americans and their employers to voluntarily contribute to tax-sheltered accounts that are open to the opportunities and exposed to the risks of investment markets, diverting Social Security contributions to private accounts duplicates existing programs, and

Whereas, such recently created systems now cover half of American families, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the General Assembly respectfully and strongly urges Congress not to enact laws that might tend to diminish or undermine a unified and stable Social Security system, and be it further

Resolved, That laws to encourage workers and their employers to save or invest for retirement should supplement and not substitute for the basic benefits of Social Security insurance that are vital to American working families, and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

POM–166. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee relative to the reindustrialization of the East Tennessee Technology Park; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–167. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland Heights, Ohio relative to the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–168. A joint resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of Nevada relative to surface mining regulations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19—

Whereas, Mining is of critical importance to Nevada and its rural communities as a significant contributor to this state's economy; and

Whereas, The ''Nevada model'' of regulating the mineral industry is known and respected industrywide because it balances the global needs for natural resources with related environmental concerns and the economic needs of private business, thereby resulting in an environmentally healthy state with a viable and responsible mineral industry that uses state-of-the-art technology; and

Whereas, Surface mining regulations governing hardrock mining operations and mineral exploration activities on public lands are codified in Part 3809 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations and are commonly referred to as ''3809 Regulations''; and

Whereas, The Bureau of Land Management initiated the revision of these regulations in January 1997; and

Whereas, In response to concerns raised by the Western Governor's Association and a group of 15 United States Senators, including Nevada Senators Harry Reid and Richard H. Bryan, Congress included language in the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998 to require a detailed, comprehensive study by the National Academy of Science of the environmental and reclamation requirements for mining on federal lands and the adequacy of those requirements to prevent undue degradation, and prohibited final revision to the 3809 Regulations before September 30, 1999; and

Whereas, Contrary to the requirements of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, the Secretary of the Interior is moving forward with revisions to the 3809 Regulations and to the Environmental Impact Statement; and

Whereas, Under the Bureau of Land Management's most recent revisions, every western state, including Nevada, may be faced with the choice of either expending substantial resources to revise its regulations to conform with the new requirements of the Bureau of Land Management or having the successful programs of the State of Nevada, which have been carefully tested and enforced over the years, simply cease to be operative on public lands, thereby imposing significantly detrimental impacts on the mineral industry and the State of Nevada; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature do hereby urge the Secretary of the Interior to comply with the intent of Congress as stated in the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998 which requires a study of the issue by the National Academy of Sciences and prohibits final revision of 43 C.F.R. Part 3809, the 3809 Regulations, before September 30, 1999; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature strongly supports Alternative 1, the ''No Action'' alternative, as described in the draft Environmental Impact Statement on Surface Management Regulations and Locatable Mineral Operations, to maintain the existing 3809 Regulations without revision or modification; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and approval.

POM–169. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska relative to the use of phosphide gas in grain storage; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 43

Whereas, Nebraska's agricultural heritage and economy is dependent upon the harvest, storage, and transportation of grain; and

Whereas, there are 357 grain elevators with 663 million bushels of storage and 55,000 farms with 1.02 billion bushels of storage in Nebraska; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators are valued neighbors to and located in close proximity to homes, schools, farms, and businesses in most of all Nebraska's communities; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators, feed mills, processors, and growers are committed to protecting the health and safety of applicators and workers and to the well-being of the public; and

Whereas, grain elevators are located in Nebraska communities near railroads and highways to facilitate the transportation of grain; and

Whereas, Nebraska is a leader in the nation and in the world in grain production; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators, feed mills, processors, and growers are committed to producing an adequate, safe, and high quality food supply for domestic and world consumers; and

Whereas, treaties and established trade relations may require pest-controlled grain before grain can be exported; and

Whereas, insect pests in grain without fumigation treatment could create health risks and reduce the quality of the grain marketed from Nebraska; and

Whereas, aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas are cost-effective fumigants used both by commercial elevators and farmers in the storage of grains in Nebraska; and

Whereas, the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) acknowledges few, if any, viable alternatives to the use of aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas exist for fumigation to control pests in stored grain; and

Whereas, the current label restrictions for aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas provide for the safe and effective use of the product; and

Whereas, the State of Nebraska practices rigorous enforcement of the label restrictions on fumigants, ensures adequate training of certified applicators, and conducts a fumigation and grain storage project to inspect the use of fumigants; and

Whereas, restrictions in the use of fumigants in grain storage and transport should be based only on sound scientific reasoning, available technology, and analysis of risk level and avoid raising undue public alarm over unsubstantiated or inconsequential risk: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the ninety-sixty legislature of Nebraska, first session, That the Congress of the United States direct the federal Environmental Protection Agency to curtail implementation of new restrictions from its Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) on phosphide gas that would require a 500-foot buffer zone and other restrictions that effectively preclude the use of aluminum or magnesium phosphide in most of Nebraska's grain storage facilities and grain transportation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States direct the Federal Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that risk mitigation allowances for aluminum or magnesium phosphide are clearly demonstrated as necessary to protect human health, are based upon sound science and reliable information, are economically and operationally reasonable, and will permit the use of these products in accordance with the label.

POM–170. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado relative to a pay increase for Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 99–005

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment to the constitution of the United States, also known as ''The Madison Amendment'', provides that ''No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.''; and

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment requires that an intervening election be held between the enactment of any congressional pay increase and its subsequent application to any member of Congress; and

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment's requirement for an intervening election is intended to allow voters in each state and congressional district to obtain direct information regarding salary increases prior to the reelection of incumbents or the election of others in their stead; and

Whereas, Salary increases for members of Congress currently are regulated by ''The Government Ethics Reform Act of 1989,'' (''The Act'') pursuant to 2 U.S.C. sec. 31; and

Whereas, The Act gives members of Congress an immediate one-time salary increase and, in subsequent years, an annual cost of living adjustment increase to salaries or pensions; and

Whereas, Such annual cost of living adjustment is established in accordance with federal law and incorporated in an executive

order of the President in December of each year to establish salary increases that are put into effect on January 1 of the next year; and

Whereas, Through the automatic operation of the cost of living adjustment provisions, congressional salaries have been increased on the first day of January for several years; and

Whereas, Without the action of legislation, each Congress effectively and automatically enacts for itself a cost of living adjustment salary increase in violation of the twenty-seventh amendment; and

Whereas, When each year's cost of living adjustment increase is paid on the following January 1 to members of Congress, former members, or spouses of deceased members without the process of an intervening election, the twenty-seventh amendment is violated; now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the General Assembly hereby expresses its opposition to automatic annual cost of living adjustment salary increases for members of Congress of the United States as violative of the twenty-seventh amendment to the United States Constitution and hereby memorializes the Congress to refrain from enacting any pay increase for members of Congress without an affirmative vote or that takes effect before the following Congress has been elected and fully sworn into office; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Congressional delegation representing the state of Colorado.

POM–171. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington relative to immigration laws, policies and practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4015

To the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) represent the most dramatic changes in immigration law in more than 30 years; and

Whereas, These acts mandate that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) arrest, detain, and deport large segments of the United States immigrant population and the implementation of these laws has had far-reaching effects, including unnecessary financial burdens on the state's legal, social, and welfare systems; and

Whereas, The United States has long been known as a nation of immigrants, as a champion of human rights for all peoples, and as a country that holds justice and equality under the law among its highest ideals, especially equal justice under law; and

Whereas, Immigrant detainees may have been legal permanent residents who have lived almost their entire lives in the United States, served in the United States military, have a United States citizen spouse, or have United States citizen children; and

Whereas, Detainees, including women and children, are frequently in INS custody for periods longer than seventy-two hours and are especially vulnerable within the INS system; and

Whereas, Families consisting of both legal and illegal family members are often divided causing not only emotional and psychological hardship when mothers are separated from their children, but also financial difficulties resulting in increased welfare rolls when primary wage earners are removed from their jobs;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the President, the Congress, and the appropriate agencies continue to look closely at current immigration law and INS policies and practices, and that necessary changes be made so that problems surrounding immigration may be resolved as soon as possible; and be it

Resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of Congress from the State of Washington, Doris Meissner, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Gary Locke, the Governor of the State of Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 323. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park and establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–69).

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1009. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

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 Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1188. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the provision of classroom-related technology training for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1188. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the provision of classroom-related technology training for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

TEACHER TECHNOLOGY TRAINING ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help teachers use technology in their teaching, the Teacher Technology Training Act of 1999.

This bill has three major provisions:

It authorizes $500 million for state education departments to award grants to local public school districts on the basis of need to train teachers in how to use technology in the classroom.

It specifies that grants may be used to strengthen instruction and learning, provide professional development, and pay the costs of teacher training in using technology in the classroom.

It requires the Secretary of Education to evaluate the technology training programs for teachers developed by school districts within three years.

I am introducing this bill because teachers say they need to learn how to use computers and other technology in their teaching. In a 1998 survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, only 20 percent of teachers said they felt ''well prepared'' to integrate educational technology into instruction.

Furthermore, the training that does exist for these teachers is inadequate. In the same Department of Education survey, among full-time, public school teachers, 78 percent said they had participated in professional development programs on using educational technology in their instruction, but only 23 percent of those teachers said they felt ''well prepared'' in this area. Of the teachers who report having received some training, 40 percent felt that it had improved their classroom teaching only ''somewhat'' or ''not at all.'' This is unacceptable. What we see now is that in many schools the students know more about how to use computers than the teachers do. In one Kentucky school profiled by Inside Technology Training magazine, the students run the school's computer systems. The article quoted the school district's technology coordinator as saying that the students had ''long surpassed'' what the teachers could do and reported that one student had recently trained twenty teachers on software for Web page construction (''Fast Times at Kentucky High,'' Inside Technology Training, June 1998).

I see this problem in my own state. A report by the Los Angeles County Office of Education in 1996 found that in Los Angeles County, nearly half of the teachers had no experience with computers or had only limited familiarity with word processing software. According to a 1998 report by the California Teachers Association, teachers in California rank training in the use of new technology fourth among eighteen

changes they believe could most improve public education. Forty-five percent of the teachers surveyed said more technology training would greatly improve conditions for teaching and learning (CTA for the Next Century, 1998).

It is crucial that we given students the opportunity to become familiar with technology in their classrooms because post-high school education and most good jobs require experience using computers. U.S. Commerce Secretary William M. Daley has said, ''Opportunities are now dependent upon a person's ability to use computers and engage in using the Internet'' (CQ Weekly, ''Digital Haves and Have Nots,'' April 17, 1999). In my state, a 1997 Rand report found that there is currently a shift in the state's economy away from manufacturing and toward higher-skill service and technology industries, and employers are placing a higher premium on the computer skills necessary for these positions (Immigration in a Changing Economy, Rand, 1997). Students are better educated when their teachers are well trained. We cannot prepare students for the increasingly technological workplace without trained teachers.

We have made great efforts to make technology available to students in their classrooms, and now we have a national student to computer ratio of 10 to 1. Seventy-eight percent of our nation's schools have Internet access. These are good first steps.

But also essential is having teachers and students use all this technology in their day-to-day classroom activities when it can enhance learning. This will not happen until teachers are trained in how to include technology in their instruciton.

One teacher expressed her frustration in an article in the National School Boards Association's Electronic School magazine:

> Most teachers have no model to show them the advantages of hooking up to the projects available on the Internet. And shrinking school budgets don't provide nearly enough money to train teachers in new or visionary techniques. Meanwhile, we can't escape the magazine and newspaper articles touting the Information Superhighway and heralding new ways of responding to, using, and learning information in our society. Well, who most needs to learn to traverse this road successfully? Society future leaders—and their teachers (Electronic School, ''Going Global,'' February 1995).

I agree.

Our teachers are not prepared to use technology in their classrooms. Students need to learn to use modern technology and it can help them learn. If we are expecting teachers to use up-to-date methods and tools, we must train them to do so. This bill will provide some of the funds needed to do that.

By introducing this bill I am not suggesting that technology is a cure-all for the problems in our schools. Technology is one of many teaching and learning tools. It can bring some efficiencies to learning, for example, providing a new way to do math and spelling drills or keeping students engaged in learning while a teacher works with other students who need extra help. It can also be an important research tool by providing easy access to information that, without a computer, is not easily available.

We expect a great deal from our teachers and students. We must give them the resources they need. This bill is one step.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 216, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the use of foreign tax credits under the alternative minimum tax.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) 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. 337

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to preserve the balance of rights between employers, employees, and labor organizations which is fundamental to our system of collective bargaining while preserving the rights of workers to organize, or otherwise engage in concerted activities protected under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor 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. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459 a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor 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. 541

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make certain changes related to payments for graduate medical education under the medicare program.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage depletion allowance for certain hardrock mines, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims.

S. 625

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) 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 Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) 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. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals are being significantly reduced, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor 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 Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) 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. 740

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the hydroelectric licensing process by granting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission statutory authority to better coordinate participation by other agencies and entities, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to combat nursing home fraud and abuse, increase protections for victims of telemarketing fraud, enhance safeguards for pension plans and health care benefit programs, and enhance penalties for crimes against seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 784

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 880

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to remove flammable fuels from the list of substances with respect to which reporting and other activities are required under the risk management plan program.

S. 897

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S.897, a bill to provide matching grants for the construction, renovation and repair of school facilities in areas affected by Federal Activities, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a permanent tax incentive for research and development, and for other purposes.

S. 1003

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased tax incentives for the purchase of alternative fuel and electric vehicle, and for other purposes.

S. 1010

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1010, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a medical innovation tax credit for clinical testing research expenses attributable to academic medical centers and other qualified hospital research organizations.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1023, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1053, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999.

S. 1066

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1067

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to promote the adoption of children with special needs.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for qualified individual for bone mass measurement (bone density testing) to prevent fractures associated with osteoporosis.

S. 1110

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. LOTT, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1128, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers, to provide for a carryover basis at death, and to establish a partial capital gains exclusion for inherited assets.

S 1148

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1148, a bill to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project, and for other purposes.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1150, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment.

S. 1177

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1177, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to permit the harvesting of crops on land subject to conservation reserve contracts for recovery of biomass used in energy production.

S. 1187

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 34, a resolution designating the week beginning April 30, 1999, as ''National Youth Fitness Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 59

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 59, a resolution designating both July 2, 1999, and July 2, 2000, as ''National Literacy Day.''

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

BOXER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 541

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1122) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 8106, and insert the following:

SEC. 8106. Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the inventory and status of operational support aircraft, Commander-in-Chief support aircraft, and command support aircraft of the Department of Defense. The report shall include a detailed discussion of the requirements for such aircraft, the foreseeable future requirements for such aircraft, the cost of leasing such aircraft, commercial alternatives to use of such aircraft, the cost of maintaining the aircraft, the capability and appropriateness of the aircraft to fulfill mission requirements, and the relevancy of the missions of the aircraft to warfighting requirements.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 542

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . In addition to any funds appropriated elsewhere in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $9,000,000 is hereby appropriated only for the Army Test Ranges and Facilities program element.''

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 543

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Navy'', is hereby reduced by $26,840,000 and the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', is hereby increased by $51,840,000 to reflect the transfer of the Joint Warfighting Experimentation program: provided, That none of the funds provided for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program may be obligated until the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reports to the Congressional defense committees on the role and participation of all unified and specified commands in the JWEP.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 544

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense, $23,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, that the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $23,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 545

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . In addition to the funds available in Title III, $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for U–2 cockpit modifications.

Y2K ACT

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 546

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 96) to regulate commerce between and among the several States by providing for the orderly resolution of disputes arising out of computer-based problems related to processing data that includes a 2-digit expression of that year's date; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY FOR A Y2K ACTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consent is given to join the United States as a necessary party defendant in a Y2K action.

(b) JURISDICTION AND REVIEW.—The United States, when a party to any Y2K action—

(1) shall be deemed to have waived any right to plead that it is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty;

(2) shall be subject to judgments, orders, and decrees of the court having jurisdiction; and

(3) may obtain review thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. EDWARDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', $63,041,000 shall be available for C–5 aircraft modernization.

GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 548

Mr. GREGG proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) for emergency support of refugees and displaced persons and the local communities directly affected by the influx of refugees may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 549–450

Mr. BYRD proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 549

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'' for the Office of the Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Gulf War Illnesses, $10,000,000 shall be available for carrying out the first-year actions under the 5-year research plan outlined in the report entitled ''Department of Defense Strategy to Address Low-Level Exposures to Chemical Warfare Agents (CWAs)'', dated May 1999, that was submitted to committees of Congress pursuant to section 247(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1957).

AMENDMENT NO. 550

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', $51,250,000 shall be available for the Information System Security Program, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other act may be made available for reconstruction activities in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of Kosovo) as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

INHOFE AMENDMENT NO. 552

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

SEC. . The Department of the Army is directed to conduct a live fire, side-by-side operational test of the air-to-air Starstreak and air-to-air Stinger missiles from the AH–64D Longbow helicopter. The operational test is to be completed utilizing funds provided for in this bill in addition to funding provided for this purpose in the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–262): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department is to ensure that the development, procurement or integration of any missile for use on the AH–64 or RAH–66 helicopters, as an air-to-air missile, is subject to a full and open competition which includes the conduct of a live-fire, side-by-side test as an element of the source selection criteria: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition & Technology) will conduct an independent review of the need, and the merits of acquiring an air-to-air missile to provide self-protection for the AH–64 and RAH–66 from the threat of hostile forces. The Secretary is to provide his findings in a report to the Defense Oversight Committees, no later than March 31, 2000.

MACK AMENDMENTS NOS. 553–555

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MACK) proposed three amendments to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 553

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $6,000,000 may be made available for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system.

AMENDMENT NO. 554

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for electronic propulsion systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 555

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', up to $5,000,000 may be made available for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar.

BURNS AMENDMENT NO. 556

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill the following:

''SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army''; up to $6,000,000 may be provided to the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory to continue research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems.''

MCCONNELL AMENDMENT NO. 557

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY'', up to $13,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the MK-45 weapon system, and up to $19,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the Close In Weapon System.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 558

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Army'', up to $1,500,000 may be available for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System.

BENNETT AMENDMENT NO. 559

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BENNETT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new general provisions:

SEC. . Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force', up to $1,000,000 may be made available only for alternative missile engine source development.

HOLLINGS AMENDMENT NO. 560

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative.

REID AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follow:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', up to $4,500,000 may be made available for a hot gas decontamination facility.

LIEBERMAN AMENDMENT NO. 562

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Defense Health Program'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to support the establishment of a DOD Center for Medical Informatics.

REID AMENDMENT NO. 563

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS'', up to $2,800,000 may be made available for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System.

KERREY AMENDMENT NO. 564

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KERREY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to continue and expand on-going work in recombinant vaccine research against biological warfare agents.

LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 565

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) The purpose of this section is to provide means for the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, to furnish fire protection through the City's municipal fire department for the tenants, including the Coast Guard, and property at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, thereby enhancing the City's capability for furnishing safety services that is a fundamental capability necessary for encouraging the economic development of Military Ocean Terminal.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, convey without consideration to the Bayonne Local Redevelopment Authority, Bayonne, New Jersey, and to the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, jointly, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the firefighting equipment described in subsection (c).

(c) The equipment to be conveyed under subsection (b) is firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, as follows:

(1) Pierce Dash 2000 Gpm Pumper, manufactured September 1995.

(2) Pierce Arrow 100-foot Tower Ladder, manufactured February 1994.

(3) Pierce HAZMAT truck, manufactured 1993.

(4) Ford E–350, manufactured 1992.

(5) Ford E–302, manufactured 1990.

(6) Bauer Compressor, Bauer–UN 12–E#5000psi, manufactured November 1989.

(d) The conveyance and delivery of the property shall be at no cost to the United States.

(e) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 566

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding).

DOMENICI AMENDMENTS NOS. 567–568

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 567

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $5,000,000 may be available for Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $7,500,000 may be made available for GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program.

WYDEN (AND SMITH) AMENDMENT NO. 569

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $4,000,000 may be available solely for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 570

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', up to $20,000,000 may be made available for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research and development efforts.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 571

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On line 22, page 97, insert the following:

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 572

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . From within the funds provided for the Defense Acquisition University, up to $5,000,000 may be spent on a pilot program using state-of-the-art training technology that would train the acquisition workforce in a simulated government procurement environment.

INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 573

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following:

SEC. . During the current fiscal year, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management and humanitarian assistance: *Provided*, That not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the training of foreign personnel conducted under this authority during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under the section: *Provided further*, That the report shall specify the countries in which the training was conducted, the type of training conducted, and the foreign personnel trained.

HUTCHISON (AND GRAMM) AMENDMENT NO. 574

Mr. STEVENS (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. GRAMM)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to evaluate and demonstrate methods for more efficient operation of military installations through improved capital asset management and greater reliance on the public or private sector for less-costly base support services, where available.

(b) AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may carry out at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, a demonstration project to be known as the ''Base Efficiency Project'' to improve mission effectiveness and reduce the cost of providing quality installation support at Brooks Air Force Base.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the Project in consultation with the Community to the extent the Secretary determines such consultation is necessary and appropriate.

(3) The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other authority vested in or delegated to the Secretary, and the Secretary may exercise any authority or combination of authorities provided under this section or elsewhere to carry out the purposes of the Project.

(c) EFFICIENT PRACTICES.—(1) The Secretary may convert services at or for the benefit of the Base from accomplishment by military personnel or by Department civilian employees (appropriated fund or non-appropriated fund), to services performed by contract or provided as consideration for the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of property.

(2) Notwithstanding section 2462 of title 10, United States Code, a contract for services may be awarded based on ''best value'' if the Secretary determines that the award will advance the purposes of a joint activity conducted under the Project and is in the best interest of the Department.

(3) Notwithstanding that such services are generally funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large, the Secretary may contract for public services at or for the benefit of the Base in exchange for such consideration, if any, the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(4)(A) The Secretary may conduct joint activities with the Community, the State, and any private parties or entities on or for the benefit of the Base.

(B) Payments or reimbursements received from participants for their share of direct and indirect costs of joint activities, including the costs of providing, operating, and maintaining facilities, shall be in an amount and type determined to be adequate and appropriate by the Secretary.

(C) Such payments or reimbursements received by the Department shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(d) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary may lease real or personal property located on the Base to any lessee upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and in the interest of the United States, if the Secretary determines that the lease would facilitate the purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a lease under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) A lease under this subsection—

(A) may be for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary to accomplish the goals of the Project; and

(B) may give the lessee the first right to purchase the property if the lease is terminated to allow the United States to sell the property under any other provision of law.

(4)(A) The interest of a lessee of property leased under this subsection may be taxed by the State or the Community.

(B) A lease under this subsection shall provide that, if and to the extent that the leased property is later made taxable by State governments or local governments under Federal law, the lease shall be renegotiated.

(5) The Department may furnish a lessee with utilities, custodial services, and other base operation, maintenance, or support services, in exchange for such consideration, payment, or reimbursement as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(6) All amounts received from leases under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(7) A lease under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, other than subsection (b)(1) of that section.

(B) Section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b).

(C) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(e) PROPERTY DISPOSAL.—(1) The Secretary may sell or otherwise convey or transfer real and personal property located at the Base to the Community or to another public or private party during the Project, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a sale or other conveyance or transfer or property under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) The sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2693 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)

(4) Cash payments received as consideration for the sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(f) LEASEBACK OF PROPERTY LEASED OR DISPOSED.—(1) The Secretary may lease, sell, or otherwise convey or transfer real property at the Base under subsections (b) and (e), as applicable, which will be retained for use by the Department or by another military department or other Federal agency, if the lessee, purchaser, or other grantee or transferee of the property agrees to enter into a leaseback to the Department in connection with the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of one or more portions or all of the property leased, sold, or otherwise conveyed or transferred, as applicable.

(2) A leaseback of real property under this subsection shall be an operating lease for no more than 20 years unless the Secretary of Defense determines that a longer term is appropriate.

(3)(A) Consideration, if any, for real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection shall be in such form and amount as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) The Secretary may use funds in the Project Fund or other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department for use at the Base for payment of any such cash rent.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department or other military department or other Federal agency using the real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection may construct and erect facilities on or otherwise improve the leased property using funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department or other military department or other Federal agency for such purpose. Funds available to the Department for such purpose include funds in the Project Fund.

(g) CONSIDERATION.—(1) The Secretary shall determine the nature, value, and adequacy of consideration required or offered in exchange for a lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of real or personal property or for other actions taken under the Project.

(2) Consideration may be in cash or in-kind or any combination thereof. In-kind consideration may include the following:

(A) Real property.

(B) Personal property.

(C) Goods or services, including operation, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of any property or facilities (including non-appropriated fund facilities).

(D) Base operating support services.

(E) Construction or improvement of Department facilities.

(F) Provision of facilities, including office, storage, or other usable space, for use by the Department on or off the Base.

(G) Public services.

(3) Consideration may not be for less than the fair market value.

(h) PROJECT FUND.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the ''Base Efficiency Project Fund'' into which all cash rents, proceeds, payments, reimbursements, and other amounts from leases, sales, or other conveyances or transfers, joint activities, and all other actions taken under the Project shall be deposited. All amounts deposited into the Project Fund are without fiscal year limitation.

(2) Amounts in the Project Fund may be used only for operation, base operating support services, maintenance, repair, construction, or improvement of Department facilities, payment of consideration for acquisitions of interests in real property (including payment of rentals for leasebacks), and environmental protection or restoration, in addition to or in combination with other amounts appropriated for these purposes.

(3) Subject to generally prescribed financial management regulations, the Secretary shall establish the structure of the Project Fund and such administrative policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary to account for and control deposits into and disbursements from the Project Fund effectively.

(4) All amounts in the Project Fund shall be available for use for the purposes authorized in paragraph (2) at the Base, except that the Secretary may redirect up to 50 per cent of amounts in the Project Fund for such uses at other installations under the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary as the Secretary determines necessary and in the best interest of the Department.

(i) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—(1)(A) Any Federal agency, its contractors, or its grantees shall pay rent, in cash or services, for the use of facilities or property at the Base, in an amount and type determined to be adequate by the Secretary.

(B) Such rent shall generally be the fair market rental of the property provided, but in any case shall be sufficient to compensate the Base for the direct and overhead costs incurred by the Base due to the presence of the tenant agency on the Base.

(2) Transfers of real or personal property at the Base to other Federal agencies shall be at fair market value consideration. Such consideration may be paid in cash, by appropriation transfer, or in property, goods, or services.

(3) Amounts received from other Federal agencies, their contractors, or grantees, including any amounts paid by appropriation transfer, shall be deposited in the Project Fund.

(j) ACQUISITION OF INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Secretary may acquire any interest in real property in and around the Community that the Secretary determines will advance the purposes of the Project.

(2) The Secretary shall determine the value of the interest in the real property to be acquired and the consideration (if any) to be offered in exchange for the interest.

(3) The authority to acquire an interest in real property under this subsection includes authority to make surveys and acquire such interest by purchase, exchange, lease, or gift.

(4) Payments for such acquisitions may be made from amounts in the Project Fund or from such other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department for such purposes.

(k) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to transactions at the Base during the Project.

(2)(A) Not later than March 1 each year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on any transactions at the Base during the preceding fiscal year that would be subject to such section 2662, but for paragraph (1).

(B) The report shall include a detailed cost analysis of the financial savings and gains realized through joint activities and other actions under the Project authorized by this section and a description of the status of the Project.

(l) LIMITATION.—None of the authorities in this section shall create any legal rights in any person or entity except rights embodied in leases, deeds, or contracts.

(m) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to enter into a lease, deed, permit, license, contract, or other agreement under this section shall expire on September 30, 2004.

(n) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Project'' means the Base Efficiency Project authorized by this section.

(2) The term ''Base'' means Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

(3) The term ''Community'' means the City of San Antonio, Texas.

(4) The term ''Department'' means the Department of the Air Force.

(5) The term ''facility'' means a building, structure, or other improvement to real property (except a military family housing

unit as that term is used in subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code).

(6) The term ''joint activity'' means an activity conducted on or for the benefit of the Base by the Department, jointly with the Community, the State, or any private entity, or any combination thereof.

(7) The term ''Project Fund'' means the Base Efficiency Project Fund established by subsection (h).

(8) The term ''public services'' means public services (except public schools, fire protection, and police protection) that are funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large.

(9) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a civilian official of the Department appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(10) The term ''State'' means the State of Texas.

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 575

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', $4,000,000 shall be made available for the Advanced Integrated Helmet System Program.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 576

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

Office of Net Assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the United States Pacific Command, shall submit a report to Congress no later than 180 days after the enactment of this act which addresses the following issues:

1. A review and evaluation of the operational planning and other preparations of the U.S. Defense Department, including but not limited to the U.S. Pacific Command, to implement the relevant sections of the Taiwan Relations Act since its enactment in 1979.

2. A review and evaluation of all gaps in relevant knowledge about the current and future military balance between Taiwan and mainland China, including but not limited to Chinese open source writings.

3. A set of recommendations, based on these reviews and evaluations, concerning further research and analysis that the Office of Net Assessment and the Pacific Command believe to be necessary and desirable to be performed by the National Defense University and other defense research centers.

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 106, line 4, strike ''The Communications Act'' and insert ''(a) The Communications Act of 1934''.

On page 107, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(b)(1) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report which shall—

(A) set forth the anticipated schedule (including specific dates) for—

(i) preparing and conducting the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a); and

(ii) depositing the receipts of the competitive bidding process;

(B) set forth each significant milestone in the rulemaking process with respect to the competitive bidding process;

(C) include an explanation of the effect of each requirement in subsection (a) on the schedule for the competitive bidding process and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) when compared with the schedule for the competitive bidding and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) that would otherwise have occurred under section 337(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(b)(2)) if not for the enactment of subsection (a);

(D) set forth for each spectrum auction held by the Federal Communications Commission since 1993 information on—

(i) the time required for each stage of preparation for the auction;

(ii) the date of the commencement and of the completion of the auction;

(iii) the time which elapsed between the date of the completion of the auction and the date of the first deposit of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(iv) the dates of all subsequent deposits of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(E) include an assessment of how the stages of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a), including preparation, commencement and completion, and deposit of receipts, will differ from similar stages in the auctions referred to in subparagraph (D).

(2) Not later than October 5, 2000, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report which shall—

(A) describe the course of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a) through September 30, 2000, including the amount of any receipts from the competitive bidding process deposited in the Treasury as of September 30, 2000; and

(B) if the course of the competitive bidding process has included any deviations from the schedule set forth under paragraph (1)(A), an explanation for such deviations from the schedule.

(3) The Federal Communications Commission may not consult with the Director in the preparation and submittal of the reports required of the Commission by this subsection.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

ROBERTS AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998 AND INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.

(a) EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—Section 2 of the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–194; 112 Stat. 627) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1999'' each place it appears and inserting ''September 30, 2002''.

(b) EXTENSION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 902(a) of the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1 note) is amended by striking ''for a period not to exceed one year upon enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''for a period not to exceed September 30, 2002''.

(2) REPORT.—Section 904 of such Act is amended by striking ''a one-year period described in section 902'' and inserting ''the first year following the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or September 30, 1999.

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, Unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph (1) is a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 580

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress recognizes and supports, as being fundamental to the national defense, the ability of the Armed Forces to test weapons and weapon systems thoroughly, and to train members of the Armed Forces in the use of weapons and weapon systems before the forces enter hostile military engagements.

(2) It is the policy of the United States that the Armed Forces at all times exercise the utmost degree of caution in the testing of weapons and weapon systems in order to avoid endangering civilian populations and the environment.

(3) In the adherence to these policies, it is essential to the public safety that the Armed Forces not test weapons or weapon systems,

or engage in training exercises with live ammunition, in close proximity to civilian populations unless there is no reasonable alternative available.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there should be a thorough and independent investigation of the circumstances that led to the accidental death of a civilian employee of the Navy installation in Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the wounding of four other civilians during a live-ammunition weapons test at Vieques, including a reexamination of the adequacy of the measures that are in place to protect the civilian population during such testing and of the extent to which the civilian population at the site can be adequately protected during such testing;

(2) the President should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition testing on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is not available an alternative testing site with no civilian population located in close proximity;

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the testing be carried out despite the potential risks to the civilian population;

(C) measures to provide the utmost level of safety to the civilian population are to be in place and maintained throughout the testing; and

(D) in the event that testing resumes, measures are to be taken to protect the Island of Vieques and the surrounding area from environmental degradation, including possible environmental harm, that might result from the testing of ammunition containing radioactive materials; and

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the President should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the President decides to resume live-ammunition weapons testing on the Island of Vieques, consult with the Governor on a regular basis regarding the measures being taken from time to time to protect civilians from harm from the testing.

INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL HEALTH CARE PARTNERSHIP.

SEC. . (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Veterans Administration and Federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by Federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of these sections, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii''.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 582

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated in title III, Procurement, under the heading ''MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $35,000,000 may be made available to retrofit and improve the current inventory of Patriot missiles in order to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles.

LEVIN AMENDMENT NO. 583

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in Title IV of this act under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, is hereby reduced by $200,000,000: *Provided,* That not more than $836,555,000 of the funds provided under this Act may be obligated for National Missile Defense programs: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Aircraft Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $56,100,000 for re-engining of the CH–47 helicopter, *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Missile Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $98,400,000 for advance procurement of the Javelin missile; *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army is hereby increased by $20,000,000 for procurement of the Field Artillery Ammunition Supply Vehicle, *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Other Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $25,500,000 for procurement of SINCGARS radios.

McCAIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 584–585

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. McCAIN) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Strike section 8108, and insert the following:

SEC. 8108. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act by titles III, IV, and VI is hereby reduced by $3,100,000,000, the reductions to be derived from appropriations as follows:

(1) From Operation and Maintenance, Army, $27,000,000.

(2) From Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $36,000,000.

(3) From Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, $10,200,000.

(4) From Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $61,800,000.

(5) From Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, $78,900,000.

(6) From Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, $53,500,000.

(7) From Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard, $2,900,000.

(8) From Aircraft Procurement, Army, $178,000,000.

(9) From Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, $26,400,000.

(10) From Procurement of Ammunition, Army, $37,500,000.

(11) From Other Procurement, Army, $135,500,000.

(12) From Aircraft Procurement, Navy, $69,000,000.

(13) From Weapons Procurement, Navy, $54,400,000.

(14) From Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, $317,500,000.

(15) From Other Procurement, Navy, $67,800,000.

(16) From Procurement, Marine Corps, $54,900,000.

(17) From Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, $164,500,000.

(18) From Missile Procurement, Air Force, $25,400,000.

(19) From Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, $5,100,000.

(20) From Other Procurement, Air Force, $53,400,000.

(21) From Procurement, Defense-Wide, $73,000,000.

(22) From National Guard and Reserve Equipment, $190,500,000.

(23) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, $249,100,000.

(24) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $288,700,000.

(25) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, $263,300,000.

(26) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, $287,900,000.

(27) From Defense Health Program, $226,200,000.

(28) From Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, $61,600,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 585

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Subject to subsection (c) and except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may waive any domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement referred to in subsection (b) and thereby authorize procurements of items that are grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured—

(1) inside a foreign country the government of which is a party to a reciprocal defense memorandum of understanding that is entered into with the Secretary of Defense and is in effect;

(2) inside the United States or its possessions; or

(3) inside the United States or its possessions partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured outside the United States or its possessions.

(b) For purposes of this section:

(1) A domestic source requirement is any requirement under law that the Department of Defense must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item that is grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States, its possessions, or a part of the national technology and industrial base.

(2) A domestic content requirement is any requirement under law that the Department must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item produced or manufactured

partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States or its possessions.

(c) The authority to waive a requirement under subsection (a) applies to procurements of items if the Secretary of Defense first determines that—

(1) the application of the requirement to procurements of those items would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding providing for reciprocal procurement of defense items that is entered into between the Department of Defense and a foreign country in accordance with section 2531 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) the foreign country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country; and

(3) one or more of the conditions set forth in section 2534(d) of title 10, United States Code, exists with respect to the procurement.

(d) LAWS NOT WAIVED.—The Secretary of Defense may not exercise the authority under subsection (a) to waive any of the following laws:

(1) The Small Business Act.

(2) The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c).

(3) Sections 7309 and 7310 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to ships in Federal Supply Class 1905.

(4) Section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 (10 U.S.C. 2241 note), with respect to articles or items of textiles, apparel, shoe findings, tents, and flags listed in Federal Supply Classes 8305, 8310, 8315, 8320, 8335, 8340, and 8345 and articles or items of clothing, footware, individual equipment, and insignia listed in Federal Supply Classes 8405, 8410, 8415, 8420, 8425, 8430, 8435, 8440, 8445, 8450, 8455, 8465, 8470, and 8475.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority under subsection (a) to waive a domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement is in addition to any other authority to waive such requirement.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 586

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In Title IV, under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, add the following:

"Of the funds appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation Army, up to $10 million may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology."

BOND (AND ASHCROFT) AMENDMENT NO. 587

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. . In addition to funds appropriated elsewhere in this Act, the amount appropriated in Title III of this Act under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force" is hereby increased by $220,000,000 only to procure four (4) F–15E aircraft; *Provided*, that the amount provided in Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for National Missile Defense; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment" is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 on a pro-rata basis; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force" is hereby reduced by $70,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Navy" is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts.

KOHL AMENDMENT NO. 588

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KOHL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to $220,000 may be made available to carry out the study described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall carry out a study for purposes of evaluating the cost-effectiveness of various technologies utilized, or having the potential to be utilized, in the demolition and cleanup of facilities contaminated with chemical residue at facilities used in the production of weapons and ammunition.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the study at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin.

(3) The Secretary shall provide for the carrying out of work under the study through the Omaha District Corps of Engineers and in cooperation with the Department of Energy Federal Technology Center, Morgantown, West Virginia.

(4) The Secretary may make available to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government information developed as a result of the study.

LOTT (AND COCHRAN) AMENDMENT NO. 589

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . Of the total amount appropriated in this Act for RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY shall be increased by $3,800,000 to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 590

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE" (other than the funds appropriated for space launch facilities), $7,300,000 shall be available, in additional to other funds appropriated under that heading for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for space launch facilities for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules.

(b) The funds set aside under subsection (a) may not be obligated for any purpose other than the purpose specified in subsection (a).

VOINOVICH AMENDMENT NO. 591

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. VOINOVICH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army", up to $500,000 may be available for a study of the costs and feasibility of a project to remove ordnance from the Toussaint River.

SANTORUM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 592

STEVENS (for Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Mr. SPECTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE", up to $4,000,000 may be made available for the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 593

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY", up to $5,000,000 may be available for visual display performance and visual display environmental research and development.

BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 594–595

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 594

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading "OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY", $51,250,000 shall be available for the Information System Security Program, of which up to $10,000,000 may be made available for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

AMENDMENT NO. 595

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE" for the Office of the Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Gulf War Illnesses, up to $10,000,000 may be made available for carrying out the first-year actions under the 5-

year research plan outlined in the report entitled ''Department of Defense Strategy to Address Low-Level Exposures to Chemical Warfare Agents (CWAs)'', dated May 1999, that was submitted to committees of Congress pursuant to section 247(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1957).

ASHCROFT (AND BOND) AMENDMENT NO. 596

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself and Mr. BOND)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The B–2 bomber has been used in combat for the first time in Operation Allied Force against Yugoslavia.

(2) The B–2 bomber has demonstrated unparalleled strike capability in Operation Allied Force, with cursory data indicating that the bomber could have dropped nearly 20 percent of the precision ordnance while flying less than 3 percent of the attack sorties.

(3) According to the congressionally mandated Long Range Air Power Panel, ''long range air power is an increasingly important element of United States military capability''.

(4) The crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, deserve particular credit for flying and supporting the strike missions against Yugoslavia, some of the longest combat missions in the history of the Air Force.

(5) The bravery and professionalism of the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base have advanced American interests in the face of significant challenge and hardship.

(6) The dedication of those who serve in the Armed Forces, exemplified clearly by the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, is the greatest national security asset of the United States.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the skill and professionalism with which the B–2 bomber has been used in Operation Allied Force is a credit to the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, and the Air Force;

(2) the B–2 bomber has demonstrated an unparalleled capability to travel long distances and deliver devastating weapons payloads, proving its essential role for United States power projection in the future; and

(3) the crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base deserve the gratitude of the American people for their dedicated performance in an indispensable role in the air campaign against Yugoslavia and in the defense of the United States.

SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 597

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate page in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force,'' up to $10,000,000 may be made available for U–2 aircraft defensive system modernization.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 598

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122 supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amount appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', $25,185,000 shall be available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for continuation of research into Gulf War syndrome that includes multidisciplinary studies of fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome, multiple chemical sensitivity, and the use of research methods of cognitive and computational neuroscience, and of which up to $2,000,000 may be made available for expansion of the research program in the Upper Great Plains region.

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 599

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the total amount appropriated in title III under the heading ''AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE'', up to $17,500,000 may be made available for procurement of the F–15A/B data link for the Air National Guard.

COLLINS AMENDMENT NO. 600

Mr. STEVENS (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the MK–43 Machine Gun Conversion Program.

INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 601

Mr. SPECTER (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. . DEVELOPMENT OF FORD ISLAND, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Navy may exercise any authority or combination of authorities in this section for the purpose of developing or facilitating the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, to the extent that the Secretary determines the development is compatible with the mission of the Navy.

(2) The Secretary may not exercise any authority under this section until—

(A) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a master plan for the development of Ford Island; and

(B) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may convey to any public or private person or entity all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property (including any improvements thereon) or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is excess to the needs of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A conveyance under this subsection may include such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to any public or private person or entity any real property or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is not needed for current operations of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A lease under this subsection shall be subject to section 2667(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and may include such others terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) A lease of real property under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the lessee shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the real property covered by the lease if the property is then conveyed under subsection (b).

(4)(A) The Secretary may provide property support services to or for real property leased under this subsection.

(B) To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, any payment made to the Secretary for services provided under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriation, account, or fund from which the cost of providing the services was paid.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LEASEHOLD INTEREST BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may acquire a leasehold interest in any facility constructed under subsection (f) as consideration for a transaction authorized by this section upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to promote the purpose of this section.

(2) The term of a lease under paragraph (1) may not exceed 10 years, unless the Secretary of Defense approves a term in excess of 10 years for the purpose of this section.

(3) A lease under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the facility covered by the lease.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall use competitive procedures for purposes of selecting the recipient of real or personal property under subsection (b) and the lessee of real or personal property under subsection (c).

(f) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance of real or personal property under subsection (b), or for the lease of real or personal property under subsection (c), the Secretary of the Navy shall accept cash, real property, personal property, or services, or any combination thereof, in an aggregate amount equal to not less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased.

(2) Subject to subsection (i), the services accepted by the Secretary under paragraph (1) may include the following:

(A) The construction or improvement of facilities at Ford Island.

(B) The restoration or rehabilitation of real property at Ford Island.

(C) The provision of property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy may not carry out a transaction authorized by this section until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of the transaction, including—

(A) a detailed description of the transaction; and

(B) a justification for the transaction specifying the manner in which the transaction will meet the purpose of this section; and

(2) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(h) FORD ISLAND IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the ''Ford Island Improvement Account''.

(2) There shall be deposited into the account the following amounts:

(A) Amounts authorized and appropriated to the account.

(B) Except as provided in subsection (c)(4)(B), the amount of any cash payment received by the Secretary for a transaction under this section.

(i) USE OF ACCOUNT.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts, funds in the Ford Island Improvement Account may be used as follows:

(A) To carry out or facilitate the carrying out of a transaction authorized by this section.

(B) To carry out improvements of property or facilities at Ford Island.

(C) To obtain property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(2) To extent that the authorities provided under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, are available to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary may not use the authorities in this section to acquire, construct, or improve family housing units, military unaccompanied housing units, or ancillary supporting facilities related to military housing at Ford Island.

(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the following funds:

(i) The Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(ii) The Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(2) of that title.

(B) Amounts transferred under subparagraph (A) to a fund referred to in that subparagraph shall be available in accordance with the provisions of section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, for activities authorized under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of that title at Ford Island.

(j) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, transactions under this section shall not be subject to the following:

(1) Sections 2667 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

(3) Sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483, 484).

(k) SCORING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive the applicability to any lease entered into under this section of the budget scorekeeping guidelines used to measure compliance with the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(l) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2883(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(i) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(ii) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''.

(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' has the meaning given that term in section 2801(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''property support service'' means the following:

(A) Any utility service or other service listed in section 2686(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Any other service determined by the Secretary to be a service that supports the operation and maintenance of real property, personal property, or facilities.

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BROWNBACK) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 578 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

TITLE—-SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST INDIA AND PAKISTAN

SEC. _1. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective for the period of five years commencing on the date of enactment of this Act, the sanctions contained in the following provisions of law shall not apply to India and Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under those provisions arising prior to that date:

(1) Section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa).

(2) Section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1) other than subsection (b)(2)(B), (C), or (G).

(3) Section 2(b)(4) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(4)).

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF DUAL-USE ARTICLES AND TECHNOLOGY.—The sanction contained in section 102(b)(2)(G) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)(2)(G)) shall not apply to India or Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of that sanction arising prior to the date of enactment of this Act if imposition of the sanction (but for this paragraph) would deny any license for the export of any dual-use article, or related dual-use technology (including software), listed on the Commerce Control List of the Export Administration Regulations that would not contribute directly to missile development or to a nuclear weapons program. For purposes of this subsection, an article or technology that is not primarily used for missile development or nuclear weapons programs.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS WAIVER OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The restriction on assistance in section 102(b)(2)(B), (C), or (G) of the Arms Export Control Act shall not apply if the President determines, and so certifies to Congress, that the application of the restriction would not be in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) no waiver under paragraph (1) should be invoked for section 102(b)(2)(B) or (C) of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to any party that initiates or supports activities that jeopardize peace and security in Jammu and Kashmir;

(B) The broad application of export controls to nearly 300 Indian and Pakistani entities is inconsistent with the specific national security interest of the United States and that this control list requires refinement.

(C) export controls should be applied only to those Indian and Pakistani entities that make direct and material contributions to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and only to those items that can contribute such programs.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees listing those Indian and Pakistani entities whose activities contribute directly and materially to missile programs or weapons of mass destruction programs.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—A license for the export of a defense article, defense service, or technology is subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review procedures described in that section.

(f) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—Upon the expiration of the initial five-year period of suspension of the sanctions contained in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the President may renew the suspension with respect to India, Pakistan, or both for additional periods of five years each if, not less than 30 days prior to each renewal of suspension, the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

(g) RESTRICTION.—The authority of subsection (a) may not be used to provide assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to economic support fund assistance) except for—

(1) assistance that supports the activities of nongovernmental organizations;

(2) assistance that supports democracy or the establishment of democratic institutions; or

(3) humanitarian assistance.

(h) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act prohibits the imposition of sanctions by the President under any provision of law specified in subsection (a) or (b) by reason of any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under that provision of law arising on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. _2. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 620E(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2375(e)).

(2) The India-Pakistan Relief Act (title IX of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as contained in section 101(a) of Public Law 105–277).

SEC. _3. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 603

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In amendment No. 547, on page 1, line 5, strike ''shall'' and insert ''may''.

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 604

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 106, line 4, strike ''The Communications Act'' and insert ''(a) The Communications Act of 1934''.

On page 107, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(b)(1) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report which shall—

(A) set forth the anticipated schedule (including specific dates) for—

(i) preparing and conducting the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a); and

(ii) depositing the receipts of the competitive bidding process;

(B) set forth each significant milestone in the rulemaking process with respect to the competitive bidding process;

(C) include an explanation of the effect of each requirement in subsection (a) on the schedule for the competitive bidding process and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) when compared with the schedule for the competitive bidding and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) that would otherwise have occurred under section 337(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(b)(2)) if not for the enactment of subsection (a);

(D) set forth for each spectrum auction held by the Federal Communications Commission since 1993 information on—

(i) the time required for each stage of preparation for the auction;

(ii) the date of the commencement and of the completion of the auction;

(iii) the time which elapsed between the date of the completion of the auction and the date of the first deposit of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(iv) the dates of all subsequent deposits of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(E) include an assessment of how the stages of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a), including preparation, commencement and completion, and deposit of receipts, will differ from similar stages in the auctions referred to in subparagraph (D).

(2) Not later than October 5, 2000, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report which shall—

(A) describe the course of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a) through September 30, 2000, including the amount of any receipts from the competitive bidding process deposited in the Treasury as of September 30, 2000; and

(B) if the course of the competitive bidding process has included any deviations from the schedule set forth under paragraph (1)(A), an explanation for such deviations from the schedule.

(3) The Federal Communications Commission may not consult with the Director in the preparation and submittal of the reports required of the Commission by this subsection.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

COVERDELL (AND KERREY) AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. COVERDELL, for himself and Mr. KERREY), proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

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

(1) On June 25, 1996, a bomb detonated not more than 80 feet from the Air Force housing complex known as Khobar Towers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 members of the Air Force, and injuring hundreds more;

(2) An FBI investigation of the bombing, soon to enter its fourth year, has not yet determined who was responsible for the attack; and

(3) The Senate in S. Res. 273 in the 104th Congress condemned this terrorist attack in the strongest terms and urged the United States Government to use all reasonable means available to the Government of the United States to punish the parties responsible for the bombings.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) The United States Government must continue its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing until every terrorist involved is identified, held accountable, and punished;

(2) The FBI, together with the Department of State, should report to Congress no later than December 31, 1999, on the status of its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing; and

(3) Once responsibility for the attack has been established the United States Government must take steps to punish the parties involved.

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 606

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 102, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

TITLE IX—McGREGOR RANGE LAND WITHDRAWAL

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''McGregor Range Withdrawal Act''.

SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) The term ''Materials Act'' means the Act of July 31, 1947 (commonly known as the Materials Act of 1947; 30 U.S.C. 601–604).

(2) The term ''management plan'' means the natural resources management plan prepared by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 9005(e).

(3) The term ''withdrawn lands'' means the lands described in subsection (d) of section 9003 that are withdrawn and reserved under section 9003.

(4) The term ''withdrawal period'' means the period specified in section 9007(a).

SEC. 9003. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS AT MCGREGOR RANGE, NEW MEXICO.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, and except as otherwise provided in this title, the Federal lands at McGregor Range in the State of New Mexico that are described in subsection (d) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the Materials Act.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the withdrawal is to support military training and testing, all other uses of the withdrawn lands shall be secondary in nature.

(c) RESERVATION.—The withdrawn lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for military training and testing.

(d) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands withdrawn and reserved by this section (a) comprise approximately 608,000 acres of Federal land in Otero County, New Mexico, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''McGregor Range Land Withdrawal-Proposed,'' dated January ____, 1999, and filed in accordance with section 9004.

SEC. 9004. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) PREPARATION OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of the withdrawn lands; and

(2) file one or more maps of the withdrawn lands and the legal description of the withdrawn lands with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) LEGAL EFFECT.—The maps and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this title, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal description.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Copies of the maps and the legal description shall be available for public inspection in the offices of the New Mexico State Director and Las Cruces Field Office Manager of the Bureau of Land Management and in the office of the Commander Officer of Fort Bliss, Texas.

SEC. 9005. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.

(a) GENERAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—During the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall manage the withdrawn lands, in accordance with the provisions of this title and the management plan prepared under subsection (e), for the military purposes specified in section 9003(c).

(b) ACCESS RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CLOSE.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Secretary of the Army determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to public use of any portion of the withdrawn lands (including any road or trail therein) commonly in public use, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to take such action.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Any closure under paragraph (1) shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods required for the purposes specified in such paragraph. During a closure, the Secretary of the Army shall keep appropriate warning notices posted and take appropriate steps to notify the public about the closure.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN AND ACQUIRED MINERAL RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior shall manage all withdrawn and acquired mineral resources within the boundaries of

McGregor Range in accordance with Public Law 85–337 (commonly known as the Engle Act; 43 U.S.C. 155–158).

(2) MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL MATERIALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or the Materials Act, the Secretary of the Army may use, from the withdrawn lands, sand, gravel, or similar mineral material resources of the type subject to disposition under the Materials Act, when the use of such resources is required for construction needs of Fort Bliss.

(d) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the withdrawn lands shall be conducted in accordance with section 2671 of title 10, United States Code, and the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.).

(e) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly develop a natural resources management plan for the lands withdrawn under this title for the withdrawal period. The management plan shall be developed not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be reviewed at least once every five years after its adoption to determine if it should be amended.

(2) CONTENT.—The management plan shall—

(A) include provisions for proper management and protection of the natural, cultural, and other resources and values of the withdrawn lands and for use of such resources to the extent consistent with the purpose of the withdrawal specified in section 9003(b);

(B) identify the withdrawn lands (if any) that are suitable for opening to the operation of the mineral leasing or geothermal leasing laws;

(C) provide for the continuation of livestock grazing at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army under such authorities as are available to the Secretary; and

(D) provide that the Secretary of the Army shall take necessary precautions to prevent, suppress, or manage brush and range fires occurring within the boundaries of McGregor Range, as well as brush and range fires occurring outside the boundaries of McGregor Range resulting from military activities at the range.

(3) FIRE SUPPRESSION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of the Army may seek assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in suppressing any brush or range fire occurring within the boundaries of McGregor Range or any brush or range fire occurring outside the boundaries of McGregor Range resulting from military activities at the range. The memorandum of understanding under section 9006 shall provide for assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in the suppression of such fires and require the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the Bureau of Land Management for such assistance.

SEC. 9006. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to implement this title and the management plan.

(b) DURATION.—The duration of the memorandum of understanding shall be the same as the withdrawal period.

(c) AMENDMENT.—The memorandum of understanding may be amended by agreement of both Secretaries.

SEC. 9007. TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION; EXTENSION.

(a) TERMINATION DATE.—The withdrawal and reservation made by this title shall terminate 50 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTENSION.—

(1) NOTICE OF CONTINUED MILITARY NEED.—Not later than five years before the end of the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall advise the Secretary of the Interior as to whether or not the Army will have a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn lands after the end of the withdrawal period.

(2) APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION.—If the Secretary of the Army determines that there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn lands after the end of the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall file an application for extension of the withdrawal and reservation of the lands in accordance with the then existing regulations and procedures of the Department of the Interior applicable to extension of withdrawal of lands for military purposes and that are consistent with this title. The application shall be filed with the Department of the Interior not later than four years before the end of the withdrawal period.

(c) LIMITATION ON EXTENSION.—The withdrawal and reservation made by this title may not be extended or renewed except by Act or joint resolution.

SEC. 9008. RELINQUISHMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.

(a) FILING OF RELINQUISHMENT NOTICE.—If, during the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army decides to relinquish all or any portion of the withdrawn lands, the Secretary of the Army shall file a notice of intention to relinquish with the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) DETERMINATION OF PRESENCE OF CONTAMINATION.—Before transmitting a relinquishment notice under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall prepare a written determination concerning whether and to what extent the lands to be relinquished are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous wastes and substances. A copy of such determination shall be transmitted with the relinquishment notice.

(c) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION.—In the case of contaminated lands which are the subject of a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Army shall decontaminate or remediate the land to the extent that funds are appropriated for such purpose if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of the lands is practicable and economically feasible, taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land; and

(2) upon decontamination or remediation, the land could be opened to the operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(d) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO OTHER LAWS.—The activities of the Secretary of the Army under subsection (c) are subject to applicable laws and regulations, including the Defense Environmental Restoration Program established under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(e) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO REFUSE CONTAMINATED LANDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept lands specified in a relinquishment notice if the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army, concludes that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of any land subject to the relinquishment notice is not practicable or economically feasible;

(2) the land cannot be decontaminated or remediated sufficiently to be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

(3) a sufficient amount of funds are not appropriated for the decontamination of the land.

(f) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LANDS.—If, because of the condition of the lands, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction of lands proposed for relinquishment or, if at the expiration of the withdrawal made under this title, the Secretary of the Interior determines that some of the withdrawn lands are contaminated to an extent which prevents opening such contaminated lands to operation of the public land laws—

(1) the Secretary of the Army shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands;

(2) after the expiration of the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Army shall retain jurisdiction over the withdrawn lands, but shall undertake no activities on such lands except in connection with the decontamination or remediation of such lands; and

(3) the Secretary of the Army shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(g) SUBSEQUENT DECONTAMINATION OR REMEDIATION.—If lands covered by subsection (f) are subsequently decontaminated or remediated and the Secretary of the Army certifies that the lands are safe for nonmilitary uses, the Secretary of the Interior shall reconsider accepting jurisdiction over the lands.

(h) REVOCATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over lands specified in a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Interior may revoke the withdrawal and reservation made under this title as it applies to such lands. If the decision be made to accept the relinquishment and to revoke the withdrawal and reservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(1) terminate the withdrawal and reservation;

(2) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(3) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws, if appropriate.

SEC. 9009. DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY.

(a) SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—The functions of the Secretary of the Army under this title may be delegated.

(b) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this title may be delegated, except that an order under section 9008(h) to accept relinquishment of withdrawn lands may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

STEVENS (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 607

Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following:

TITLE —RENEWAL OF MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the Military Lands Withdrawal Renewal Act of 1999''.

SEC. 02. WITHDRAWALS.

(a) MCGREGOR RANGE.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the public lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army—

(A) for training and weapons testing; and

(B) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), for other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are the lands comprising approximately 608,384.87 acres in Otero County, New Mexico, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''McGregor Range Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(d) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

(4) Any of the public lands withdrawn under paragraph (1) which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, are managed pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) shall continue to be managed under that section until otherwise expressly provided by law.

(b) FORT GREELY MANEUVER AREA AND FORT GREELY AIR DROP ZONE.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws), under the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union'', approved July 7, 1958 (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21), and under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for—

(A) military maneuvering, training, and equipment development and testing; and

(B) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3)(A) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(i) the lands comprising approximately 571,995 acres in the Big Delta Area, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Greely Maneuver Area Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(e) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986; and

(ii) the lands comprising approximately 51,590 acres in the Granite Creek Area, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Greely, Air Drop Zone Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of such section.

(B) Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

(c) FORT WAINWRIGHT MANEUVER AREA.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the public lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws), under the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union'', approved July 7, 1958 (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21), and under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for—

(A) military maneuvering;

(B) training for artillery firing, aerial gunnery, and infantry tactics; and

(C) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are the lands comprising approximately 247,951.67 acres of land in the Fourth Judicial District, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Wainwright Maneuver Area Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(f) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

SEC. 03. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) PUBLICATION AND FILING REQUIREMENT.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of the lands withdrawn by this title; and

(2) file maps and the legal description of the lands withdrawn by this title with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Such maps and legal descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this title except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in such maps and legal descriptions.

(c) AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—Copies of such maps and legal descriptions shall be available for public inspection in the following offices:

(1) The Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) The offices of the Director and appropriate State Directors of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) The offices of the Director and appropriate Regional Directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(4) The office of the commander, McGregor Range.

(5) The office of the installation commander, Fort Richardson, Alaska.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for any costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out this section.

SEC. 04. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.

(a) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—(1)(A) The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the lands withdrawn by this title pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other applicable law, including the Recreation Use of Wildlife Areas Act of 1962 (16 U.S.C. 460k et seq.) and this title. The Secretary shall manage such lands through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) To the extent consistent with applicable law and Executive orders, the lands withdrawn by this title may be managed in a manner permitting—

(A) the continuation of grazing pursuant to applicable law and Executive orders where permitted on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat;

(C) control of predatory and other animals;

(D) recreation; and

(E) the prevention and appropriate suppression of brush and range fires resulting from nonmilitary activities.

(3)(A) All nonmilitary use of the lands withdrawn by this title, other than the uses described in paragraph (2), shall be subject to such conditions and restrictions as may be necessary to permit the military use of such lands for the purposes specified in or authorized pursuant to this title.

(B) The Secretary of the Interior may issue any lease, easement, right-of-way, or other authorization with respect to the nonmilitary use of such lands only with the concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(b) CLOSURE TO PUBLIC.—(1) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to public use of any road, trail, or other portion of the lands withdrawn by this title, that Secretary may take such action as that Secretary determines necessary to effect and maintain such closure.

(2) Any such closure shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods which the Secretary of the military department concerned determines are required to carry out this subsection.

(3) During any closure under this subsection, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall—

(A) keep appropriate warning notices posted; and

(B) take appropriate steps to notify the public concerning such closures.

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—(1)(A) The Secretary of the Interior (after consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned) shall develop a plan for the management of each area withdrawn by this title.

(2) Each plan shall—

(A) be consistent with applicable law;

(B) be subject to conditions and restrictions specified in subsection (a)(3); and

(C) include such provisions as may be necessary for proper management and protection of the resources and values of such areas.

(3) The Secretary of the Interior shall develop each plan required by this subsection not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act. In developing a plan for an area, the Secretary may utilize or modify appropriate provisions of the management plan developed for the area under section 3(c) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986.

(d) BRUSH AND RANGE FIRES.—(1) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall take necessary precautions to prevent and suppress brush and range fires occurring

within and outside the lands withdrawn by this title as a result of military activities and may seek assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in the suppression of such fires.

(2) Each memorandum of understanding required by subsection (e) shall provide for Bureau of Land Management assistance in the suppression of fires referred to in paragraph (1) in the area covered by the memorandum of understanding, and for a transfer of funds from the military department concerned to the Bureau of Land Management as compensation for such assistance.

(e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the military department concerned shall (with respect to each area withdrawn by section 2902) enter into a memorandum of understanding to implement the management plan developed under subsection (c).

(2) Each memorandum of understanding shall provide that the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall provide assistance in the suppression of fires resulting from the military use of lands withdrawn by this title if requested by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(f) ADDITIONAL MILITARY USES.—(1) The lands withdrawn by this title may be used for defense-related uses other than those specified in the applicable provision of section 2902. The use of such lands for such purposes shall be governed by all laws applicable to such lands, including this title.

(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Interior in the event that the lands withdrawn by this title will be used for defense-related purposes other than those specified in section 2902.

(B) Such notification shall indicate the additional use or uses involved, the proposed duration of such uses, and the extent to which such additional military uses of the lands will require that additional or more stringent conditions or restrictions be imposed on otherwise-permitted nonmilitary uses of the land or portions thereof.

(3) Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize sand, gravel, or similar mineral or material resources on the lands withdrawn by this title when the use of such resources is required to meet the construction needs of the military department concerned on the lands withdrawn by this title.

SEC. 06. LAND MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS.

(a) PERIODIC ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, any every 10 years thereafter, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, conduct an analysis of the degree to which the management of the lands withdrawn by this title conforms to the requirements of laws applicable to the management of such lands, including this title.

(b) DEADLINE.—Each analysis under this section shall be completed not later than 270 days after the commencement of such analysis.

(c) LIMITATION ON COST.—The cost of each analysis under this section may not exceed $900,000 in constant 1999 dollars.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the completion of an analysis under this section, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to Congress a report on the analysis. The report shall set forth the results of the analysis and include any other matters relating to the management of the lands withdrawn by this title that such Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 07. ONGOING ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—To the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall carry out a program to provide for the environmental restoration of the lands withdrawn by this title in order to ensure a level of environmental decontamination of such lands equivalent to the level of environmental decontamination that exists on such lands as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORTS.—(1) At the same time the President submits to Congress the budget for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2000, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the committees referred to in paragraph (2) a report on environmental restoration activities relating to the lands withdrawn by this title. The report shall satisfy the requirements of section 2706(a) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to the activities on such lands.

(2) The committees referred to in paragraph (1) are the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Resources of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 08. RELINQUISHMENT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may relinquish all or any of the lands withdrawn by this title to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) NOTICE.—If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines to relinquish any lands withdrawn by this title under subsection (a), that Secretary shall transmit to the Secretary of the Interior a notice of intent to relinquish such lands.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTAMINATION.—(1) Before transmitting a notice of intent to relinquish any lands under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense, acting through the military department concerned, shall determine whether and to what extent such lands are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous materials.

(2) A copy of a determination with respect to any lands under paragraph (1) shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior together with the notice of intent to relinquish such lands under subsection (b).

(3) Copies of both the notice of intent to relinquish lands under subsection (b) and the determination regarding the contamination of such lands under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) DECONTAMINATION.—(1) If any land subject to a notice of intent to relinquish under subsection (a) is contaminated, and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned, makes the determination described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, undertake the environmental decontamination of the land.

(2) A determination referred to in this paragraph is a determination that—

(A) decontamination of the land concerned is practicable and economically feasible (taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land); and

(B) upon decontamination, the land could be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(e) ALTERNATIVES.—(1) If a circumstance described in paragraph (2) arises with respect to any land which is covered by a notice of intent to relinquish under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept the land under this section.

(2) A circumstance referred to in this paragraph is—

(A) a determination by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned that—

(i) decontamination of the land is not practicable or economically feasible; or

(ii) the land cannot be decontaminated to a sufficient extent to permit its opening to the operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

(B) the appropriation by Congress of amounts that are insufficient to provide for the decontamination of the land.

(f) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LANDS.—If, because of their contaminated state, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction over lands withdrawn by this title which have been proposed for relinquishment under subsection (a)—

(1) the Secretary of the military department concerned shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands; and

(2) the Secretary of the military department concerned shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken in furtherance of this subsection.

(g) REVOCATION OF AUTHORITY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over lands proposed for relinquishment pursuant to subsection (a), revoke the withdrawal established by this title as it applies to such lands.

(2) Should the decision be made to revoke the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(A) terminate the withdrawal;

(B) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(C) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of some or all of the public lands laws, including the mining laws.

(h) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN RELINQUISHED LANDS.—Any lands withdrawn by section 2902(c) or 2902(d) that are relinquished under this section shall be public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and shall be consider vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated for purposes of the public land laws.

SEC. 09. DELEGABILITY.

(a) DEFENSE.—The functions of the Secretary of Defense or of the Secretary of a military department under this title may be delegated.

(b) INTERIOR.—The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this title may be delegated, except that an order described in section 2908(g) may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 10. WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to establish a reservation to the United States with respect to any water or water right on the lands described in section 2902. No provision of this title shall be construed as authorizing the appropriation of water on lands described in section 2902 by the United States after the date of the enactment of

this Act except in accordance with the law of the relevant State in which lands described in section 2902 are located. This section shall not be construed to affect water rights acquired by the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.

All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands withdrawn by this title shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 2671 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 12. MINING AND MINERAL LEASING.

(a) DETERMINATION OF LANDS SUITABLE FOR OPENING.—(1) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act and at least every five years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned, which public and acquired lands (except as provided in this subsection) described in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2902 the Secretary of the Interior considers suitable for opening to the operation of the Mining Law of 1872, the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of 1947, the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, or any one or more of such Acts.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall publish a notice in the Federal Register listing the lands determined suitable for opening pursuant to this section and specifying the opening date.

(b) OPENING LANDS.—On the day specified by the Secretary of the Interior in a notice published in the Federal Register pursuant to subsection (a), the land identified under subsection (a) as suitable for opening to the operation of one or more of the laws specified in subsection (a) shall automatically be open to the operation of such laws without the necessity for further action by the Secretary or Congress.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMMON VARIETIES.—No deposit of minerals or materials of the types identified by section 3 of the Act of July 23, 1955 (69 Stat. 367), whether or not included in the term ''common varieties'' in that Act, shall be subject to location under the Mining Law of 1872 on lands described in section 2902.

(d) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior, with the advice and concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall prescribe such regulations to implement this section as may be necessary to assure safe, uninterrupted, and unimpeded use of the lands described in section 2902 for military purposes.

(2) Such regulations shall contain guidelines to assist mining claimants in determining how much, if any, of the surface of any lands opened pursuant to this section may be used for purposes incident to mining.

(e) CLOSURE OF MINING LANDS.—In the event of a national emergency or for purposes of national defense or security, the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall close any lands that have been opened to mining or to mineral or geothermal leasing pursuant to this section.

(f) LAWS GOVERNING MINING ON WITHDRAWN LANDS.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this title, mining claims located pursuant to this title shall be subject to the provisions of the mining laws. In the event of a conflict between those laws and this title, this title shall prevail.

(2) All mining claims located under the terms of this title shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(g) PATENTS.—(1) Patents issued pursuant to this title for locatable minerals shall convey title to locatable minerals only, together with the right to use so much of the surface as may be necessary for purposes incident to mining under the guidelines for such use established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation.

(2) All such patents shall contain a reservation to the United States of the surface of all lands patented and of all nonlocatable minerals on those lands.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, all minerals subject to location under the Mining Law of 1872 shall be treated as locatable minerals.

SEC. 13. IMMUNITY OF UNITED STATES.

The United States and all departments or agencies thereof shall be held harmless and shall not be liable for any injuries or damages to persons or property suffered in the course of any mining or mineral or geothermal leasing activity conducted on lands described in section 2902.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing entitled ''Home Health Care: Will the New Payment System & Regulatory Overkill Hurt Our Seniors?'' This Subcommittee hearing will focus on how the new Medicare Interim Payment System and new regulatory requirements from the Health Care Financing Administration may limit the access of beneficiaries most in need of home health services.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 10, 1999, at 2:00 p.m., in Room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Lee Blalack of the Subcommittee staff at 224–3721.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a full committee oversight hearing has been schedule before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Thursday, June 24, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine the implications of the proposed acquisition of the Atlantic Richfield Company by BP Amoco, PLC. Specifically the Committee will examine the following issues related to the acquisition:

U.S. national and energy security;

Impact on crude oil prices and supply on the U.S. West Coast;

Marine transportation;

Pipeline transportation; and

Exploration and production in Alaska and the lower 48.

Those who wish to testify or to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. Presentation of oral testimony is by Committee invitation only. For further information, please contact Jo Meuse or Brian Malnak at (202) 224–6730.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been schedule before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 29, at 2:30 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 fire preparedness on Federal lands. Specifically, what actions the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are taking to prepare for the fire season; whether the agencies are informing the public about these plans; and ongoing research related to wildfire and fire suppression activities.

Those who wish to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please contact Mike Menge (202) 224–6170.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a full committee hearing on S. 1049, the ''Federal Oil and Gas Lease Management Improvement Act of 1999,'' scheduled for June 17, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building has been postponed and will be rescheduled for a later date to be announced by the committee.

For further information, please contact Dan Kish, of the committee professional staff, at (202) 224–8276.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in open session, to consider the nominations of General Eric K. Shinseki, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army; and Lieutenant General James L. Jones, Jr., USMC, to be general and for appointment as Commandant of the Marine Corps.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet in closed session for a hearing re Department of Justice Oversight, during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 10:00 a.m., in S407 of the Capitol.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing on the nominations of Kenneth W. Kizer, M.D., M.P.H., to be Under Secretary for Health, Department of Veterans Affairs, and John T. Hanson to be Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 2:15 p.m., in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on African Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 2:15 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RETIREMENT OF COL. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, USAF

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as the Senate proceeds with its debate on the Defense Appropriations Bill, it is appropriate that we pause and recognize the contribution of a Defense Procurement Official on the occasion of his retirement. Colonel William Alexander—Alex to his friends—is retiring this month after an Air Force career spanning almost 30 years. Alex has spent much of his career leading and mentoring Defense Acquisition Professionals, leaving as his legacy a new generation of experienced procurement managers.

Born in the baby boom era between WWII and the Korean War, Alex grew up in Indiana, where he attended DePauw and Indiana Universities. After completing his Masters Degree in 1970, he entered the Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio. Some of his early projects started the development for today's generation of precision guided weapons. It was a whole lot trickier then, without the advantage of the Global Positioning System, but his team worked to develop a way to triangulate a target designation to improve bomb targeting reliability.

The Air Force recognized the contributions of this young officer and moved him into a career in procurement and satellite operations. Alex spent the next 20 years of his career moving between different aspects of the complex world of keeping satellites operating successfully on orbit. He was a procurement official in a number of software source selections, using his abilities to aid the Air Force in getting revolutionary operating software for its expanding fleet of satellites. After his work in operations, the Air Force wisely transferred him into the National Reconnaissance Office as the Director of the Acquisition and Engineering Group within the Communications System Acquisition and Operations Directorate. When the Deputy Director of the Communications Directorate was reassigned, Alex was selected for this position in light of his vast experience in successful acquisitions.

However, I don't want to spend too much time discussing the technical details of Colonel Alexander's career. There are many successful procurement officials within the Air Force and the Department of Defense, but few are as widely recognized for their crafting of personnel in addition to their acquisition expertise. Although the project was always treated with importance, Alex always made sure that his people came first. He was always looking to find ways to challenge his staff to grow both in technical ability and in interpersonal relationships. His success gives credence to the philosophy of empowering and caring for your people, which ultimately leads to the program success. One night during his time in satellite operations, a satellite was having difficulties getting initialized. Scores of people were working around the clock trying to work through the complex issues involved. Recognizing that people do not perform at their best when they are exhausted, Colonel Alexander banished a number of people from the operations floor until they had a rest period. The engineers returned to the floor with clearer heads and ultimately were able to get the satellite up and running successfully on orbit.

When there was a tragic death of an employee on official travel, Alex temporarily set aside his own grief to assist others in the office in addition to the employee's family. In the confusion that surrounded the funeral, Alex took time to meet with all of the family members to try to help them understand the events that had taken place. It was a difficult time for all involved, but Alex clearly demonstrated his caring for his co-workers and should be commended for his actions.

One area where Colonel Alexander should be especially proud is in his initiatives for acquisition reform. Alex was always driving to improve all aspects of buying satellites and software, looking for new and innovative ways to execute the program. At his encouragement, one division has studied purchasing satellites on-orbit, which would be a first for the NRO. He has been an advocate for openness and revolutionary thinking, balancing trusted methods with new ideas. Under his leadership, a security rebaselining was started which resulted in his program appearing on CBS' Eye on America. His drive in this area has literally saved the federal government millions of dollars.

Finally, I want to thank Colonel Alexander for one final initiative. After being nominated for a Congressional Fellowship by Colonel Alexander, a member of his staff has joined my staff for the legislative year. This staff member has been of great assistance already in the Defense bills that have gone to the floor, and I look forward to his continuing contribution through the rest of the Senate's session.

I'm sure that there are still many details for Colonel Alexander to work out as he transitions to a ''former'' military life. I wish him the best in his endeavors and pass along a sincere thank you on behalf of Congress for passing along his life's philosophy to the generation that will follow in his procurement footsteps. The legacy left behind is greater than mere relics of satellites and software, which will age and be disregarded. Colonel Alexander's heritage is in a corps of people who now have a greater understanding of the balances and pressures in life and a toolkit with how to deal with them. This is a true success, and one that I hope will be a sustained source of pride throughout his retirement.•

THE FENWAY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today the Fenway Community Development Corporation in Boston is celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, and I congratulate the corporation on its impressive accomplishments.

The Nation's economy is currently enjoying the longest period of peacetime expansion in the nation's history. Today, more Americans than ever have access to quality education and productive jobs and careers. But that success is no cause for complacency. Too many of our fellow citizens and too many of our communities are not full participants in the nation's overall prosperity. For them, economic growth often means higher housing costs and pressures to move out of neighborhoods which have been their homes all their lives.

Twenty-five years ago, the Fenway Community Development Corporation was formed to do more to see that neighborhood development benefits the residents of the neighborhood. The Corporation stands proudly for the fundamental principle that local residents should enjoy the benefits of economic growth too, regardless of their incomes, and that neighborhood planning should always put people first.

Since 1973, the Fenway CDC has worked skillfully to improve the quality of life in the community, actively encouraging residents to participate in decisions that affect it. Under its leadership, residents from different cultures, age groups, and income levels have all come together for a better Fenway. I commend them for what they have done to empower people and strengthen the fabric of their neighborhoods.

A large part of this success comes from many activities to improve life in the Fenway. Protecting existing housing, actively seeking opportunities to develop affordable new housing, pursuing commercial development that meets the needs of the neighborhood—all of these are essential parts of the mission.

Other activities include homebuyer counseling—the afterschool programs and playground renovation for neighborhood youth through the Fenway Family Coalition—the computer training and job opportunities with local employers through the Walk to Work Program—and the Senior Task Force, which maintains affordable housing for low income elderly residents, as well as blood pressure screenings and recreation facilities available at the Peterborough Senior Center. All of these programs have contributed immensely to the quality of life in the Fenway neighborhood, and the Corporation deserve great credit for these achievements.

Fenway CDC is a respected leader of CDCs nationwide. I congratulate them for 25 years of skillful work and real results, and I know that the next 25 years will be just as successful.●

TRIBUTE TO THE LOON MOUNTAIN RECREATION CORPORATION

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation of Lincoln, New Hampshire for their outstanding achievements in the environmental arena. This month. Loon Mountain will receive the Times Mirror Company's Silver Eagle Award for Environmental Excellence in Visual Impact.

Loon Mountain will be receiving this award due to the recent installation of a new snowmaking pump station. The resort's two objectives in the design of this station were to reduce the visual impact of the pump station to the surrounding community and minimize the impact of the new water withdrawal system on the adjacent river.

Through careful site planning and creative architectural design, the pump station blends in naturally with its surroundings. The techniques employed during construction were environmentally sound and the withdrawal system does not disturb the river environment.

As a senior member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I realize the impact that industrial design can have on the environment, and I am excited to see businesses such as Loon Mountain working hard to minimize these impacts. I commend the Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation for their environmental awareness, and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

ANDRE AGASSI

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the historic event that took place this past weekend in Paris when Las Vegas's own Andre Agassi captured the 1999 French Open Championship. Andre's completion of the career Grand Slam secures him a place in tennis history that only five other men can claim, and as a testament to his versality, he is the only person to accomplish this feat on three different surfaces—hardcourt, grass, and clay. He is the first American in 61 years to win all four majors—Wimbledom in 1992, the U.S. Open in 1994, the Australian Open in 1995, and now the French—and his victory will soon catapult him to No. 4 in the world rankings.

As great as Andre's accomplishments have been on the court throughout his career, they are, in my opinion, overshadowed by the generosity and compassion he has shown off the court. Andre's commitment to at-risk and underprivileged youth has been a passion of his throughout his tennis career. His establishment of the Andre Agassi Foundation in 1994 to support and fund programs that serve underprivileged kids has provided much needed assistance to a variety of service organizations that work with children in the Las Vegas area, including the Boys & Girls Clubs in Las Vegas, the Assistance League of Las Vegas, and Child Haven. Since its inception, the Agassi Foundation has donated over $5 million to local youth charities.

In today's world of professional sports, it is always refreshing to see an athlete who recognizes the blessings and opportunities he has received, and has chosen to give something back to his community. In spite of a tennis career that has had its ups and downs, Andre has always had a steady hand when it comes to helping underprivileged children. Andre Agassi is the epitome of what a professional athlete should be, and I ask my colleagues to join me in commending him for making tennis history and for all of his charitable endeavors that mean so much to the Las Vegas community.●

TRIBUTE TO MEYER ''MIKE'' BERMAN

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Meyer ''Mike'' Berman, a World War II veteran who demonstrated unusual heroism during his two years of service in the United States Army.

Mike Berman, Private First Class, served as part of the 12th Infantry Regiment during World War II. An outstanding soldier, he was decorated with the Good Conduct Medal, the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the World War II Victory Medal and Ribbon, the European African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, and a Ribbon with one Silver Service Star.

However, the accomplishment Mike Berman is proudest of is the time he saved the life of his friend, Private John Buyers. While artillery shells were coming from all directions, Mike Berman rushed to the aid of Private Buyers, who had been grievously injured. Mike Berman singlehandedly carried Private Buyers by foot to the service jeep that transported him to medical aid. I ask that Private Buyers' letter expressing the gratitude he felt towards Private Berman for saving his life be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

England: Oct: 29th 1944

DEAR MIKE: Just a few lines to say hello and let you know I'm coming along pretty good. I just wanted to thank you for what you done for me the day I got hit. I'll never forget it. If it hadn't been for you, I wouldn't be living today. Thanks a million, ''Mike.'' I've had three operations so far and I'm pretty weak, but I'll live through it. I won't be with you boys' any more but tell them all hello for me. Please write to me if you get a chance.

Well, Mike, be good and take care of yourself. I sure didn't last long, did I? Oh well! It was all in the cards I guess. Please excuse my writing. I can do better but I'm pretty nervous these days. Once again thanks for what you done for me and maybe some day, I'll be able to sort of square things up.

So long.

Cordially,

BUYERS.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It is particularly appropriate with the recent celebration of Memorial Day that we pay homage to truly courageous individuals like Mike Berman, whose faith in democracy and freedom for mankind have helped make our nation as great as it is today.

The worst of times often best reveals the character of an individual. In the worst of times, Mike Berman proved his charity and love for his fellow man. He went beyond the call of duty when no one else dared to.

Having come from an immigrant family, Mr. Berman's achievements illustrate the enormous passion and desire America's immigrants have to create a better future in their newly adopted country. Our recognition of Mr. Berman reminds us of the tremendous contribution that immigrants have made in the shaping of our Nation. This diverse group of extraordinary, enterprising, and self-sufficient individuals have continuously served to strengthen the United States.●

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 1554

Mr. STEVENS. I move that with respect to H.R. 1554, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and further, the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed from the Judiciary Committee: Mr. HATCH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KOHL; from the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee: Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. HOLLINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1999

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 9. 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, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

I further ask consent there then be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator COLLINS, 20 minutes; Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, 10 minutes; Senator DURBIN or his designee, 30 minutes.

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

Mr. STEVENS. As I understand it, the consent that was just entered into means Senator MCCAIN will be recognized at the close of that period of morning business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I further ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. the Senate begin consideration of S. 96, the Y2K legislation, in accordance with that agreement.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. tomorrow. By previous consent, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 96 has been vitiated, and at 11 a.m. the Senate will begin debate on the important Y2K legislation. Hopefully, the Senate will make substantial progress throughout the day, and therefore votes on amendments can be expected.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. STEVENS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:52 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 9, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8, 1999:

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

FRANZ S. LEICHTER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2006, VICE DANIEL F. EVANS, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

DOUGLAS L. MILLER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2002, VICE LAWRENCE U. COSTIGLIO, TERM EXPIRED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, June 8, 1999*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 8, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM GIBBONS 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 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for 5 minutes.

THE ABUSIVE TAX SHELTER SHUTDOWN ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, long ago, Will Rogers suggested that, ''people want just taxes even more than they want lower taxes. They want to know that every man is paying his proportionate share according to his wealth.''

Today, some of our worst tax inequities arise from those who use abusive tax shelters to exploit loopholes in the Tax Code. To stop these, and to make our tax system more fair and just, I am introducing the Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act of 1999.

Forbes Magazine, which proudly proclaims itself ''The Capitalist Tool,'' recently reported on, as the cover of the magazine says, what are called ''Tax Shelter Hustlers: Respectable accountants are peddling dicey corporate tax loopholes.'' Here on the cover, we see the fellow with the fedora standing in the shadows. Unlike those supermarket tabloid stories about UFO abductions, with this particular cover, the substance inside actually lives up to the teaser on the cover. It is true that most abusive tax shelters are already against the law. The problem is that every time we shut down one, more spring up. That is not by accident because, as Forbes also reported, some of the Big 5 accounting firms actually have teams of staffers, and my guess is that most of them dress a little better than this fellow does, who are out there and have as their job to come up with one new tax shelter every single week.

Deploring what he calls the ''energy, creativity and viciousness'' of these so-called ''shelter shops,'' Calvin Johnson, a professor of tax law at the University of Texas, has labeled these hustling operations ''skunk works'' because of the sorry odor surrounding their fouling of our tax system. The literal hustling of improper tax shelters is so commonplace that one representative of a Texas-based multinational corporation has recently indicated that he gets a cold call every day from someone hawking or hustling one of these shelters.

Some are even called black box proposals. They are kept under wraps and they are not offered to any but a select few so as to avoid public notoriety. As a partner at one national firm boasted, ''A whale cannot get harpooned unless it surfaces for air.''

What a whale-sized gulp of arrogance toward honest taxpayers everywhere who dutifully file our returns on April 15 and who have to make up for the taxes that the big boys dodge.

My legislation will curtail egregious behavior without impacting legitimate business deals. It will eliminate the well-justified feeling that these high rollers are cheating and gaming the system, a feeling which leads to distrust and disrespect on behalf of our taxpaying public.

This bill seeks to shut down abusive tax shelters by prohibiting loss generators. These are transactions that lack any legitimate business purpose that are ginned up just to obtain another tax loss, credit or deduction in order to dodge taxes.

The second thing the bill does is it says that a company which thinks it has a proper shelter will be required to provide complete, clear and concise disclosure, verified by a corporate officer. This does not make them forfeit their buried pirate treasure but on these complex transactions it does require them to give up the map where X marks the spot of the treasure.

These disclosure provisions were drafted based on the sound advice of tax practitioners; not the kind of practitioner that is proud to define their success by having another loophole named after them, but the thoughtful commentary of the tax section of the American Bar Association.

The third provision is directed to the penalty for tax dodging, and we tighten and increase the penalty for such tax dodging. Just getting some thick carpet, downtown lawyer to bless what the accounting department has contrived with the help of these tax shelter hustlers is no longer going to be sufficient to save a corporation from penalties if it has clearly stepped over the line with an abusive tax shelter.

These abusive tax shelters have grown and have become so extensive that some experts estimate that they account for $10 billion a year in lost tax revenue. Typical is a recent ad selling a guide to offshore tax shelters that ran in the Wall Street Journal. Featuring a happy, smiling, bikini-clad couple, sipping cocktails on the beach, obviously enjoying the good life at someone else's expense, the ad promised, ''Live simply and easily make a tax-free fortune using the world's most exotic places,'' and you can do all this, it claimed, ''in complete privacy and full protection from everyone, including your spouse, competitors, partners and more.''

Such schemes suggest the challenge that we face. Surely if locally owned businesses in central Texas can play by the rules, the big boys should, too. The Abusive Tax Shelter Shutdown Act is not a panacea but it will help law enforcement close some loopholes, eliminate the sham transactions and stop the hustlers.

As we say in Texas, move 'em out and shut 'em down.

TURKEY MUST ACCEPT KURDISH PEACE OFFER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, there are some who call it the ''trial of the century.'' Abdullah Ocalan, the imprisoned Kurdish rebel leader, is on trial before a Turkish military tribunal. The trial could hardly be called fair. Mr. Ocalan, who faces the death penalty if convicted, has been denied access to his lawyers. His legal team has faced a pattern of harassment and threats.

The Turkish government and media have stirred up nationalistic passions against Mr. Ocalan. If the Turkish government forges ahead with legally railroading Mr. Ocalan and the threat to hang him is carried out, the result would be disastrous for all the people of the region. Yet interestingly enough, the trial of Mr. Ocalan has created a potentially positive and long overdue opening towards reconciliation between the Turkish and Kurdish peoples.

Standing in the dock at his show trial, Mr. Ocalan made a brave plea for a negotiated, Democratic solution to the Kurdish question. Mr. Ocalan's organization, the Kurdish workers's party known as the PKK, has announced its support for Mr. Ocalan's peace offer. With the media attention that the trial is attracting, putting the Kurdish issue in the spotlight to an almost unprecedented degree, Turkey could vastly improve its international standing by simply agreeing to begin negotiations with the Kurdish leaders but, sadly, Mr. Speaker, so far the Turkish government has rejected the path to peace insisting that it will not negotiate with Mr. Ocalan or any leaders of the Kurdish movement.

Yesterday's Washington Post had an editorial entitled, ''Turkey's Kurdish Opening,'' which begins with these words: ''Turkey may have a once in a generation opening to treat its national cancer, the problem of its aggrieved Turkish minority.''

The editorial in the Post, a paper that has previously shown sympathy to the Turkish point of view on a number of issues, notes that the Turkish policy of relentless military and political attack on the Kurdish movement dooms Turkey to a conflict that sets it at odds with the human Democratic values of the western nations whose company it most values.

That is the bind, Mr. Speaker, that Turkey has put itself into. Turkey is a member of NATO and has sought membership in the European Union, so far unsuccessfully. At the same time, Turkey continues not only to wage a dirty war against a minority community within its borders but to repress and essentially deny the existence of a distinct Kurdish identity, language or culture.

In the meantime, Turkey's economic development, levels of education, infrastructure, development and standard of living, lag far behind European standards while scarce resources are squandered on its ongoing war against the Kurds. It is a cycle that must be broken.

As The Washington Post editorial concludes, ''Friends of Turkey must hope it can muster the courage to broaden its perspective and to conduct an honest exploration of the Ocalan initiative.''

Mr. Speaker, two recent articles in the New York Times suggest unfortunately that the Turkish political and military establishment is a long way from making this major leap. Last Friday, it was reported that Turkey's best known human rights advocate, Akin Birdal, entered prison to serve a 9½ month sentence for giving speeches judged subversive.

What was his subversive activity? Mr. Birdal, chairman of the Human Rights Association, has repeatedly urged the Turkish state to reach a peaceful settlement with Kurdish rebels. Now, as the article reports, such statements constitute support for terrorism under Turkish law. This same law has recently been used to convict two journalists, a university professor and an aide to Mr. Birdal. While some brave Turks, including the country's top judge, have called for repeal of the law, the hardline regime refuses to give in.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to encourage the U.S. Government to play a constructive role in heading off the crisis in Turkey, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and I, are circulating a letter this week asking our colleagues to sign a letter to President Clinton urging his intervention to implore that the Turkish authorities show some basic fairness in trying Mr. Ocalan and to spare his life. Seeking a fair trial for Mr. Ocalan should be the first step in our efforts to press Turkey to enter into negotiations to achieve a political solution to this tragic struggle.

Mr. Ocalan and his Kurdish organization have offered an olive branch to the Turkish government. It would be both the decent and the smart thing to do for Turkey to accept this good faith offer and to embark on the path of peace.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ocalan made several previous cease-fire offers prior to his arrest—all of which were summarily rejected by the Turkish government and military officials.

An article in Sunday's New York Times further describes the hardening of official attitudes in Turkey. According to the article, the Turkish Interior Ministry has issued a directive listing terms that must be used when discussing Mr. Ocalan, his movement or Kurds in general. The rules are binding on all reporters for state-run news agencies. It represents another example of the ongoing pattern of inciting nationalistic fear and distrust of the PKK, while trying to blind the Turkish people to the Kurds, their history, their culture and the validity of their struggle.

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish regime refuses to even acknowledge the Kurds' existence, referring to them as "mountain Turks," prohibiting all expression of Kurdish culture and language in an effort to forcibly assimilate them, while jailing, torturing and killing Kurdish leaders. The Government of Turkey's undeclared war on the Kurds has claimed close to 40,000 lives and caused more than 3 million people to become refugees.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Peter M. Kurowski, St. Paul's Lutheran Church, California, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Lord God, enlighten us to see that unless You build the house, in vain the artisans toil; and unless You stand sentry upon a nation, in vain do our guardians watch. Open our eyes to see Your awesome fingerprints in creation, Your amazing footprints in the realm of redemption, and Your architectural imprints upon the documents which helped to give birth to this Republic. May these revelations move citizens everywhere to walk humbly, do justice, and show compassion. Inspire a desire in Americans everywhere to absorb the Biblical book of Ecclesiastes so that as a nation we do not repeat the melancholy moments in history. We ask this in the name of the Wisdom of the ages, the Saviour of sinners, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). 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.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG 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.

INTRODUCING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to introduce to the House the guest chaplain who is with us today, the Reverend Dr. Peter M. Kurowski. The Reverend is affectionately referred to as ''Pastor Pete'' by his congregation at St. Paul's Lutheran Church in California, Missouri, which is located in Missouri's Fourth Congressional District.

In recent years, I have had the privilege of getting to know Pastor Pete through our discussions of history and the Missouri Tigers. I have found his spiritual guidance to be uplifting as well as inspirational. Pastor Pete, along with his wife of 25 years, Janice, continue to make such an outstanding contribution to their communities.

A native of Green Bay, Wisconsin, Pastor Pete has attended Oshkosh State University, Concordia College and Fort Wayne Senior College. He later attended Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

He has served congregations in St. Louis, Missouri, Joylston, Illinois, and New Orleans, Louisiana, prior to serving the California, Missouri community.

Pastor Pete is the author of the book, Lifelines of Love, and has done script writing for the Lutheran Layman League animated video ''Red Boots for Christmas.'' He has also written a number of theological and sports articles for various periodicals.

I am truly proud to have such a distinguished leader from California, Missouri give the opening prayer to my colleagues here in the House this morning.

VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 45, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1999

(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, the Committee on Commerce recently amended H.R. 45, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1999 to exempt the $8 billion Nuclear Waste Fund from the Budget Enforcement Act. So what does this mean? Well, this move to take the nuclear waste budget off-budget would open the floodgates for unrestricted, uncontrolled spending.

By taking H.R. 45 off-budget, we will permit funding increases without the necessary offsets and provide for little or no congressional oversight and accountability, all in the name of nuclear waste.

By fragmenting the budget to accommodate nuclear waste interests, we would set a dangerous precedent that every other trust fund would undoubtedly attempt to follow.

As Members of Congress, we should be concerned about any erosion of our commitment to budget discipline. Let us not forget that there are several hundred trusts and special funds in existence today, with only Social Security and the Postal Service receiving this special status of off-budget.

I would encourage my colleagues to uphold their commitment to fiscal responsibility and vote ''no'' on H.R. 45. Let us not make nuclear waste more important than our Social Security, Medicare, seniors and children.

CRA IS A VITAL SUCCESS STORY

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Community Reinvestment Act is a success. Community reinvestment means banks responding to creditworthy applicants in their local neighborhoods or towns. Congress must maintain this vital policy, not undercut it.

CRA means safe and sound business for financial institutions. That is the key requirement of the 1977 law. CRA's bank success is meeting people opportunities that safe and sound business represents.

In my home district, the University National Bank is serving Frogtown, an inner city community in St. Paul. This bank has received an outstanding CRA rating for its efforts.

Amazingly, over 70 percent of the loans in University Bank's portfolio qualify for CRA. Of the millions of dollars these loans represent, they have had losses totaling only $300. These loans happened because every year University Bank officers are required to make 500 calls, person-to-person, getting outside the bank.

In telling the story of improving the urban community, Bill Reiling, the owner and president of the University National Bank, states and I quote, ''Behind every statistic is a human success story with repercussions that echo and multiply a dozen-fold. How do you measure the impact of a successful new retail business that brings a new job base? How do you measure the positive effect of revitalizing a decaying neighborhood?''

Mr. Speaker, that is CRA. That is how we measure it.

EGYPT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern for what is happening in the country of Egypt. Our State Department's Country Reports this year detail security and police abuses against citizens from minority backgrounds.

The Reports detailed one horrifying situation in which police brutalized over 1,200 Egyptian Coptik Christians in the village of El-Kosheh. The official Egyptian report of the incident, in response, states that there was no torture or abuse.

Mr. Speaker, look at these photos. We can see the wounds made on this man's flesh. We can see in the faces of the little children who were dashed to the ground and beaten while in their mothers' arms.

The apparent unwillingness of the Egyptian Government to punish police officers involved in these human rights violations, or even admit that these violations occurred is very unfortunate.

Recent news reports suggest that the police officers involved in these human rights violations were not only not punished but rewarded by the government.

I urge the Egyptian Government to take serious measures to correct police brutality and correct the injustices perpetrated against the minorities in El-Kosheh.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Community Reinvestment Act was created by the Congress in 1977 to combat discrimination by encouraging federally insured financial institutions to help meet the credit needs of the communities they serve. I am here today to report that the Community Reinvestment Act, or CRA, has been a tremendous success.

CRA's success results from the effective partnerships of municipal leaders, local development advocacy organizations, and community-minded financial institutions. Working together, the CRA has proven that local investment is not only good for business but critical to improving the quality of life for low- and moderate-income residents in the communities financial institutions serve.

We will be hearing about other CRA success stories in the next few weeks,

and I want to applaud the financial services industry for their extraordinary record of meeting their CRA obligations. At present, it is estimated that almost 98 percent of all financial institutions have achieved a satisfactory or better CRA compliance. We need to keep and strengthen CRA.

READINESS AND MORALE A PROBLEM WITH U.S. MILITARY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has created a national security emergency by spreading our troops all over the world while neglecting the defense budget.

From 1960 until 1991, American troops were deployed 10 times. Since the Cold War, our fighting forces have been called into action an astonishing 26 times. Strangely enough, this increased activity has occurred during a period in which our military has shrunk by 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the defense bill the House will consider later this week addresses the problems of troop readiness and troop morale by providing the resources to ensure that American troops are the best trained and best equipped in the world.

This important bill also provides funding to facilitate the deployment of a national missile defense system that will protect the American people from a ballistic missile attack launched by a rogue nation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation replenishes our military, strengthens our national security, and enhances our ability to carry out foreign policy objectives. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

PEACE AGREEMENT IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, about 40 days ago an 11-member bipartisan congressional delegation, led by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), went to Vienna in search of a structure of peace which could be put together with leaders of the Russian Duma, a peace plan which, hopefully, would lead to an end to the war in the Balkans. That was 40 days ago.

One of the principles in this plan was the following: Article 4. The humanitarian crisis will not be solved by bombing. A diplomatic solution to the problem is preferable to the alternative of military escalation.

Unfortunately, in the ensuing 40 days we saw an intense military escalation which resulted in the deaths of countless innocent civilians.

One of the articles in this plan that was put together called on the interested parties to find practical measures for a parallel solution to three tasks, without regard to sequence: the stopping of the bombing, the withdrawal of Serbian armed forces from Kosovo, and the cessation of the military activities of the KLA.

That is where the G–8 is headed now. But they should have stopped the bombing, and they should not today be threatening Belgrade with further bombing if there is not a signature on the dotted line today.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ARE NOT UNDERTAXED

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while in politics the truth slips out. Sometimes the so-called political pros call it a gaffe. Well, we have a perfect example of a gaffe by the leader of the Democratic Party in this body in the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

The gentleman spoke to a group the other day and he said, and I quote, ''You've got to have a combination of taking it out of the defense budget and raising revenue. We can argue about how to do that, closing loopholes or even raising taxes to do it.''

Well, maybe the other side can argue about how they want to raise taxes, but Republicans in this House are arguing about how to cut taxes, not raise them. The American people are overtaxed, not undertaxed.

Let us get together and cut taxes across the board on all Americans, and let us get rid of this horrible tax, the death tax, where the Federal Government can take up to 55 percent of what Americans earn during the course of their lives, even though they have been taxed for that over and over again over the course of their lives.

Let us cut taxes, not talk about raising them.

NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP WEEK

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss homeownership in America. Buying a home is a dream for many Americans. People want a place where they can raise their children, where neighbors come together to form a safe community, and ultimately, where they can comfortably grow older.

A memory I have from when I was young was my grandmother. She came to this country. She worked 7 days a week, every day that I can remember, walking half a mile to get on the bus and go to work. She was a restaurant worker. She would come back late at night after dark. I lost her a few years ago. The last few things she said to me was she had two dreams she did not accomplish in the United States: one, to visit the Pope; and two, to own her own home.

This week is National Homeownership Week and it is a time that we can appreciate the growth our Nation has made in homeownership, and it is also when we realize how much more we have to do to help people own that little piece of the American dream, their own home.

I hope that this week we all gather together and work very hard to ensure that there are ways, like CRA and other ways, to help people become homeowners in the United States.

AMERICAN NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY SECRETS STOLEN BY CHINA

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I say to Bill Richardson, tell the truth. He has been traveling around America and this city saying that when he found out, this administration, that China stole the secrets to our nuclear weapons, the W–88 and the W–87, that he took aggressive steps in 1995 to change that. Tell the truth, Bill Richardson.

U.S. News and World Report, special feature, July 31, 1995, Hazel O'Leary leaked the plans, which are in this magazine, for the W–87 nuclear warhead.

Tell the truth, Bill Richardson. It was this administration that publicly released the documented evidence relative to our W–87 warhead in U.S. News and World Report, July 31, 1995.

Tell the truth, Bill Richardson.

AMERICA SHOULD GUARD AMERICAN BORDERS

(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, 90 percent of all crime in America is drug related. Eighty percent of all heroin, 80 percent of all cocaine comes across the Mexican border. To boot, only three out of every 100 trucks coming from Mexico are even inspected.

It is so bad, experts now admit it is even possible for terrorists to smuggle nuclear weapons across our border. And after all this, the White House wants to send 7,000 American soldiers to guard the borders of Yugoslavia.

Beam me up here. Europe should be guarding the borders of Europe and Yugoslavia. America should be guarding the borders of America for the American people. Think about that.

I yield back this weak and foolish national security policy we have in place.

SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the challenge before this body this week and the next several weeks is passing 13 appropriation bills. The challenge is based on whether or not we are going to stick by the promise that we made in the balanced budget agreement of 1997. At that time most of the Democrats and most Republicans voted for that balanced budget agreement.

That balanced budget agreement included setting caps on future spending. Keeping that commitment means that for the next fiscal year we will not be spending any of the Social Security surplus.

Now the question is—can we keep that commitment? Can we keep that promise? Last week we passed what we called a lockbox, again stating that we are not going to spend the Social Security surplus dollars for other government spending programs. Let us keep our commitment. Let us keep our promise to the American people. Let us not jeopardize current and future Social Security recipients by caving in to the big spenders.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Republican leadership in this House told us that we could not vote on gun safety legislation before we left for the Memorial Day break because we needed to have a hearing in committee, needed to go through the proper legislative process.

Ah-ha. Well, now they are bringing this legislation to the floor with no hearings and with no markup. So what was the 2-week delay all about? It was about giving the NRA a head start. We took the Republican leadership at their word that they would play it straight with gun safety legislation. But now it appears that they spent the last 2 weeks scheming with the NRA to bring down gun safety legislation.

With their 2-week head start, the NRA has launched a 2-week campaign of fear. They have spent more than a million dollars in the last several days to kill gun safety legislation.

I am here today to ask to plead with the Republican leadership in this body to stop playing games with gun safety. This debate is about protecting our children. Thirteen children a day are killed by gunfire in the United States of America. This is about saving kids' lives.

This vote on gun safety is deadly serious. There is no more room for political games. Let us stop the games. Let us pass gun safety legislation for our families and for our children.

U.S. MILITARY SHOWING SEVERE SIGNS OF STRAIN

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, American military success in Kosovo has shown once again that American forces are second to none in the world. Our brave pilots and many thousands who work around the clock to support them deserve our highest praise and our deep gratitude.

However, the military operation in Kosovo has also exposed the problem in our national defense structure that we need that needs immediate attention. Our military is undermanned, overextended, and showing severe signs of strain after having to do more with less for too long.

The defense appropriations bill on the House floor later this week is an excellent first step to reverse the trend and to end the damage to the shortchanging of the U.S. military. I urge its support.

COMMEMORATING LIVES OF D.C. FIREFIGHTERS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate the lives of two brave young firefighters who gave their lives in a fire in the District while Congress was out of session. Both firefighters were born and raised in the Nation's Capital.

The loss is not only to their families but to the Congress of the United States and to this city, where D.C. firefighters prepare every day to do what is necessary to protect both hometown Washington and official Washington, including the Members of this House.

Anthony Phillips of Engine Company No. 10 worked the busiest fire house in the Nation. Only 30 years old, he was the father of two boys, one 21 months old, the other 6 years old. Firefighter Phillips married his childhood sweetheart, Lysa. They were a deeply loving couple and family.

Louis Matthews of Engine Company No. 26 was only 29 years old but served 7 years as a D.C. firefighter. He leaves a loving family, including his mother, Cassandra Shields, and two young children.

Members of this body have been mindful of the risks firefighters face and the sacrifices that their families could be called upon to make. I am grateful that the 105th Congress passed my bill, the Officer Brian Gibson Tax Free Pension Equity Act, that allows the families of firefighters killed in the line of duty to receive survivors' benefits tax free. They did their duty, and I am grateful that we did ours.

SPIRIT OF FREEDOM AWARD

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

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I presented to Mobile Meals of Spartanburg, South Carolina, the first Spirit of Freedom Award. Every day Mobile Meals volunteers deliver as well as prepare over 1,700 meals to needy people in my district, all without government funding. The people at Mobile Meals have shown me that freedom comes from the able hands of local people, people who take responsibility for themselves and their communities.

Here in Washington, we can either protect or take away those freedoms. I believe it is our role in Congress to be the guardians of freedom. That is why we are working to return dollars, decisions and freedoms to the hands of local people.

I thank Mobile Meals for showing us that freedom begins at home.

RAISING ELIGIBILITY AGE OF MEDICARE RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, this Nation already has the most unfair distribution of wealth and income in the entire industrialized world.

Given that reality, it is absurd that some in Congress are talking about giving huge tax breaks to some of the wealthiest people in this country while at the same time they are talking about raising the eligibility age of Medicare to 67, charging a 10-percent copayment fee for home health care, and voucherizing Medicare, which would mean more out-of-pocket expenses for seniors in this country.

Mr. Speaker, 111 members of Congress have written to the President. We have urged him, do not raise the eligibility age of Medicare to 67, do not charge a 10-percent copayment fee on home health care to some of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country, and do not force seniors to pay more out-of-pocket for their health care costs.

I urge all Members of this body to join us.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, military readiness is the kind of thing that requires long-term planning and long-term commitment. Decisions made today about our military forces do not show up until years down the road. That is why it is easy for shortsighted or politically motivated leaders to shortchange our military for a few years because future generations will have to pay the price.

Similarly, the defense buildup that President Reagan made his top priority paid huge dividends only after he left office. The Soviet Union fell shortly after he left, and President George Bush reaped the benefits of our extraordinary military prowess in the Gulf War in 1991.

In my judgment, and in the opinion of many military experts, this administration has shortchanged our military systematically over the past 6 years. Our commitments grow, but the resources are just not there to meet them.

This House will soon have the opportunity to take action to change this course. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the DOD authorization bill.

SCHOOL SAFETY AND GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, how much longer do families have to live in fear before Congress acts? How many more memorials must our Nation have before Congress passes sensible gun control? Those are the questions.

It appears that the answer is that some politicians would rather have the National Rifle Association invest in them than for our Congress to invest in our children's future, investing with a sensible gun control measure.

Millions of families across the Nation agree that we need to tighten gun control laws. So it is time for the House to act. The Senate has done the right thing. Now the House must do the same. If that means coming to the floor every day demanding that the Republican leadership bring debate on child safety locks, on background checks at gun shows, and a prohibition on the import of large magazines, so be it, we are going to do it.

We must pass gun safety legislation, we must make our schools safe, and we must do it now.

CHINA HAS AMERICAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I suspect I am one of the few individuals in this House who has worked at a nuclear weapons laboratory. I did this for one summer while I was a graduate student at Berkeley at the University of California. And I found it to be a very good experience to work at a nuclear weapons laboratory, even though my work was primarily on unclassified science.

What impressed me is that the individuals that worked at that laboratory were extremely security conscious and they were very concerned about any leaks of information about nuclear weapons. We seem to have lost that. We have lost that culture ever since the Berlin Wall fell.

But what is dismaying to me is the reaction of the White House to the discovery that the Chinese have managed to obtain information about our nuclear weapons. The spin doctors have gone to work full-time. The President's men seem to be more concerned with blaming the Bush and Reagan administration than with taking responsibility and trying to correct the problem as they should be doing.

□ 1030

It is the mark of strong individuals to take responsibility for the mistakes that they have made and to correct them, and I expect no less of the President and his aides. We do have leaks, we have to cure them, and it is absolutely essential that those individuals who are responsible take responsibility, correct the problem, and solve it.

SUPPORT GUN CRIME PROSECUTION ACT

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and other cosponsors, I introduce a bill that will put at least one Federal prosecutor in every State.

There is no question that our Nation is facing a growing scourge of gun violence that is holding an increasing number of our communities under siege. Crimes committed with firearms are among the most heinous and should be prosecuted as quickly and forcefully as possible.

While the Federal government has in the past approached the problem of gun violence by passing new Federal laws and putting more cops on the beat, there is nothing that can be done to attack the problem if our prosecutors do not have the resources they need to enforce existing laws. Simply put, we must give them the resources they need to fully enforce existing gun laws. That is why we have introduced the Gun Crime Prosecution Act of 1999.

This legislation will give every United States Attorney for each judicial district an additional Assistant U.S. Attorney position whose sole purpose would be the prosecution of crimes committed with a firearm. Specifically, each new prosecutor position would give priority to violent crimes and crimes committed by felons by committing a full-time position within the United States Attorney's office to prosecuting gun crimes. We will be giving our prosecutors the tools they need to enforce the laws that already exist in the statute.

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

A BETTER WAY

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my neighbor from New Mexico offer a point which I think cannot be stated enough. You see, it is not enough to pass laws in Congress. The fact is, prosecutors and those who would uphold the law need to enforce existing laws and need to obey existing laws.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things I heard time and again visiting with my constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona. I know that different Members of this body spent their district work periods in different ways. For example, the minority leader of this body, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), spent time in Philadelphia bragging about how my friends on the left might take control of this institution in the year 2000.

Here is what the minority leader said:

"You've got to have a combination of taking it out of the defense budget and raising revenue. We can argue about how to do that. We can close loopholes or even raise taxes to do it."

There is the candor attack, the honesty episode from the minority leader. Cut defense and raise taxes. That is their prescription for the future? Mr. Speaker, there is a better way.

PLAUDITS TO COX COMMITTEE

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

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I think every single Member of this body owes a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) my Republican colleague. The gentleman from

California headed the Select Committee on China and has been an outstanding example of even temperament, fair-mindedness and bipartisanship in his handling of the House investigation of Chinese espionage at our nuclear laboratories.

Although there is considerable evidence that the administration has been selectively leaking the most sensational stories to the New York Times, the Cox Committee has been a tomb. No one has accused Chairman COX or anyone on his staff of leaking information about his long-awaited report, an extraordinary achievement in Washington.

Thus far, public statements by the gentleman from California have been judicious and moderate and he has bent over backwards not to be partisan, even though most of the espionage occurred during the periods 1994 and 1995. Instead, he has focused on what can be done about the problems at our Energy Department laboratories.

CHRIS COX, well done. The American people have benefitted greatly from your outstanding work on this extremely important issue.

COMMENTS ON COX COMMITTEE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson stated, ''I can assure the American people that their nuclear secrets are now safe at the labs.'' Somehow I do not think the American people believe him.

In fact, the unanimous conclusion of the Cox Committee is also at odds with the Secretary's reassurance. The committee concludes that ''such thefts almost certainly continue to the present day.''

I am quite distressed at the reaction of the administration's spokesmen who even to this very day are downplaying the significance of the Cox report finding. And, of course, they are changing the subject.

The big news is not that our nuclear secrets were stolen. The incomprehensible news is what this administration has done about it when it was discovered in 1995 that the crown jewel of our nuclear arsenal, the W–88, was stolen by the Communist Chinese.

No one told the President.

The Justice Department denied the FBI's request for a wiretap on the clear and obvious suspect.

The issue, my colleagues, is what was done in 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question de novo of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 46, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—355

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
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
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 (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—46

Aderholt
Bilbray
Borski
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Etheridge
Filner
Gephardt
Gibbons
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hutchinson
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Martinez
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Pallone
Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Ramstad
Riley
Sabo
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Vento
Visclosky
Weller

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Scarborough

NOT VOTING—31

Boucher
Brown (CA)
Cannon
Chenoweth
Coburn
Coyne
Danner
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Frost
John
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Lee
Linder
Lipinski
McCollum
Obey
Pickett
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanders
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Smith (MI)
Tiahrt
Waters
Wise
Young (AK)

□ 1056

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 170, I was unavoidably absent from the Journal

vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a Certificate of Election received from the Honorable M.J. "Mike" Foster, Jr., Governor, State of Louisiana, indicating that, at the Special Election held on May 29, 1999, the Honorable David Vitter was duly elected Representative in Congress for the First Congressional District, State of Louisiana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk.

□ 1100

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DAVID VITTER, OF LOUISIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Louisiana delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. VITTER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the United States Congress.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE DAVID VITTER

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pleasure that the Louisiana delegation presents to you the newest member of our delegation, the newest Member of the American House of Representatives, Mr. DAVID VITTER.

DAVID is extremely well qualified to join this body. Unlike the Member in the well, who graduated from Harvard on the Bayou in Louisiana, DAVID actually got his education at Harvard University. He is a Rhodes Scholar. He and his lovely wife, Wendy, are the parents of three beautiful children, including a young set of twins. Their three daughters are here today to celebrate this day with them. Like CHRIS JOHN in our delegation, they are the parents of twins, and we are real excited to have him and his family join our delegation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Bob Livingston is here, a former member, as you know, and Mr. Jimmy Hayes is here from Louisiana, also to welcome DAVID.

Would you please join me in welcoming again the newest member of the Louisiana delegation and the newest Member of our House of Representatives here in Washington, D.C., Mr. DAVID VITTER.

SERVING LOUISIANA WITH HONOR, HUMILITY, AND AWE

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, distinguished Congressman TAUZIN and other members of the Louisiana delegation, I am honored, humbled, awestruck to stand before you today.

My goal in the years ahead is simply this: to become at ease and comfortable with you as I become a respected colleague and friend; to become at ease and comfortable with the ways of the House as I become an effective Congressman; but never to become so at ease and comfortable that I lose these feelings of honor, of humility, of awe. And how could I? This is the people's House. You, we, are the people's representatives, a vital part of the most powerful and moral political experiment in human history.

I look forward to always honoring you as the people's representatives and to working constructively with you on the people's business.

In closing, I would like to recognize the forces that have brought me here today: God; family, led by my parents and wife; friends; and, of course, the wonderful people of Louisiana's First Congressional District. They are here today, they are here always, and I thank them from the depths of my heart.

EDUCATION LAND GRANT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

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. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute 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 question 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 189 is an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources' amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read.

Members who have preprinted their amendments in the record prior to their consideration may be given priority in recognition to offering their amendments if otherwise consistent with House rules.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone votes during consideration of the bill and reduce

voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 150, the Education Land Grant Act, is the product of tireless efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). The gentleman is looking for innovative ways to provide educational resources for State and local governments.

Like many western States, Arizona has scarce non-Federal resources within the National Forest land system, making it very expensive and cost-prohibitive for school districts to buy land needed to expand or build the necessary school facilities.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) recognized this clearly when he had to fight to convey 30 acres of Forest Service land to the Alpine School District for the purpose of building new school facilities during the 104th Congress. The Education Land Grant Act would codify this process for all Forest Service land. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey Forest Service lands for educational purposes, as long as the school is publicly funded, the conveyance serves the public interest, and the land is not environmentally sensitive or needed for the purpose of the National Forest System.

□ 1115

This process mirrors the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, which allows Congress to sell or lease Bureau of Land Management land to State and local governments, and qualified nonprofit organizations for public purposes.

I am proud of the work my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) has done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we return to the Education Land Grant Act, which was scheduled for consideration a few weeks ago but postponed until today. The bill was reported on a voice vote from the Committee on Resources. It is a relatively straightforward bill and enjoys bipartisan support.

Although I know there are Members who have objections which will be raised in the ensuing debate, it will be ably handled on our side by my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. Speaker, this is a request for an open rule on a bill which could easily be handled on the suspension calendar, and an open rule which was granted only after the Democrat efforts to bring forward the juvenile justice bill were defeated on a party line vote.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the privilege to attend my granddaughter's high school graduation and to hear her give a commencement address welcoming her classmates to the last day of their childhood and the first day of the rest of their lives.

She stated:

> We have come to an intersection with no signs, our past beeping loudly at us and a foggy road ahead. Some of us are struggling wildly to go into reverse, which in life is utterly impossible. We are hesitantly facing our future, an unnerving task for we know not what the future holds. But take comfort, the beauty of the future lies not in its planning, but in its spontaneous creation.

Mr. Speaker, I was just like thousands of other parents and grandparents who attended the graduation ceremonies over the past few weeks. There we were, watching our kids, our grandkids, the kid next door who only last week it seems was learning to ride without training wheels, and is now about to claim his or her future.

Sadly, so many, far, far too many children in recent years have gone through that rite of passage forever tinged by violence inside their school walls. In some instances, the classes following these children will have learned not only the fire drill but the evacuation drill, in case a classmate has a gun.

A columnist in my hometown paper, the Democrat and Chronicle in Rochester, New York, observed that we have had so many school shootings that we can now rank them in order of the carnage which was created. It is so sad I can hardly speak to it, but in homes across this country, families are being forced to have exactly that discussion.

Mr. Speaker, if Members do not believe the threat is real, ask the mere child who came to me recently wondering how to find a bulletproof vest.

Mr. Speaker, let us not get complacent on the issues of gun violence and juvenile justice. Let us not let another graduation day pass without action by this House to reduce violence and to help our troubled children.

Mr. Speaker, that is still a debate which this House needs, which I encourage the leadership to allow, and which America wants. Instead of or at least in addition to the debate on the Education Land Grant Act, let us have a constructive and bipartisan debate on our response to the growing crisis of school violence.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, continuing debate on H.R. 150, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 150. H.R. 150 is an important piece of legislation that will help schoolchildren in rural communities throughout this country.

The Education Land Grant Act will allow publicly-funded education entities to acquire Forest Service land at nominal cost for school facilities. This will help many of the cash-strapped communities that are hemmed in by government land to provide an education for their children.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill that will help the Nation's children. I would like to thank the minority for working with us to fine-tune this legislation, and I look forward to the discussion on H.R. 150 on the floor. I support the rule, and hope that my colleagues will do likewise.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 150. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me to speak on this bill, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for his vision and forthrightness and commitment in bringing this bill before the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the Second Congressional District of Nevada. It has numerous communities that are land-locked by the Federal government, Federal land, including Forest Service lands. We have several rural communities that have very little private land from which to expand or build new schools.

For example, let me take one of the counties which I represent. It has an area of approximately 10,000 square miles. That is bigger than the State of Maine. It has 98 percent of that land being owned, operated, and managed by the Federal government. That leaves 2 percent of 10,000 square miles to pay for education, for the infrastructure, highways, for police and fire services, and all of the other county and local community needs. They are not able to reach out and improve their economic and financial base without H.R. 150.

Let me say that that 2 percent is not enough to support many of these counties. What we are asking for here is 80 acres at a maximum, that is 80 acres for this one county out of 10,000 square miles; 80 acres, not a lot. Without this legislation, there is no chance for these people to build new schools, to expand their community for their children, and to improve the future for their children.

H.R. 150 is a commonsense proposal to enhance the education of our children, not just in Nevada, not just in Arizona, but across America, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 150, the rule and the underlying bill.

Again, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding time to me.

I also thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Slaughter) for her remarks, such as they pertain to this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to come together as Americans, not as Democrats or as Republicans but as Americans, to pass an important piece of legislation that will make it easier for economically-challenged communities to provide educational facilities for our children.

The title of this bill says it all: The Education Land Grant Act. This act would allow school districts around the country to apply for conveyances of small tracts of Forest Service land at nominal cost to build, renovate, or expand their educational facilities.

Currently only school districts near Bureau of Land Management land can apply for conveyances under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, or R&PPA. Modeled after the R&PPA, my legislation simply adds Forest Service lands to this equation.

Mr. Speaker, the idea for this legislation grew out of work I was honored to do in the 104th Congress during my first term here representing the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona. At that time the Alpine School District in eastern Arizona was in desperate need of new school facilities. This district lies within Apache County in the eastern part of the State, near our border with New Mexico.

Eighty-five percent of Apache County, Arizona, is federally-controlled land. That limited what could be raised in property taxes, so the school district was dependent on proceeds from timber harvesting. However, due to lawsuits, logging had been halted. Consequently, the timber receipts that had gone toward funding the schools all but dried up.

The Alpine School District faced a dilemma. It could not afford both the cost of land, estimated to be $225,000, and the cost of new school facilities. So I introduced legislation which was signed into law that conveyed 30 acres of Forest Service land to the Alpine School District so that the people there could use that land for the construction of new school facilities.

Construction of those facilities proceeds, and I am pleased to report that when the children of Alpine return to school this fall, the facilities will be completed.

The legislation we consider today sets up a national mechanism for school districts to apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for Forest Service land without having to come to Congress to draw up a specific bill for a special remedy, as the people of Alpine did.

However, the Education Land Grant Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey Forest Service land only if certain specific conditions are met:

First, the entity seeking the conveyance must use the land for a public or publicly-funded elementary or secondary school.

Second, the conveyance must serve the public interest.

Third, the land cannot, cannot be environmentally sensitive or needed for purposes of the National Forest system.

Finally, the total acreage to be conveyed will be limited to the amount reasonably necessary for the proposed use, but not to exceed 80 acres.

It also provides that conveyances under this legislation shall be made for a nominal cost using guidelines established under the R&PPA for approximately $10 an acre. The bill would provide expedited review of applications by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to acknowledge the receipt of an application within 14 days.

A final determination about whether to convey the land must be made within 120 days unless the Secretary of Agriculture submits a written notice to the applicant explaining the delay.

Passage of this bill will be a boon for rural areas throughout our Nation, but especially in the West and in the South, where there is a large amount of federally-controlled land.

For example, Gila County, Arizona, a county in my district which is approximately the size of the State of Connecticut, only finds 3 percent of its land mass privately owned. In other words, 97 percent of Gila County, Arizona, is under the control, the ownership, if you will, of some governmental entity.

That is why in the West private land, when we can find it, like in Gila County, only 3 percent, is extremely expensive. Not only that, but the West also confronts the problem and the challenge of rapidly growing populations. In fact, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada are the three fastest growing States in the Nation. This means there will be more demand to build school facilities but less land to do it on.

The Education Land Grant Act is one of the ways we can alleviate some of the West's growing pains and at the same time help our children receive the education they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have continually talked about the importance of education and the future of our children. H.R. 150 is a commonsense proposal on which we can all agree because it will allow economically-strapped school districts throughout the United States to put the money where it counts, in the classroom, helping teachers teach, helping children learn. This is a goal I believe we all support, Mr. Speaker.

I hope this House will strongly support the rule and this bipartisan, commonsense legislation.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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.

□ 1130

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 189 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. 150.

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. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHAW 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 150, the Education Land Grant Act. H.R. 150 is a good piece of legislation that will help school children in rural communities throughout the country. I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for his hard work on this bill.

The Education Land Grant Act was designated to alleviate the problem that may help small Western communities. These towns are often hemmed in by government-owned lands such as BLM land, Indian reservations, national forests, State land, national monuments, national parks, et cetera.

Since so much of this land base in these areas is nontaxable government

land, they often find it difficult to afford school facilities. The little private land that does exist in these areas tends to be very expensive. This often makes land acquisition for school facilities cost-prohibitive.

Those communities that are fortunate enough to have a suitable parcel of BLM land near their town can get land at a nominal cost for school facilities through the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. Unfortunately, those communities that are next to a suitable parcel of forest land do not have this option because the Recreation and Public Purposes Act does not apply to Forest Service lands.

H.R. 150 was designed to help these towns and cities surrounded by or adjacent to Forest Service land. They would be able to buy parcels of land for school facilities from the Forest Service at nominal cost. This will allow many of these cash-strapped communities to build more adequate education facilities for their children.

I would like to thank the minority for working closely with us on this legislation. The legislation we have before us today is much improved and something I believe we should all support.

I understand that the administration has some concerns with this legislation. In particular, they object to the concept of selling Forest Service lands at less than full market value. While I understand their concerns, I think it is important to note who it is that we are trying to help. We are talking about schoolchildren. We are talking about giving school districts a little land to build an elementary school or a playground for the children.

This is a good cause and a very good idea. H.R. 150 is simple legislation that resolves a difficult problem for rural school districts. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 150.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as introduced, H.R. 150 had significant problems. The bill would have amended the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to provide for the transfer of national forest lands to local education entities for use as elementary and secondary schools, including public charter schools.

At the Committee on Resources hearing on H.R. 150, the administration testified in opposition to the bill. While they supported the objective of making Federal lands available in certain circumstances for public purposes, they testified that the legislation was burdensome.

One of the problems with the bill was that the Recreation and Public Purposes Act was designed to apply to public lands only. H.R. 150 tried to shoehorn national forest lands into that law and it was not a very good fit. The problem was not only with using the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, but also the fact that the bill sponsor was seeking waivers or changes to the normal requirements of land conveyances.

We should not be setting different requirements for school lands than applied to public lands used for hospitals or other public purposes. Further, we had no definition of a public charter school and, as such, we did not know what such use would entail.

During the Committee on Resources' consideration of H.R. 150, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted and made substantial improvements to this legislation. As reported by the Committee on Resources, the bill is now a freestanding measure that provides discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to make available certain national forest system lands at nominal cost to qualifying entities for use as elementary and secondary schools and related facilities.

The bill requires that in order to make such a conveyance, the Secretary must determine that, one, the land will be used for the intended purposes, two, that the conveyance will serve the public interest, three, that the land to be conveyed is not otherwise needed for the national forest system, and four, the total acreage to be conveyed does not exceed the amount reasonably necessary for the proposed use.

In any event, the conveyance is limited to 80 acres, and the mineral rights are reserved to the United States. In addition, the committee amendment includes the reverter clause that would be applicable if the lands were to be used, without consent of the Secretary, for use other than the use for which the lands were not conveyed.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 150, as amended by the Committee on Resources, is a significant improvement from the bill as it was introduced. Although the administration objects to the bill because the lands are authorized to be conveyed for less than full cost, I do not think that what the bill provides in this case is unreasonable, given the discretionary nature of the bill and the public interests being served.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the author of this legislation, and compliment the gentleman for doing such an excellent job on this very necessary bill.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for yielding to me. I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) because, as I have learned since coming to this institution, good legislation is often a collaborative process.

I would simply say in response to a couple of points raised by the administration and the Forest Service, it is precisely because so many rural communities find themselves enclosed by federally controlled land are so economically strapped, so economically challenged, so economically disadvantaged that we brought this legislation forward.

Fair market value in this case cannot apply, nor should it apply; and this bill rectifies that at a nominal cost to allow these communities to concentrate their resources where they are best utilized, in the education of our children, by helping teachers teach, helping children learn, and helping local communities within their discretion use this as another tool to empower parents, to empower these varied communities.

The irony of the Forest Service opposition I think speaks volumes, sadly, of the fact that ofttimes there are two Americas. There is the America that is the cause celebre of the news magazines, of the media events, of the cries on our National Mall to remember the children, to care for the children.

Mr. Chairman, folks from the Sixth District of Arizona in remote communities, folks from rural America, do not often get the chance to come to Washington and engage in a photo op. They do not often get the chance to have officials from the administration come with hordes of media to cover an hour in a schoolroom.

But, Mr. Chairman, do rural children not count as much as those in the city? Do those who find their industry shut and their way of life abandoned not have the same rights as those who are easily accessible by the national media and so many opportune photo experiences? I say yes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe Members on both sides of the aisle, rhetoric notwithstanding, understand full well our responsibility to children, whether they reside in a cosmopolitan place such as the Bay area of California or a rural location such as Apache County, Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I have often said that Mark Twain had it right. History does not repeat itself, but it rhymes. With this new Education Land Grant Act, we will reaffirm one of the greatest examples that has gone before.

Another Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Justin Smith Morrill, in the 1860s brought similar legislation to the floor of this body. Indeed, in the presidential campaign of 1860, it is often obscured because of the terrible Civil War that followed, but a one-term Member, former Member of this body, a man named Abraham Lincoln, told Congressman Morrill that his land grant act would be one of the pillars of the Lincoln administration.

What the Morrill land grant act did for institutions of higher learning,

granting back to our States federally controlled land for the establishment of institutions of higher learning with concentration in the agricultural and mechanical arts, what that act did to make higher education available to all Americans is what we seek to do today with this land grant act, for schools K through 12, for those who find themselves embattled and at an economic disadvantage, without the voices of the special interests in Washington, to step up and put them on the cover of ''Time'' or ''Newsweek,'' or speak about the challenges they face, to say to rural America, this Congress recognizes the needs that you have.

Mr. Chairman, bipartisan passage of this legislation is essential because the impact of this legislation will literally be ground breaking because it will empower local districts. It will give them the opportunity to have another tool at their disposal to educate their children as they see fit.

That is why today I come to the floor of this House and I ask my colleagues to join me, not as Democrats or as Republicans, but as Americans, in offering this opportunity so that we can end the days that existed before, so that individual Members of Congress do not have to come with a bill exclusively designed for a school district in their area and hope that it is attached like an ornament on a Christmas tree to a larger piece of legislation and end up with a crazy quilt that exists at the discretion of this House and at the whims of the legislative winds that may blow.

This legislation strikes a powerful blow on behalf of America's children, and its impact will be far-reaching and have consequences that the pundits may ignore and the spinmeisters may do their best to sweep aside, but will not soon be forgotten in the classrooms of rural America.

I ask my colleagues to join me in passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we do not deny the bill has been, we believe, substantially improved with the substitute, as proposed, to the bill, as amended. We have no problem with this.

I would say I do not think this bill is going to solve the education problems in this country. There is much for this Congress to do. While we are happy to help pass this legislation, we wish that the majority would get on with the rest of the agenda that the people in this country want with respect to schools, and clearly part of that is to protect our students and schools from violence. We wish that before the break you had taken up the legislation dealing with background checks at gun shows, child safety locks, and other measures to try to prevent the easy access and irresponsible access of young people to guns that have played out in the tragic incidents, oft too often, in this country.

□ 1145

We appreciate that this legislation may impact 40, 50, maybe 60, 70 districts that may have access to some lands, but there are millions of students that are in schools that are crumbling, that are not ready for the next century, that have not been wired, and we really think that the Federal Government ought to participate in helping, whether it is through the Tax Code or whether through loans or grants, to rebuilding some of these crumbling schools in America that are both urban and rural so that children can have a decent setting in which to learn and in which knowledge can be conveyed and can be acquired by these children.

So this is an interesting piece of legislation, but it falls far short of what the country expects out of this Congress with respect to the children's education in this Nation. And we would hope at some point, since we are only working a couple of hours a week around here, that we would find time to address that legislation and deal with the issue of revitalizing the infrastructure of education in this country.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to concur with what the gentleman from Arizona said regarding this bill before us. I do not think that people who come from the large metropolitan areas or the large heavily populated States realize the problems we have in some of rural America. Many States, and we can look at a lot of the western States in particular and some in the south, where there is a small community surrounded by government land. I come from one of those communities myself where all of a sudden the Forest Service or BLM land has you hemmed in and communities can do nothing. They cannot touch it or do anything with it. Then, when they want to expand for a playground or expand their school, they have to come up against this bureaucracy of how do we do it.

Nothing is more difficult, Mr. Chairman, in America than trying to figure out a way to get the Federal Government to trade, barter, or somehow buy some Federal land. It goes through the biggest fudge factory there is in America, and communities are lucky if they get it done. It normally takes 11 years before they even look at it. Therefore, this is an overdue piece of legislation.

At this particular time we have a President of the United States and Vice President of the United States, and last Thursday the minority leader of the Democratic side, talking about the need for education, but we are not seeing too much happening around here. This is the first time this term, in my mind, that we have seen something that substantially helps schoolchildren.

I commend the gentleman from Arizona for taking it upon himself to do it. I know he had some tough fights in committee to get it to this point, but finally we will get something that will help these little communities that are a forgotten part of America. Everyone thinks of the New Yorks and the San Franciscos and the L.A.s, but they do not think of the little Apache areas or Farmington, Utah, or some other little place in Wyoming. Finally, we are doing something for those folks. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 150, the Education Land Grant Act, because it will help children in my district in Kern County, California, to continue to attend their school situated on federally owned land in the Los Padres National Forest. Passage of this bill will finally give the U.S. Forest Service the authority to dedicate 10 acres of land currently used by the Frazier Park Elementary School for continuation of this school's operation.

Many schools in the rural West were built on land owned by the U.S. Forest Service. There is often no other choice because the communities are surrounded by government owned land—''land-locked''. However, under current regulations, these schools are facing skyrocketing lease prices from the Forest Service's new land value assessment methods. Many schools are finding it almost impossible to remain open because of being hit by the higher leases. Yet, it makes no sense for the federal government to dedicate billions to general education while strangling specific schools that operate on federal land.

Frazier Park Elementary is a good example of a rural school the bill could aid. Imbedded within the Los Padres National Forest, the school is now facing a financial crisis. Since 1975, the School has leased and developed land from the Forest Service. Like many leaseholders, their property has been reevaluated by the Forest Service, and the lease has gone up by 1300% in one year from $1,290 per year to $17,750 per year.

Does it make sense to take education dollars from isolated, rural schools to put into the coffers of a federal land agency? Local Forest Service officials have repeatedly lamented that they had no authority to dedicate the land to the school district. Passage of this bill will finally give the Forest Service the authority and direction from Congress to make such a dedication in the case of Frazier Park Elementary School.

The Education Land Grant Act provides real and immediate assistance to school districts like Frazier Park Elementary School that are asking for our help. I urge my colleagues to stand and join me in voting for this bill and provide a resounding answer that we do support education for our children.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 150

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 ''Education Land Grant Act''.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Upon application, the Secretary of Agriculture may convey National Forest System lands for use for educational purposes if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the entity seeking the conveyance will use the conveyed land for a public or publicly funded elementary or secondary school, to provide grounds or facilities related to such a school, or for both purposes;

(2) the conveyance will serve the public interest;

(3) the land to be conveyed is not otherwise needed for the purposes of the National Forest System; and

(4) the total acreage to be conveyed does not exceed the amount reasonably necessary for the proposed use.

(b) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—A conveyance under this section may not exceed 80 acres. However, this limitation shall not be construed to preclude an entity from submitting a subsequent application under this section for an additional land conveyance if the entity can demonstrate to the Secretary a need for additional land.

(c) COSTS AND MINERAL RIGHTS.—A conveyance under this section shall be for a nominal cost. The conveyance may not include the transfer of mineral rights.

(d) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—When the Secretary receives an application under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) before the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of the application, provide notice of that receipt to the applicant; and

(2) before the end of the 120-day period beginning on that date—

(A) make a final determination whether or not to convey land pursuant to the application, and notify the applicant of that determination; or

(B) submit written notice to the applicant containing the reasons why a final determination has not been made.

(e) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If at any time after lands are conveyed pursuant to this section, the entity to whom the lands were conveyed attempts to transfer title to or control over the lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than the use for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been 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 demand for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any proposed question that immediately follows another vote, provided the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to this bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHAW, 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. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 189, 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
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
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
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
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
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
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
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)
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
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich

Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
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 (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
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bliley
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Crane
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Lee
McCollum
Pickett
Rush
Smith (MI)
Waters
Weldon (PA)

□ 1213

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey National Forest System lands for use for educational purposes, and for other purposes.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 171, I was inadvertently detained in a meeting with AARP re Social Security. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 171, I was unavoidably absent from the vote on H.R. 150. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, I was not able to record my vote for two measures considered in the U.S. House of Representatives today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for rollcall number 170, and I would have voted "aye" for rollcall number 171.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 1906.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 185 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1906.

□ 1215

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 26, 1999, the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 13, line 1, to page 14, line 19.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole has had this bill under consideration for 2 days. We have consumed about 11 hours of floor time so far. We have disposed of 10 amendments by recorded votes and we have reached page 14 of a 70-page appropriations bill. I believe that this is a record for this bill. I rise to make the point that the membership has been very strong in its support of the Committee on Appropriations and of the votes cast on the 10 amendments; over 70 percent have supported the committee's recommendations and less than 30 percent have opposed them. I want to take this opportunity to thank the membership for supporting our work and to ask for its continued support.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform the House that we are going to proceed forward on this bill today. It is our hope, in view of the crisis in rural America, we can move through it expeditiously. We look forward to working with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and to try to move through the amendments that remain. I think further delay is not in the interest of the Nation. We would like to move this bill to conference as quickly as possible. We look forward to proceeding with the amendments in order. I look forward to the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $4,600,000.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: for payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $276,548,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), $2,060,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $58,695,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,783,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,000,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,214,000; payments to upgrade research, extension, and teaching facilities at the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University, as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113 (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $8,426,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $908,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,561,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,000,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $7,365,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,192,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,714,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,309,000; payments for rural health and safety education as authorized by section 2390 of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 2661 note, 2662), $2,628,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328) and Tuskegee University, $25,843,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of the Smith-Lever Act, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341–349), and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $12,741,000; in all, $438,987,000: *Provided,* That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico,

Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

For the integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants programs, including necessary administrative expenses, $10,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, $618,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U.S.C. 114b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426–426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $444,000,000, of which $4,105,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 2000, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

Of the total amount available under this heading in fiscal year 2000, $87,000,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $7,200,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States, including field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $49,152,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL

Not to exceed $60,730,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $12,443,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,200,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, including field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $26,448,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed $42,557,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $446,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, $652,955,000, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102–237: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for shell egg surveillance under section 5(d) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(d)): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $572,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service

Agency, $794,839,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further*, That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $4,000,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of: (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer; or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968 (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, $450,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of the farmer's willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $559,422,000, of which $431,373,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,295,284,000, of which $1,697,842,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $97,442,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $1,028,000; for emergency insured loans, $53,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, $100,000,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $7,243,000, of which $2,416,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $61,825,000, of which $23,940,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $8,585,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $21,000; and for emergency insured loans, $8,231,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $214,161,000, of which $209,861,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 6933), $70,716,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 2000, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be $14,368,000,000 in the President's fiscal year 2000 Budget Request (H. Doc. 106–3)), but not to exceed $14,368,000,000, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 2000, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation in this Act.

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service, $693,000.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $654,243,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), of which not less than $6,124,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than $9,238,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed $250,000: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance and related expenses to carry out programs authorized by section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974 (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service (16 U.S.C. 590e–2).

WATERSHED SURVEYS AND PLANNING

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, and for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1001–1009), $10,368,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005 and 1007–1009), the provisions of the Act of

April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $99,443,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b) (of which up to $15,000,000 may be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701 and 16 U.S.C. 1006a)): *Provided*, That not to exceed $47,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205), including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010–1011; 76 Stat. 607), the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451–3461), $35,265,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Rural Housing Service, the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, $588,000.

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 1926a, 1926c, 1926d, and 1932, except for sections 381E, 381G, 381H, 381N, and 381O of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009f), $666,103,000, to remain available until expended, of which $34,387,000 shall be for rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of such Act; of which $579,216,000 shall be for the rural utilities programs described in sections 381E(d)(2), 306C(a)(2), and 306D of such Act; and of which $52,500,000 shall be for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in sections 381E(d)(3) and 310B(f) of such Act: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated for rural community programs, $5,000,000 shall be made available for hazardous weather early warning systems; and $6,000,000 shall be available for a Rural Community Development Initiative: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated for the rural business and cooperative development programs, not to exceed $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development; and $5,000,000 shall be made available for partnership technical assistance grants to rural communities: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated for rural utilities programs, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the United States/Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C of such Act; not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems for rural and native villages in Alaska pursuant to section 306D of such Act; not to exceed $16,215,000 shall be for technical assistance grants for rural waste systems pursuant to section 306(a)(14) of such Act; and not to exceed $5,300,000 shall be for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $45,245,000 shall be available through June 30, 2000, for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66, of which $2,106,000 shall be for rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; of which $34,704,000 shall be for the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of such Act; of which $8,435,000 shall be for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in section 381E(d)(3) of such Act: *Provided further*, That any obligated and unobligated balances available from prior years for the ''Rural Utilities Assistance Program'' account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 35, line 7 (relating to the rural community advancement program), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 53, line 7 (relating to ocean freight differential grants), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering would provide $1 million in the rural community advancement program in order to fund a national pilot program to promote agritourism. The purpose of this program is to provide another means of income for America's struggling family farmers. I think the plight of the family farmer in America is well documented and I do not need to get into it at this time. But I believe that the body here knows that many, many thousands of hardworking family farmers are struggling to keep their farms afloat and to keep their heads above water. I am impressed with the work done in the chairman's home State of New Mexico with agritourism, and I know the gentleman from New Mexico has been very active in this program. I think it would be very useful to farmers in the State of Vermont and farmers throughout this country to expand this general concept into a national program. The concept here is that in States throughout this country, tourism brings in substantial sums of money. One of the reasons people come to the State of Vermont or come to many of the other beautiful States in this country is because of the work done by family farmers in keeping the land open and keeping our landscape beautiful.

Unfortunately, in many areas throughout the State, the farmers themselves do not substantially benefit from the tourism that comes into rural areas. So it seems to me that if we could get a pilot program developed at the Federal level by which States can develop their own innovative programs, this would be a means by which tourism dollars can come into the hands of farmers and I think would well serve rural America.

My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the chairman of the committee has agreed to accept this amendment. I am very grateful to him for that.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this amendment has a lot of value for the rural parts of the United States. We have a program in New Mexico that was patterned after the same one that the gentleman is headed for. We accept the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to rise in support of this important amendment and to say that we would certainly want to encourage the Department of Agriculture to do as good a job as possible on linking many of the rural events around the country, many of our special fairs, rural shows, whether it is equipment, whether it is planting or whatever it might be. This is an incredible display of American innovation and creativity. I just really want to compliment the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for seeing this opportunity which can benefit Vermont, an incredible State. I am so happy to have traveled there myself, just the sheer beauty of it would be of interest to our own people and people from abroad, but all of the counties and townships and communities across the country that are bringing forth their wares and their culture and to make this more open and available to people who are touring. I just think the gentleman has an excellent idea and support this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member very much for their support. The bottom line is that we are all fighting very hard to see that our family farmers survive. Agritourism is one way we can get some cash into the pockets of our family farmers. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: $4,537,632,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which $3,200,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $32,400,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $100,000,000 for section 538 guaranteed multi-family housing loans; $25,000,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; $120,000,000 for section 515 rental housing; $5,152,000 for section 524 site loans; $7,503,000 for credit sales of acquired property, of which up to $1,250,000 may be for multi-family credit sales; and $5,000,000 for section 523 self-help housing land development loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: section 502 loans, $133,620,000, of which $19,520,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $9,900,000; section 538 multi-family housing guaranteed loans, $480,000; section 514 farm labor housing, $11,308,000; section 515 rental housing, $47,616,000; section 524 site loans, $4,000; credit sales of acquired property, $874,000, of which up to $494,250 may be for multi-family credit sales; and section 523 self-help housing land development loans, $281,000: *Provided,* That of the total amount appropriated in this paragraph, $9,829,000 shall be for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66, empowerment zones as authorized by Section 951 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34), enterprise communities as authorized by Division A, Title VII, Section 766 of the Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–277), and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further,* That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 2000, they shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $377,879,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Housing Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

In the third paragraph under the headings ''RURAL HOUSING SERVICE'' and ''RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)'', strike the period at the end of the paragraph and insert the following: '': *Provided,* That of this amount the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer up to $7,000,000 to the appropriation for 'Outreach for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers'.''.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to a special effort for outreach for our socially disadvantaged farmers. Members might recall, last year we made an effort to try to help the Department of Agriculture to resolve former civil rights problems that existed with loan programs and programs that were there to reach many of the small-scale farmers and ranchers, those grants that go through our 1890 and 1862 land grant institutions, American Indian community colleges, Hispanic- and Latino-serving institutions, as well as all minorities involved in agriculture. I think we did a good job of it. We took the unusual step of waiving statutes of limitation to allow complaints involving racial discrimination to move forward. This amendment this year would not increase the budget but would merely allow the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer up to $7 million from the rural housing salaries and expenses account to this program. If the Secretary uses the full authority to do that, that would mean that this outreach program for socially disadvantaged farmers would be brought up to the $10 million request level by the administration for fiscal year 2000. This program is important, because it provides technical and managerial assistance to small-scale farmers and ranchers. There is a particular emphasis in the program on farmers from minority groups, but the program is not just limited to racial or ethnic minorities. It is carried out through grants to colleges and universities, including the 1890 and 1862 land grant institutions, American Indian community colleges and Hispanic- and Latino-serving institutions as well as through grants to community-based organizations throughout our country. These institutions and organizations in turn provide intensive training and management assistance to small farmers and ranchers. This assistance includes, for example, preparing individualized farm plans, helping in upgrading accounting systems, and applying for credit, aid and better understanding and taking advantage of USDA programs and services.

This outreach is especially crucial now because of the crisis afflicting rural America. And it is vital to helping small and minority farmers and ranchers weather these hard times and stay on the land. I think it also adds to an important civil rights sensitivity that we need to continue pressing at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I want to compliment Secretary Glickman and his staff for being open to the efforts of this Congress to serve all of America. For these reasons, I am pleased to offer this amendment. I greatly appreciate the support of the gentleman from New Mexico for this initiative, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment. I thank her for her concern. The committee has increased funding for civil rights programs at USDA in the past several years but progress has fallen far short of their expectation.

□ 1230

The 2501 program has been moved within the bureaucracy several times, and it has never been audited. I believe the committee should look carefully at this program again next year to make sure that eligible farmers and ranchers get the full benefit of this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $583,400,000; and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided,* That of this amount, not more than $5,900,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further,* That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 2000 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $28,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided,* That of the total amount appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66, empowerment zones as authorized by Section 951 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34), enterprise communities as authorized by Division A, Title VII, Section 766 of the Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–277), and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further,* That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 2000, they shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants and contracts for housing for domestic farm labor, very low-income housing repair, supervisory and technical assistance, compensation for construction defects,

and rural housing preservation made by the Rural Housing Service, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, 1479(c), 1486, 1490e, and 1490m, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $3,250,000 shall be for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66, empowerment zones as authorized by Section 951 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34), enterprise communities as authorized by Division A, Title VII, Section 766 of the Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–277), and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further*, That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 2000, they shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Housing Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, and cooperative agreements, $61,979,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $520,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may expend not more than $10,000 to provide modest nonmonetary awards to non-USDA employees.

RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $22,799,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of $52,495,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $4,343,000 shall be available for the cost of direct loans for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66, empowerment zones as authorized by Section 951 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–34), enterprise communities as authorized by Division A, Title VII, Section 766 of the Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–277), and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones, to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, $10,000,000: *Provided further*, That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 2000, they shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, $3,337,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $15,000,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $3,453,000.

Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments in fiscal year 2000, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, $3,453,000 shall not be obligated and $3,453,000 are rescinded.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932), $6,000,000, of which $1,500,000 shall be available for cooperative agreements for the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program and $1,500,000 for cooperative research agreements.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; section 1323 of the Food Security Act of 1985; the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926; for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; for activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; $24,612,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $260,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935) shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $121,500,000; 5 percent rural telecommunications loans, $75,000,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, $300,000,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, $295,000,000; and loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric, $1,500,000,000 and rural telecommunications, $120,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935 and 936), as follows: cost of rural electric loans, $11,922,000, and the cost of telecommunications loans, $3,210,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, borrower interest rates may exceed 7 percent per year.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $31,046,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs. During fiscal year 2000 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be $175,000,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935), $3,290,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, $3,000,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE PROGRAM

For the cost of direct loans and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., $16,700,000, to remain available until expended, to be available for loans and grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas: *Provided*, That the costs of direct loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Utilities Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and for cooperative agreements, $34,107,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $105,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service, $554,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; $9,547,028,000, to remain available through September 30, 2001, of which $4,611,829,000 is hereby appropriated and $4,935,199,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That up to $4,363,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available unless the value of bonus commodities provided under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774, chapter 641; 7 U.S.C. 612c), and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) is included in meeting the minimum commodity assistance requirement of section 6(g) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755(g)).

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $4,005,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That none of the funds made

available under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, the Secretary shall obligate $10,000,000 for the farmers' market nutrition program within 45 days of the enactment of this Act, and an additional $5,000,000 for the farmers' market nutrition program from any funds not needed to maintain current caseload levels: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay administrative expenses of WIC clinics except those that have an announced policy of prohibiting smoking within the space used to carry out the program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), $21,577,444,000, of which $100,000,000 shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this head shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That funds made available for Employment and Training under this head shall remain available until expended, as authorized by section 16(h)(1) of the Food Stamp Act.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) and the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, $141,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note); special assistance for the nuclear affected islands as authorized by section 103(h)(2) of the Compacts of Free Association Act of 1985, as amended; and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a), $141,081,000, to remain available through September 30, 2001.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under this Act, $108,561,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

TITLE V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE AND GENERAL SALES MANAGER

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1761–1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $128,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $137,768,000: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of Public Law 83–480 title I credit agreements, including the cost of modifying credit arrangements under said Act, $165,400,000, to remain available until expended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out such title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 83–480 are utilized, $1,938,000, of which not to exceed $1,093,000 may be transferred to and merged with ''Salaries and Expenses'', Foreign Agricultural Service, and of which not to exceed $845,000 may be transferred to and merged with ''Salaries and Expenses'', Farm Service Agency (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701–04, 1731–36g–3, 2209b).

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I OCEAN FREIGHT DIFFERENTIAL GRANTS

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, $14,000,000, to remain available until expended for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act, including Food for Progress programs as authorized by the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided*, That funds made available for the cost of title I agreements and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably between the two accounts (7 U.S.C. 1701b, 2209b).

PUBLIC LAW 480 GRANTS—TITLES II AND III

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, $837,000,000 for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act: *Provided*, That sums made available to carry out title II or title III of said Act shall remain available until September 30, 2003 (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1721–26a, 1727–27e, 1731–36g–3, 1737, 2209b).

Of the funds made available by this Act to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, not to exceed 15 percent of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $4,085,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which $3,413,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager'' and $672,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

TITLE VI

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; $1,218,384,000, of which not to exceed $145,434,000 in prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379(h) may be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than $100,180,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent and related costs.

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263(b) may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

In addition, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381 may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $31,750,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $65,000,000, including not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to charge reasonable fees to attendees of Commission sponsored educational events and symposia to cover the Commission's costs of providing those events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be

credited to this account, to be available without further appropriation.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $35,800,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 2000 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 365 passenger motor vehicles, of which 361 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not to offer an amendment. I just want to assure the chairman and ranking member there was a statement I wanted to make very briefly concerning the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act which was a significant reform allowing for the expedited approval of food contract substances principally used in plastic, paper and aluminum food packaging, and under this innovative program approvals which currently take unto 6 years can be accomplished in as little as 120 days while still assuring the safety of these materials. Employers in my district would benefit from this program which would speed the introduction of new packaging materials and new uses for existing ones.

I appreciate the committee's statement recognizing the value of this regulatory reform, but I am concerned that the necessary funds have yet to be appropriated since both the committee and the administration are counting on the authorization of user fees. Although the industries benefiting from this program are willing to support reasonable use of fees, an authorization by Congress this year is not guaranteed. In fact, as of today no fee authorization bill has been introduced much less discussed in any detail.

I just wanted to point this out and I say it would be a shame if this innovative new program were to fall between the cracks, and as this bill moves along, in the process I would hope that the chairman and ranking member would work to assure that at least the authorized levels of funding could be made available in the event that a fee system cannot be enacted in time for Fiscal Year 2000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 703. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, and July 28, 1954 (7 U.S.C. 427 and 1621–1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided,* That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 705. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, fruit fly program, integrated systems acquisition project, boll weevil program, up to 10 percent of the screwworm program, and up to $2,000,000 for costs associated with collocating regional offices; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; and Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program.

New obligational authority for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; funds appropriated for rental payments; funds for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund in the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; and funds for the competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 707. Not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94–449.

SEC. 708. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 710. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs charged against agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service that exceed 19 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award: *Provided,* That notwithstanding section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310), funds provided by this Act for grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service shall be available to pay full allowable indirect costs for each grant awarded under the Small Business Innovation Development Act of 1982, Public Law 97–219 (15 U.S.C. 638).

SEC. 712. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, all loan levels provided in this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 713. Appropriations for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in each of those fiscal years respectively in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 1557.

SEC. 714. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal year 2000 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in fiscal year 2000 for the following accounts: the rural development loan fund program account; the Rural Telephone Bank program account; the rural electrification and telecommunications loans program account; the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account; and the rural economic development loans program account.

SEC. 715. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2000 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 716. Notwithstanding the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service; Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and the food safety activities of the Food Safety and Inspection Service may use cooperative agreements to reflect a relationship between the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, or the Food Safety and Inspection Service and a State or Cooperator to carry out agricultural marketing programs, to carry out programs to protect the Nation's animal and plant resources, or to carry out educational programs or special studies to improve the safety of the Nation's food supply.

SEC. 717. Notwithstanding the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, the Natural Resources Conservation Service may enter into contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements with a State agency or subdivision, or a public or private organization, for the acquisition of goods or services, including personal services, to carry out natural resources conservation activities: *Provided,* That Commodity Credit Corporation funds obligated for such purposes shall not exceed the level obligated by the Commodity Credit Corporation for such purposes in fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 718. None of the funds in this Act may be used to retire more than 5 percent of the Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank or to maintain any account or subaccount within the accounting records of the Rural Telephone Bank the creation of which has

not specifically been authorized by statute: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer to the Treasury or to the Federal Financing Bank any unobligated balance of the Rural Telephone Bank telephone liquidating account which is in excess of current requirements and such balance shall receive interest as set forth for financial accounts in section 505(c) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 719. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than $1,800,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants: *Provided,* That interagency funding is authorized to carry out the purposes of the National Drought Policy Commission.

SEC. 720. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 918 of Public Law 104–127, the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act.

SEC. 721. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 722. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 723. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the prior approval of the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 724. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2000, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2000, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 725. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the Fund for Rural America Program, authorized by section 793 of Public Law 104–127, with the exception of funds made available under that section on January 1, 1997.

SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out an environmental quality incentives program authorized by sections 334–341 of Public Law 104–127 in excess of $174,000,000.

SEC. 727. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Agriculture may be used to administer the provision of contract payments to a producer under the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.) for contract acreage on which wild rice is planted unless the contract payment is reduced by an acre for each contract acre planted to wild rice.

SEC. 728. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to enroll in excess of 120,000 acres in the fiscal year 2000 wetlands reserve program as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837.

SEC. 729. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the provisions of section 401 of Public Law 105–185, the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

SEC. 730. Notwithstanding section 381A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009), the definitions of rural areas for certain business programs administered by the Rural Business-Cooperative Service and the community facilities programs administered by the Rural Housing Service shall be those provided for in statute and regulations prior to the enactment of Public Law 104–127.

SEC. 731. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to carry out any commodity purchase program that would prohibit eligibility or participation by farmer-owned cooperatives.

SEC. 732. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out a conservation farm option program, as authorized by section 335 of Public Law 104–127.

SEC. 733. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's Budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the Budget unless such Budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2001 appropriations Act.

SEC. 734. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to establish an Office of Community Food Security or any similar office within the United States Department of Agriculture without the prior approval of the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 735. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 612 of Public Law 105–185, the National Swine Research Center.

SEC. 736. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the emergency food assistance program authorized by section 27(a) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) if such program exceeds $99,000,000.

(b) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act, $1,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of providing Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships through the Congressional Hunger Center, which is an organization described in subsection (c)(3) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under subsection (a) of such section.

SEC. 737. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to inform the membership this bill has been moving at record speeds today, and I want to express my personal appreciation to the majority for avoiding the kind of difficulty we faced on the floor the week before last on this bill. We have several Members that had wanted to offer amendments to the bill, and I think some of them did not anticipate it would have moved as swiftly as it has this afternoon, and I just wanted to make sure and put on the record that there may be some remaining amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I see the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is rising to her feet here, and there may be some other Members who were not aware until just a few moments ago that this bill would be on the floor and moving as expeditiously as it has today.

□ 1245

So I just wanted to reemphasize that point and give our Members an opportunity to come to the floor. We have

attempted to call their offices and so forth.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mrs. MEEK of Florida:

Add before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. After March 1, 2000, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) to permit the importation of meat or meat food products under subsections (a) and (f) of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) from any foreign country in violation of subsection (f) of such section; and

(2) to permit the importation of poultry or poultry products under subsection (a) of section 17 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 466) from any foreign country in violation of subsection (d) of such section.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment helps to protect United States consumers from unsafe foreign meat and poultry. What it does, it ensures fairness to protect our meat and our poultry products from unfair competition and it directs the United States Department of Agriculture to influence our current food safety laws.

What this amendment does is necessarily ensures that USDA will follow and enforce its laws. What it does is it will cut off funds for them for permitting the import of meat and poultry from any foreign country unless USDA determines that the inspection system of that foreign country is equivalent and actually provides a level of safety equivalent to what we require of the meat and poultry people in this country.

We want to be sure that that equivalency is established. If it is not, this amendment would certainly cut off funds to that foreign country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong support of the gentlewoman's amendment and her efforts to protect our consumers. Without question, food safety has to be a number one priority and responsibility of this committee. The National Cattlemen's Beef Association has been promoting this for a number of years. Why should not foreign meat imported into this country adhere to the same rigorous standards that our livestock producers here at home must meet?

Last year we know the Department, I think the gentlewoman referenced, allowed $3 billion, with a B, pounds of meat and poultry to be imported from 32 foreign countries on to our shores. This amendment simply requires USDA to enforce our food safety laws and protect our consumers.

I just want to make sure that the letter from the National Cattlemen's Beef Association is entered into the RECORD as part of this amendment, and I rise in strong support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S BEEF ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 24, 1999.

Hon. CARRIE P. MEEK,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. MEEK: On behalf of the members of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA), I wanted to inform you that NCBA supports the language on inspection equivalency you plan to offer to the FY 2000 House Agriculture Appropriations measure. We appreciate your staff reviewing the proposed amendment with us.

NCBA strongly supports measures that work, through sound science, to ensure the safety and wholesomeness of the U.S. food supply. In addition, we are constantly engaged in trade discussions and disputes with other countries who use the ''equivalency'' issue as a barrier to U.S. beef and other livestock products. Your proposed amendment certainly would reiterate the Secretary of Agriculture's important role in making sure that any beef, other meat, or poultry products imported into the United States adhere to the same rigorous standards that America's cattlemen and women, and other livestock producers meet.

Thank you for your leadership on this matter. We look forward to its successful inclusion in the Agriculture Appropriations package. Please let us know if we can be of assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

DALE W. MOORE,
Executive Director, Legislative Affairs.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have sent this amendment in its earlier version to the USDA but received no formal comment. We have been told that the administrator of the Food Safety Inspection Service has concerns about the amendment, but we do not know what those concerns are at this time. I think we can all agree with the heart of the amendment, that imported food ought to meet the same standard as the domestic products. There are important trade and food safety considerations here, and I would have liked some time to hear from the administration.

Nevertheless, I am prepared to support the gentlewoman's amendment, with the understanding that we will need to work together before the conference to give the administration an opportunity to be involved.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as supporting this amendment. As a physician and as a Member of Congress from a cattle and farm State, to me it is unconscionable that we can produce cattle and butcher it in the State of Oklahoma and ship it to Kansas under great quality standards, but, at the same time, meat produced outside of this country can come anywhere in this country and not meet those same standards.

I would like to say, as a Member of Congress from a cattle producing State, that this not only makes sense from a standpoint of food safety, but also is eminently fair to our cattle producers and our consumers. This will not raise the cost. What it will do is assure that the American consumer is getting what they paid for. The imported goods coming into this country ought to have to meet the same standard as the provider of goods in this country domestically produced. So I support the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo those comments and I want to support very strongly the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida. Her efforts in this regard will not only help with the safety standards, but, keep in mind, in the last several years, where we used to inspect trucks coming across Mexico and Canada, now you have trucks coming from Canada with Australian ground beef that is not even being inspected on some occasions.

Now, yes, this may pose some hardship on our regulatory system, but it is very much overdue and there is a tremendous economic factor involved here as well.

Our farmers have sold hogs at 7 cents a pound live weight. My God, the one thing we can do is ensure that the same hoops and hurdles our farmers have to overcome shall be the world's hurdles and hoops as well to ensure safety and quality and standardization of product.

So I want to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman. It is a great amendment and I support the amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say if anyone has ever suffered from salmonella from eating unsafe meat and poultry, they would understand the significance of this amendment. Why should our consumers be subjected to this very illness-causing disease and have these foreign countries being able to bring in meats and poultry without an equivalent kind of thing?

In speaking to the USDA, the USDA cannot clearly speak to this amendment because they do not have any facts, any substantive facts, that will prove that what they are accepting is equivalent, because last year, the last time, it looks as if USDA is not really enforcing the congressional directive,

and we need this tough new inspection system, and it is a key part of it, to take these samples of meet.

In closing, I want to thank the Congress, because this is a very, very essential matter to the health and welfare of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 8, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. ____. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be purchased using financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, the Federal agency providing the assistance shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. ____. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and inelibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this deals with the ''Buy American'' provision that says in the case of any equipment or products that may be purchased using any financial assistance under this bill, it is the sense of our Congress that those receiving such assistance should purchase American-made goods. It gives a notice to that effect. Most importantly, this provision also states in its final section that if it is determined by a court or Federal agency that any person has intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription connoting the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is actually not made in the United States, those people shall be ineligible to receive any contract, award or subcontract that is made available by this act. The bottom line, if you are saying it is made in America, it better be.

Finally, when we are going to spend hard-earned tax dollars of farmers that are getting hit from all ends, we should try and buy American-made goods. That just makes good sense.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we thought so much of the gentleman's amendment that we made it permanent law 2 years ago. I am happy to accommodate the gentleman and put this item in the fiscal year 2000 bill as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for Wildlife Services Program operations to carry out the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), may be used to conduct campaigns for the destruction of wild animals for the purpose of protecting livestock.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for salaries and expenses under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'' is hereby reduced by $7,000,000.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this is an issue which the House is revisiting for the second year in a row. Last year there was a lot of confusion around this vote. I tried to make it much more explicit and simple this year.

This amendment cuts funds only for lethal predator control to protect private livestock on private or leased land in the western United States. That is what this does.

Now, we are going to hear that actually this amendment will cause brown tree snakes to invade Hawaii, it will cause tuberculosis to spread in the northern Midwest, it will cause plague in the Southwest, it will cause planes at National Airport to crash.

No. In fact, all of those other activities would be enhanced, more money would be spent on those activities, if animal damage control, wildlife services, dropped their obsession with this failing environmentally and biologically unsound wasteful subsidy of spending $10 million, and this does not even cut every penny they are spending on lethal predator control in the western United States, if they just dropped their obsession and the subsidy.

I also offer that the ranchers would come out ahead. Nothing in this amendment would prohibit a rancher from controlling predators that are problems on their own property, owned or leased. They could go out and do it themselves. They could hire someone to do it. In some cases States would still unwisely provide subsidies to these private ranchers. But the question is, should Federal taxpayers pay for predator control services on private ranches for profit in the western United States?

If you have, as my mother did, a raccoon down the chimney, you cannot call a Federal Wildlife Services employee and ask them to remove the raccoon. If you have termites in your house, no one from the Federal Government is going to show up. They will laugh at you and tell you to call a pest control company.

So why, why is it that ranchers, private ranchers in the West, can call up a Federal agency and get a Federal employee out there pronto, who will not only kill problem predators, which the ranchers could do on their own or hire someone on their own to do, but will indiscriminately kill other wildlife, and in some cases, as happened on the northern edge of my districts, kill domestic pets and poison humans with these indiscriminate M–44 devices which cause a horrible lingering death?

□ 1300

Now, why is the Federal government paying to subsidize this activity? That is the question before us. It is very simple. In fact, if Wildlife Services stops its obsession and all the amount of energy they put into this program, they will do a better control, a better job in other States protecting against bird strikes, protecting human health and safety.

So this is a fiscally responsible amendment, an amendment that goes to cutting out an obsolete subsidy that goes to private ranchers in the West, and will also benefit environmentally in the western United States, will stop the indiscriminate destruction of nontarget wildlife. There are more coyotes now than when they started this program 68 years ago, and they are more dispersed across the country, because they are not even looking at the biology, they are ignoring previous orders of Congress to look at more effective and nonlethal predator control methods. They are not targeting the problem, they are just breaking up and dispersing the packs. Now you have coyotes in places where they have not seen them in 100 years, like Manhattan, elevators in Seattle. It actually happened. This has not been seen for a long time in this country.

It is time for this archaic and barbaric program and this subsidy to end. We have a very definitive opportunity to vote on it today. This is a very targeted amendment. Do not believe any of this other hooey about all the other problems that will be caused.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will vote down this amendment. It is true, there are funds in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for predator control in western States. There are also funds for predator control in northern, southern, and eastern States.

There is money for research on Lyme disease and diseases spread by rats. There is money to control the spread of rabies in wild animals in the Midwest and eastern States. There is money to protect the bird population in Hawaii from devastation by the brown tree snake. There is money to protect airline passengers by controlling flocks of birds at airports. There is money to control damage to grain crops by blackbirds and to control migratory birds that feed on domestically produced fish, so those farmers can make a decent living. There is money to promote nonlethal methods of animal control. There is money for animal welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if we are going to go after farmers and ranchers in one area of the country and deny them help, maybe we should look at all of the programs in this country and subsidies, to shift the entire burden to the States and the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This is the same amendment that we passed on a Friday and then defeated on a Monday with a few phone calls having been made over the weekend. I hope Congress would have the opportunity to vote again and be on record and pass this amendment this time.

It has been said that this is a very important program. From my perspective, I think it is a waste of money. The program does not work. It essentially is money from the taxpayers' pockets to private landholders to control predators on their own property. But what is sad about it is that the program seeks to spend $20 million to solve a problem that only costs private landholders $7.2 million per year.

Nothing in this amendment, nothing in this amendment will affect in any way the programs for technical assistance or for bird control at airports. I serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and on the Subcommittee on Aviation. I am an instrument-rated pilot. I have flown all over the country. I can assure the Members I would do nothing that would affect the safety of our Nation's airport.

This would carve out cleanly a subsidy to private individuals to control predators in a situation whose effectiveness is clearly under considerable question.

It is true that some of the resources for this program do go to other parts of the country, but 95 percent of the funds for this program go to these western States and to these large ranchers to use for predator control.

I would suggest that we can save money by passage of this amendment. We can eliminate a practice that by even the best of interpretations is neither effective nor seemly, and I think it is an entirely inappropriate use of Federal funds.

Although I have enormous respect for all of the Members of the Committee on Appropriations who have supported this amendment, I think it is time that we eliminated this unnecessary funding from the Federal government.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I want to talk about how my district is affected by what is going on out there. I want to share with the body some letters that I have received from people not only in the district but from the State of Oregon with regard to this.

The head of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the director, James Greer, has written saying, ''We rely heavily on Wildlife Services as a partner in addressing the effects of wildlife and predatory animals on livestock and crops. Specifically, they provide animal damage control assistance to help resolve depredations caused by black bear, cougars, and other predatory animals. In addition, they deal with human safety threats from an increasing cougar and bear population.''

These threats are from a cougar population that is very real. ''According to a recent survey conducted by the Oregon Agricultural Statistics Service, more than $158 million of annual damage to Oregon agriculture products occurs from wildlife,'' this from Phil Ward, the director of the Department of Agriculture in Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, my district is one of the most rural districts in America. We have lots of family farms, and 55.5 percent of it is under Federal control. The refuges and all out there, we have enormous populations growing of predators. The Wallowa County School District tells me they have such a problem with cougars that they will not let the young kids off the bus until their parents are there to meet them. These are issues.

Is this amendment going to deal with all of that? Probably not. I am not up here to make extraordinary claims. But the point is in these small rural counties, in these small counties that have 1,000, 2,000, 7,000 people, this program is an integral piece in an overall package to deal with predators.

I want to show the Members a picture that does not look too damaging here, but this is a coyote and this is a lamb. The next picture in this series is probably too graphic for C-Span to show. So when Members hear about control, predator control, and that somehow that is an awful thing, the flip side of that is awful, as well. The flip side is the maiming that is done of sheep and cattle and all; animals raised for production, admittedly, but for problems that are caused by these predators.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment goes too far. I think it hurts a program that is very important to the rural parts of America and that helps not just a handful of wealthy ranchers, as some might say, but probably close to 10,000 livestock producers each year are helped by this program.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Just on the photo, that was provided by the Federal government. It was actually taken at a test facility where the coyotes were starved and then put into an enclosure with sheep. It is a graphic photo, but it is not exactly representative.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if I might, the point is illustrative, here. The gentleman knows as well as I do, and as well as anybody out in agriculture knows, the next in a series of photos like this out in the real world, not in some pen but in the real world, is the devastation that we see.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would further yield, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding, although we are on opposite sides of this issue, also on the total wildlife damage in agriculture in Oregon, it was $158 million. The gentleman is exactly correct. However, the damage to livestock from predators was about $1 million, and more was spent by the State and the Feds to control that than if we had actually reimbursed people. The major damage was damage to crops, $148.6 million.

That damage, interestingly enough, took place from things on which coyotes predate, such as field mice, ground squirrels, prairie dogs, et cetera, et cetera. All of their prey is causing a big problem. Now we have to start another new program to go out and control the things that the predators used to prey on because they are eating the grain and other crops.

We need to get a better vision. I think the gentleman and I could construct something that would work better. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. However, I would say that indeed, I thought I heard earlier a comment about how the

coyote population was growing rapidly around. So it is hard to argue both cases at the same time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Not at all. If the gentleman will further yield, we will talk about coyote biology.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the point here is that we have many problems in my district in terms of predators devouring livestock. This program is helpful to that as part of the bigger package that combines State and local funds to deal with it.

Sometimes it is one game person that is out there dealing with this, one predator control officer. But because they are from such small entities, the funding is all combined.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the DeFazio amendment, which basically guts the core funding for USDA's Wildlife Services program. This is an important program that serves the public good in a number of ways, and it should be funded at the level approved by the House Appropriations Committee.

Reducing funds for USDA's Wildlife Services will not just affect lethal predator control in the West, it will also cripple other needed activities throughout the Nation. Often the same USDA staff who help ranchers manage problems of predators may also help local airports protect human life by removing flocks of birds near runways.

I emphasize that one of the reasons why the DeFazio amendment does not work as he had intended is that we use the same people, and when we eliminate a person, that person who might be not only helping ranchers with their predator problems might also be the same person that is dealing with flocks of birds around airports. That gets overlooked in some of the concern which has been expressed here on the floor.

Make no mistake about it, this reduction in funds is not a targeted cut. Let me also add that Wildlife Services is not a Federal giveaway program. The majority of funding for the work of USDA's Wildlife Services comes from sources outside the Federal government, like State, local, and private organizations. Federal funds help to secure the basic program staff, who then are able to draw in significant funding directly from those who benefit from their work. However, without these USDA staff, it is unclear whether these outside funds will continue to be made available.

Finally, I am amazed by the argument that this program is not needed because wildlife-generated losses to property and human life are considered low by some folks. That is like arguing that childhood immunization programs are a waste of money since so few children now die from these diseases.

That is the whole point. We spend public money on preventative programs so we will not have to face the alternative. We spend money on Wildlife Services in order to avoid rabies epidemics, downed aircraft, and dead or maimed livestock. I simply do not agree that just because the program seems to be working efficiently, it should now be eliminated.

Please support the responsible and necessary management of wildlife by opposing the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a compromise here. The gentleman raised a number of issues in which I am vitally concerned: Airports, bird strikes, those things on which a pitiful amount of money was spent last year, inadequate.

So if the gentleman would accept the first part of the amendment, which is a limitation only for lethal predator control for livestock, and not delete the amount of money and then support that, I would be happy to actually leave the funds in if we direct the service to not waste the money on the lethal predator control.

Would the gentleman accept that?

Mr. STENHOLM. I most certainly would not, because I absolutely disagree with the intent of gentleman's amendment. Even though that sounds very reasonable, it completely overlooks one of the fundamental areas I disagree with, that we do not need to be assisting our ranchers with predator control.

The gentleman ought to come to the Seventeenth District of Texas and see what happens to livestock and what would happen under gentleman's proposal.

I just respectfully differ with the gentleman regarding what the gentleman intends and would like to do.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would further yield, Mr. Chairman, I was the county commissioner. We had tough times. We had to cut our match, which lost our Federal predator control agents.

All of my sheep ranchers were in and said, my God, you will not believe what is going to happen, Commissioner, if we do that. Do Members know what happened? Nothing. In fact, the predation went down over a 5-year period.

That is really interesting, that when we stop spending the money, and we heard that they did kill some predators still, but they did it in a very discriminate form on their farms without a subsidy. I have a real life example in my district, which gets these funds, where we do better without them. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is where we have reasonable differences. I have real life experience on the other side.

But also I would point out one other major, important aspect of it. It is rabies control. This is something that is extremely important to the general population in large segments of Texas. Perhaps in this one district in Oregon it is different.

I would assure the Members, in most places of the country, the argument on the side of the Committee on Appropriations and what the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) are suggesting is what the full House ought to do today. We ought to defeat this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This is a classic case of the proponents of an amendment using misinformation and emotional rhetoric to try to push their cause.

I think I heard the word earlier in one of the arguments in favor of the amendment, the word ''barbaric'' used to describe the animal damage control program that currently exists, also called Wildlife Services, now. I stand corrected.

But I ask my friends who suggest that this program might be barbaric for them to think for a second about children who might be afflicted by wildlife who are bitten by an animal afflicted by rabies.

□ 1315

When you think of the possibility of the eradication that we try to do in Texas, in Texas, for example, children playing in their yards and in States all across the country and throughout the Southwest, playing in their yards, who might be afflicted by rabies because of some coyote or some other animal that might be crossing through a playground that might be afflicted, I would suggest that that is barbaric for anyone to think that a program that exists to protect the safety of children in playgrounds, that is pretty barbaric to suggest that that program is ineffective.

Also think about we just had a plane crash last week; and although the cause was not a form of wildlife, a flock of geese or birds flying into a plane engine, it is possible that that could occur. This wildlife services program tries to address that problem and keep those passengers safe in areas, many of which are located in the Northeast and in the New England area, tries to keep those passengers safe from any kind of accident like this by providing funds to control those flocks of birds near runways and airports.

Now, I would suggest that it is barbaric for anyone to think that a program like this is not a good program

that would protect the safety of families and children flying on airlines. So I would suggest that those who are proposing this kind of amendment, using misinformation and emotional rhetoric, should step back for a second and think about the safety of women and children, families of all ages from all parts of the country who might be harmed if this money is not in the budget, think about that and ask themselves if they could live with an accident occurring at an airport or live with a child dying who was afflicted with rabies because there was not enough money in the budget to support this program.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not plan on taking all of the 5 minutes, but I rise in strong opposition. I do not have a dog in this hunt. I do not represent farmers; I do not represent ranchers. I have got mostly a city area in my district.

But I want to tell my colleagues that San Diego is a series of canyons and areas where a lot of people hike, and up in the hills also. This last year we had two women joggers who were killed by mountain lions. We had requested that the Federal Government come in and help manage. Because they have not been able to hunt lions in a long time, these lions are coming into the parks, into where people picnic in private and public areas. A little child was mauled by a mountain lion, nearly died, lost an arm. Another woman was hiking, and the lion not only killed her, it ate most of her before they found her.

California also has this little rodent called, a prairie-dog-type critter, a ground squirrel. We have heard about rabies, but in California this little rodent and the fleas they carry have bubonic plague. Now think of the terror that that word brings in our past history. We need those kinds of eradications, not only on public lands, but on private as well. We cannot just take care of the public lands and then go over and let that menace ride.

So I rise in strong opposition to this. I have flown a jet out at Miramar. To tell my colleagues what an animal, a bird, will do to an airplane, this hawk went clear through my wing and broke the main spar of an F–4 Phantom that I was flying. The airplane was hard down. Luckily, I was able to land the airplane, but it totally destroyed the airplane, one hawk in the thing.

When we talk about public health, we talk about rabies, we talk about plague, we talk about lethal predators; and for this reason, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

I want to talk about just a couple different areas. I represent the entire State of Wyoming. Here is a little history lesson that I would like to give.

A lot of people think that the public lands in the West are all national parks and national forests. Well, they are not. BLM land, or Bureau of Land Management land, makes up about half of the State of Wyoming, and it is owned by the Federal Government. The reason that is public land is because it is land that no one claimed when the Homestead Act expired.

Now, why did not anybody claim that land? They did not claim it because, for the most part, it does not have water on it. It is not very productive. There is alkali on it and sagebrush. It is not productive land, so it was not claimed. No one wanted it. So it was put in trust for the Bureau of Land Management. That is now what is called the public lands in the West.

Now if my colleagues stop and think about this for a minute, if my colleagues think about the ranchers and the public land that they have or the private land that they have, the private land is private because they homesteaded it because it has water on it. Then because there is water on it, there is grass, and there is feed for the cattle.

But do my colleagues know what else? There is grass and feed and water for the wildlife as well. I am talking about deer and antelope, elk, moose, bear, and all of those kinds of species that we regard very highly that we want to take care of.

Well, the USDA predator control, or Wildlife Services Program is there to protect that wildlife as well. So I think that the gentleman from Oregon's opposition to this comes from the fact that private landowners are helped by this service on their private land. But when my colleagues consider that 80 percent of the wildlife out there, the deer, antelope, elk, and so on is on private land.

And yet the public is the owner of that wildlife. I think it is our responsibility, since we are the owners of that wildlife, to help take responsibility in caring for them.

Another point I want to make, in Gillette, Wyoming, and Campbell County, we have a serious problem with rabies. Rabid skunks have gone into the City of Gillette, Wyoming, and this program is helping us with that problem.

A cougar in Casper, Wyoming, was spotted just last week very near a playground. People in a city like Casper do not necessarily have the expertise to be able to deal with this without the help of this program. So it is very shortsighted to cut this program. It is a matter of public health, and it should also be a matter of public conscience.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also rise in opposition to this amendment that would severely undermine the USDA's Wildlife Services Program. While I do not have a district out in the West but rather in the Midwest, it is very rural, and it is very big, and the fact of the matter is this program is a critical resource for the farmers and ranchers in my district who face the threat of crop and livestock damage.

As a matter of fact, wildlife causes as much as $1.6 billion in damage to agriculture each year. Given the fact that our farmers, right now their entire livelihoods are threatened with uncertain markets, unpredictable weather, some of the lowest prices we have ever seen in decades, this additional threat of losses due to wildlife is really above and beyond all the other factors. It is something that we have to be very mindful of.

I also want to make another point which is often overlooked. Our farmers and ranchers are among the best stewards of the land anywhere. They are our best conservationists. Their land provides wildlife habitat. Their production methods promote wide stewardship of that land. So let us not point the finger at the family farmer and rancher when, in fact, they are doing good things for the environment and things that are good for the American consumer.

I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bass-DeFazio amendment. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services program spends millions of dollars annually to kill more than 100,000 coyotes, foxes, bears, mountain lions, and other predators in the Western United States. Although there are non-lethal alternatives. Wildlife Services chooses to shoot, poision, trap, and even club to death both target and non-target animals. This taxpayer subsidy gives ranchers a disincentive to seek alternative methods of livestock protection that might be more effective.

The USDA predator control methods are non-selective, inefficient, and inhumane. Aerial gunning, sodium cyanide poisoning, steel-jawed leghold traps, and neck snares are Wildlife Services' killing methods. These techniques have been known to kill pets and endangered and threatened species. Much of the killing is conducted before livestock is released into an area, with the expectation that predators will become a problem. However, killing wildlife to protect livestock is effective only if the individual animals who attack livestock are removed. Targeting the entire population is needlessly cruel, wastes taxpayer dollars and can be counter-productive. Studies have shown that predator populations reduced through indiscriminate killing produce larger litters to compensate and quickly rebuild to equal or greater than pre-controlled levels.

With this amendment, the Wildlife Services' program would be funded to assist with non-lethal predator protection services and in

cases to protect human and endangered species lives. I urge my colleagues to support the Bass-DeFazio amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which curtails the funding for what was formerly known as the Animal Damage Control program.

This amendment cuts $7 million in funding for the Department of Agriculture's inappropriately named "Wildlife Services" program. I say that it is inappropriately named, because the program does nothing to serve in the best interests of wildlife. It is, instead, a program whose purpose is to help farmers cope with natural predators who may prey on their livestock. While I believe that helping farmers is a laudable goal, the problem is that the way this program is administered, little help is provided and much damage caused.

Each year, this program indiscriminately kills 90,000 coyotes, foxes, bears and mountain lions. It is indiscriminate because there are few controls to ensure that the animals being slaughtered are tied to attacks on livestock. Oftentimes, young cubs are caught and killed, and on occasion, even a domesticated dog or cat will be mistakenly felled. This is simply not appropriate—and it should be stopped.

Wildlife Services is cruel because Wildlife Services still insists on using barbaric methods to handle these animals—including poisons, snares, and leg-hold traps. Sometimes, these animals are simply clubbed to death. Harp Seals are not the only animals that need protection from this brutal practice. We can do better than this—humane animal control techniques exist in our modern world. We can relocate animals that have caused problems.

How is it that we can build an internationally-sponsored space station yet we cannot find a way to treat our animals humanely? Do we need to spray poison in the face of animals that can contaminate other animals, or even humans, it comes in contact with afterwards? Must we kill not only the offending animal, but also every innocent scavenger that happens upon its corpse?

This program has been ineffective, and roundly criticized for decades. It was fully reviewed by advisory committees under the Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Carter Administrations—each of which suggested numerous reforms, but none have been adopted. The General Accounting Office (GAO) similarly released a report in 1995 that found the program to be largely ineffective.

Studies have shown the coyotes have adapted to our killing techniques much better than we have adapted towards more humane methods of predator control. Despite a 71% increase in funding for these programs between 1983 and 1993, coyotes have compensated for the culling of their species by simply having more pups. Surely, we have been out-foxed here—and it is time to stop the United States government from behaving like Elmer Fudd flailing blindly at nature to no avail.

We are smarter than this. This House is smarter than this. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this sensible and humane amendment being offered by Congressmen DEFAZIO and BASS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that I do not intend at least at this time to present. But the tenor of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, would have prevented Agriculture Secretary Glickman from instituting a new Federal milk marketing order system that would put thousands of dairy farmers out of business by lowering the price paid to farmers for their milk by hundreds of millions of dollars.

On March 31, 1999, Secretary Glickman announced his final decision on the Federal milk marketing order reform process that was required under 1996 Freedom to Farm Act. Unfortunately, his decision to adopt what is referred to as a modified Option 1–B has the effect of lowering Class I differentials for milk to virtually all regions of the country with the exception of the upper Midwest.

Can my colleagues imagine passing a policy, an agricultural policy that would harm the entire country except for perhaps two or three States. It defies logic.

The Secretary of Agriculture's decision flies in the face of broad bipartisan congressional multiregional support for Option 1–A. Congressional intent behind milk marketing order reform in no way anticipated this action by the Secretary.

My amendment also would have continued existing law, meaning that it would allow the continuation of the Northeast Dairy Compact. There has been increasing support for similar such compacts around the country as a way to protect against and otherwise prevent the harm that would be done by the Secretary's proposal and the havoc that it would cause in dairyland all across the Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, rather than offer the amendment at this time, I would like to enter into a colloquy with several of my colleagues. I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), chairman of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Agriculture, here; and I appreciate the gentleman coming down to participate in this discussion today.

Would the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) agree that the Department of Agriculture's recommendation of a modified version, Option 1–B, is unacceptable to the majority Members of Congress and more importantly the majority of American dairy farmers and would therefore have to be modified through the regular legislative process?

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be able to say yes just indicative of the fact that there is a bill to implement a different policy that I think has almost half of the Members of the House that are cosponsors of the bill. Certainly with the interest and concerns among the dairy industry, the Committee on Agriculture is certainly going to be looking into this in very short order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's statement and clarification of the Committee on Agriculture's position. My concern is that we need to ensure that the legislation is enacted into law before the Secretary's modified Option 1–B pricing reform is imposed on dairy farmers in my district.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would indicate to the gentleman, who has been a strong advocate of a dairy policy in this country and with a great deal of interest in this, there is a bill which has been introduced that will be the vehicle on the 24th of June for a hearing in the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture that is chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO). Very shortly after that, there will be markup on that bill, and that bill will then move to full consideration.

Given the fact that there is a recognition of some timely concern here without the Chair's being, I believe, able to give individuals total assurances about exactly what that final product would be, the vehicle that will be used for hearing purposes and for markup I think will be very much in line with the interest of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) in the dairy program.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) for explaining the position of the committee clearly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture for his comments.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the statement of the full committee chairman. I know of the intense interest of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) on this issue as well as a number of other Members of the House. As we have been negotiating and working through this issue, I will

assure the gentleman that this is a very important issue, not only to his dairy farmers, but to mine back home, and that we will move through the hearing, the markup process, and move legislation on an expedited manner through the House and try to solve this problem as quickly as we possibly can.

□ 1330

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman. With the assurances received from the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee I will at this time not offer my amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on the colloquy that we just heard with respect to regional differences in the fluid milk dairy prices, and I would like to recite for this House what the history of this matter is.

Since 1937, we have been operating under an outmoded system of milk marketing orders which mandates, by law, that certain farmers in certain regions of the country be paid more for their milk than are farmers from other sections of the country. That is a Federal law, believe it or not, and it has long since served its usefulness.

When the farm bill was up on the floor 4 years ago, then-Congressman Gunderson, the chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee, tried to get a legislative remedy to that long outmoded policy, and when he did that he was blocked, cut off at the pass by the House leadership, the Republican leadership in the form of the Speaker and Mr. Solomon, who chaired the Committee on Rules. In essence, what they told Steve at the time was, ''Sorry, we are not going to give you a chance to vote on a legislative remedy; the best you are going to get is that we will give the Secretary of Agriculture an opportunity to look at these milk marketing orders and decide through administrative action what kind of changes are needed.''

Acting under that limited authority, Secretary Glickman proposed what was known as Option 1–B, which provided very minimal changes in the milk marketing order system across the country. That was found to be objectionable by many Members of this House, certainly not me but by many other Members, and so this House last year passed legislation which blocked the Secretary from moving ahead with those changes, those reforms in the milk marketing order system.

So, then, Mr. Glickman went back to the drawing board and he produced a second modified version of his proposal, which would have provided some change, some modernization in that system, and it would have resulted in farmers in 15 of the 33 regions actually getting better prices for their milk than they do right now, and it would have had a downward pressure on some other regions.

It just seems to me that it is amazing that the folks who won by preventing us from getting a legislative decision on this issue, and who insisted that this ought to be handled through the administrative route, are now saying that they are unhappy with even the tiny changes that were made administratively by the Secretary and are now suggesting that yet another legislative action is required to selectively amend the farm bill.

I do not believe that is the right way to go. It seems to me strange indeed that in a Congress which so often talks about the need to move closer to market arrangements, that we are having people who are insisting on sticking to the status quo which blocks moving agriculture in the dairy area closer to market arrangements.

I also find it interesting that some of the same folks who say that we should have free trade internationally are some of the same folks who, when it comes to internal trade within our own country, want to put up all kinds of trade barriers, informal trade barriers, in the form of these regional compacts.

So I would simply say I cannot do anything about the colloquy that just took place between the Members of the majority party. All I can say, as one Member from the upper Midwest, is that I do not think it is fair for people to try to have this issue both ways. We were told that we should take our shot at the administrative route rather than the legislative route. That is what happened. And now the Members, at least some of the Members who just spoke, are now trying to suggest that we ought not to have let that happen either.

We cannot move agriculture into the 20th century by sticking with this outmoded, old-fashioned milk marketing order system. And I would suggest if we are going to open this issue up, then we ought to open up the whole farm bill; that we ought to open up the question of whether we ought to have any milk marketing orders at all. We ought to be allowed to vote on the question of whether there ought to be one national milk marketing order rather than a whole series of them.

So I would urge Members to think carefully before they try to selectively reopen that farm bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

If the chairman will engage me in a colloquy on the funding for the USDA facilities loan program, I would like to solicit his support for the administration's funding request for programs like the community facilities loan and grant program, which finances multipurpose community centers through which local governments are able to provide services for children and the elderly, school facilities, and fire and rescue equipment.

Mr. Chairman, over 50 percent of the community facilities funds are used for a variety of health services, including rural hospitals, mental health facilities, nursing homes, child care facilities which are desperately needed to assist in welfare reform.

There is a great need for these facilities in rural America and especially in my First Congressional District of North Carolina where local governments do not have sufficient tax resources or the sufficient tax base to provide for these essential services.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support for this program and for rural America. I share her concern and promise to work in the conference to strengthen the community facilities loan and grant program for rural America and appreciate the gentlewoman's efforts.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DE FAZIO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—193

Ackerman	Costello	Gilchrest
Allen	Coyne	Gilman
Andrews	Crowley	Gonzalez
Baird	Cummings	Goss
Baldacci	Davis (IL)	Green (TX)
Baldwin	Davis (VA)	Green (WI)
Barr	DeFazio	Greenwood
Barrett (WI)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Bass	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Becerra	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	DeMint	Hefley
Berman	Deutsch	Hill (IN)
Biggert	Diaz-Balart	Hoeffel
Bilbray	Dixon	Holt
Blagojevich	Doggett	Horn
Blumenauer	Doyle	Houghton
Boehlert	Duncan	Hoyer
Bonior	Ehlers	Hulshof
Borski	English	Inslee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Campbell	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Capuano	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Cardin	Filner	Jones (OH)
Carson	Forbes	Kelly
Castle	Fossella	Kennedy
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Clay	Franks (NJ)	Kilpatrick
Coburn	Frelinghuysen	Kind (WI)
Collins	Gejdenson	King (NY)
Conyers	Gephardt	

Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Porter
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stark
Strickland
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—230

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Schaffer
Scott
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Gutknecht
Jenkins
Lantos
McCollum
Pickett
Reynolds
Waters

□ 1358

Ms. DANNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Messrs. HILL of Montana, HILLIARD, SMITH of Texas, ENGEL and MICA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. LARGENT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained earlier today and was not present for rollcall vote No. 172. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

In the general provisions title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. (a) PROHIBITION ON UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall not restrict or otherwise prohibit any exports of food, other agricultural products (including fertilizer), medicines, or medical supplies or equipment as part of any policy of existing or future unilateral economic sanctions imposed against a foreign government.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The President may waiver, for periods of not more than 1 year each, the applicability of subsection (a) with respect to a foreign country or entity if the President, with respect to each such waiver—

(1) determines that the national security so requires; and

(2) transmits to the Congress that determination, together with a detailed description of the reasons therfor, including an explanation of how the sanctions will further the national security.

(c) UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''unilateral economic sanction'' means any restriction or condition on economic activity with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to a multilateral regime and the other members of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply only to private commercial exports that are not subject to any Federal guarantee or direct credit.

Mr. NETHERCUTT (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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, the policy of the United States of America for years has been to impose unilateral sanctions against trade between our Nation and other nations with which we might disagree on policy matters. The policy of sanctions imposed on other nations with which we might disagree on policy matters is outdated. In 1980, we saw the agriculture markets that were prominent for the United States with the Soviet Union, we saw them disappear with the imposition of unilateral sanctions against the Soviet Union. Representing agriculture as I do, we in the agriculture communities of this country have still not gotten back the markets that we lost in 1980 by virtue of the unilateral imposition of sanctions against the Soviet Union. There are today nations around this country upon which the United States has imposed unilateral sanctions that we are not doing business with, but other countries of the world are doing business with these countries and selling agriculture products and medicines to these countries. We cannot because of our outdated sanctions policy.

What my amendment does is, it lifts those sanctions on all countries on which we currently have sanctions for food and medicine only. There is no way in today's world that food should be used as a weapon in international relations with other countries. It is inhumane, it is improper, and what it eventually does is damage the American agriculture community. My State of Washington exports roughly 90 percent of all the wheat that it grows in our State. We are an export State, and we feed the world. But yet our farmers, in a time of great challenge for American agriculture, are at a distinct disadvantage because we cannot sell to some of these sanctioned countries.

What my amendment does is lift sanctions on all countries on which there are currently sanctions around the world as those sanctions relate to agriculture and medicine. They involve no direct Federal subsidies, these lifting of the sanctions, but it would allow our farmers to sell directly to sanctioned nations and sell our product. We are at a distinct disadvantage because

other countries, our competitors for our farmers, are able to sell to those countries and provide food and medicine to those countries. Because of our outdated sanctions policy, American farmers cannot.

This is wrong, it is something that should be changed. The market alone, the dollar market alone for our country and our American agriculture community is $6 billion that we would be able to bring into this country by virtue of sales to those sanctioned nations. Now, I understand the politics of dealing with a terrorist like Saddam Hussein, or the North Koreans or other countries on which we have sanctions and no trade relations. But yet as to agriculture and medicine, it seems to me this is bad policy, because it hurts our farmers. This amendment allows the President to reimpose those sanctions if for national security reasons he feels it is in the national security interests of our country to reimpose those sanctions. So there is a waiver provision in this amendment.

This amendment received consideration in the full Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and I am happy to be a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture. It was a wonderful debate. Democrats and Republicans alike debated this issue back and forth. The amendment unfortunately lost by a 28–24 vote. But it was a great debate and it is something we ought to have in this country as we decide how to help agriculture in the free market system as we are moving to under the farm bill and from a humanitarian standpoint how we ought to be dealing with people in these other nations who have corrupt governments but not corrupt people.

This is a humanitarian amendment. I fully appreciate the point of order that is being raised against it, I understand that completely, and my friend from Florida and I have discussed this issue at length. I respect him greatly. I respect his views on this whole issue. I understand the likely success of this amendment. But I want to make the very serious point, that we in this country have to make a decision about whether we are going to continue to use food as a weapon and medicine as a weapon. We will be faced in this Congress with the likelihood that the agriculture interests of our country, because of depressed prices, because of depressed markets, will come to this body and say, ''We need more Federal assistance.'' If that is the case, then the logical free market way to get through this is to lift sanctions to allow sales to be made abroad from a free market standpoint.

I want my colleagues to know how seriously I view this issue. I hope that the House will take this matter up at the appropriate time.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida insist on his point of order?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, if I may at this point speak to the point of order.

I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). He speaks from conviction on this issue. As he mentioned, we have had and will continue to have very intense and serious discussions on this point. I also believe that markets that should be open to the United States at this time are not fully open, the first one being the European Union. The European Union, in violation even of accords entered into with us, continues to put up barriers on essential products of American producers. And so this is a key issue. If there has ever been a matter where the wisdom of the rule, in this case clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting legislation on an appropriations bill, it is on an issue such as this.

This is a very serious matter that we are discussing today. On the one hand, we all agree that all that can be done to open markets to U.S. producers, including and very especially our farmers, must be done. At the same time, we must recognize that the issue of trading with, opening an entire sector, a very important sector of the economy, of the U.S. production to sponsors of State terrorism is a very delicate matter and a very serious matter which requires great deliberation and study. That is why the rule is wise and it is the committee process and the deliberative process that must bring to the floor legislation dealing with critical matters such as this.

When we talk about states such as North Korea, state sponsor of terrorism, or the Sudan where the President recently ordered an air strike against a medicine manufacturer, is that the only option that should be available to the United States? Military action? Or should sanctions be available to the United States in lieu of and instead of military action? This is a very serious question. Should we tie our hands so that the only action available in American diplomacy is military action? It is a very serious question. When we deal with the issue of the dictatorship in Cuba, 90 miles away, a state sponsor of terrorism, a safe haven for international terrorists with over 100 fugitives from U.S. justice responsible, the state itself with its air force in addition to that for the murder of U.S. citizens, unarmed U.S. citizens over international waters, when we discuss opening of U.S. market, the U.S. market to that state, that regime, that is a very serious matter. And so in essence what I am saying, with all respect to my colleague, and we will continue discussing this issue, yes, we must find ways to help America's farmers, but without helping America's enemies. And we will continue our discussions. They are intense, they are sincere, they will get to the heart of this matter, at the same time protecting the U.S. national security, in essence the national interests of the United States. And so at this time, unless my dear colleague has an announcement to make, I would have an announcement to make myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order so that the Chair might recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO)?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Washington has an announcement to make. Or I would insist on my point of order.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in light of the gentleman's insistence on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, if I insist on the point of order, what would be the difference between the gentleman withdrawing and my insistence on the point of order with regard to how it would affect debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would then have to rule on the gentleman's point of order.

Is there objection to the gentleman's unanimous-consent request to withdraw the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me just first say that I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Florida. He knows that. I also have quite a bit of respect for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and a lot of respect for his amendment and even more growing every day for both the gentleman and all of his other policies. I think the gentleman from Florida makes an interesting point, that we should not at times do anything to help enemies we have in foreign governments.

But on the other hand, I do not think we should hurt people that live in the countries where we may have enemies in the government. And so I think that this issue, as the gentleman from Washington has said, is one that we have to deal with. That is why I really think he has been so courageous on this issue. We may run away from this issue but we cannot hide from it. Eventually we are going to be called to answer questions as the greatest Nation

on Earth, as the Nation that produces the most food in the world: Why during the period of great prosperity for us we use food and medicine as a weapon to bring people around to our political will?

This issue is not about whether we agree with a government or not. The issue is simply and it has to be repeated over and over again, whether we should deprive people in those countries whose government we disagree with the ability to have food and medicine, something that is so available to us in this country. And yes, at the same time we cannot deny that the way the gentleman from Washington and I and other people have presented this issue, it is also a good investment for this country, not only because we come off as being what we truly are, a good country that does not do this to other people but also because American farmers can sell food and medicine.

□ 1415

I will give my colleagues an example.

The gentleman from Florida did bring up the issue of Cuba. I have a bill to do just that, to sell food and medicine to Cuba.

In the area of food alone, if my colleagues can get past, for a second, the issue of whether we should even give this food away or not and the issue of food alone, the Cuban Government has made it clear that they would purchase up to $850 million in rice from this country, that they would purchase $700 million in corn, that they would purchase over $500 million in chicken.

Now, every time I mention one of these products, I know that a certain State delegation or a different State delegation gets excited. What a wonderful opportunity to do that which is humanely right and that which is good for our farmers.

I must tell my colleagues when I first got elected 9 years ago, coming from a district in the Bronx, I never thought that I would have American farmers supporting a piece of legislation I presented, and they do, and they do because they support the fact that it is a good thing to do and a good thing to establish, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the President, as we know, very recently said that we should do this with all other countries, but he could not do it for Cuba because of the fact that this is handled by legislation, that we cannot sell food and medicine to Cuba, and so I think that while this issue obviously will not be dealt with today, while this issue obviously will not become law anytime soon, while this issue obviously is still at the center of a political debate in this House which is not one that seems for our side to be winning, our side being those of us who agree that we should do this, the fact is that the time is coming for this.

We cannot continue to have food and medicine business, if my colleagues will, with China, with Iraq, were Iran, with Sudan and other countries in the world and continue to argue that one place 90 miles from Miami should not be allowed the same sale.

So I would hope that we do pay attention to this issue, and I would hope that in the near future the sponsorship of our bill will continue to grow. As it is, it is over 150 sponsors at the moment, and the minute we get to 218, we will talk to our colleagues about bringing it to the House.

So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect that all Members would see this for what it is. It is something that is right, it is something that is fair, and it is something that is long overdue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said that he came up with incredible numbers that I had not heard before about what Castro says he would buy from the United States. I think the gentleman said $800 million in rice and $500 million in chicken. Where does he buy that from now? Does the gentleman from New York know?

Mr. SERRANO. Yes, those purchases made everywhere but from American farmers.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman give me where that everywhere is?

Mr. SERRANO. Well, rice comes from Asia.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I know that that is a confidence, but knowing, as I do, that Castro does not make those purchases now, I was curious to find out where the gentleman says that they are made now by Castro based on the fact that he has promised to make them in theory from us.

Mr. SERRANO. Those purchases are made now, and they will be made here later.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one final point relative to this debate. It is a good debate, it is a debate that we all ought to be having. It is a debate that we all ought to be having in this country because it affects foreign policy issues, it affects economic issues for our country.

Look what we do in North Korea. We are providing hundreds of millions of dollars of agriculture aid, food aid, at the expense of the taxpayer to a regime that I think by all accounts is a corrupt regime in North Korea. Now I would rather have our country purchase, I should say our farmers sell commodities to North Korea and other such regimes like Iran and Iraq and others with whom we disagree violently on policy issues, but who will purchase our grain and will purchase our apples and purchase our other products, peas and lentils and other foodstuffs that will help from a humanitarian standpoint feed the people of those countries and also feed our farmers in our rural agriculture economy. So on the one hand our country is giving food to North Korea.

What I want to do as we debate this in the days ahead, and I am not as pessimistic as perhaps my friend from New York. I think this has a great chance to be enacted this year if enough people will show their concern and compassion for the issue, and debate it and pursue it very forcefully. I think this is the best policy for our country to deal with these regimes diplomatically very forcefully, but not punish them and us by not providing them food and medicine.

I just will put a plug in here, Mr. Chairman, for H.R. 212. It is the sanctions relief bill that has been introduced, that I introduced, that has lots of cosponsors, and we can have the debate about which sanctions we ought to impose or not impose on which countries. But from a conceptual standpoint, from a policy standpoint, lifting sanctions is the best policy for American agriculture, and I hope this House will adopt this, and the other body as well, along with the President. This is good policy for our country.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). This is an issue that needs debate. Every single country in the world is not only geographically, but historically and sociologically and politically in a different situation and in a different moment with regard to the certainty that it will have a democratic transition the moment of that democratic transition, and to broad-brush this issue, certainly again I would reiterate the wisdom of not doing so on an appropriations bill at the same time that I reiterate my willingness to continue discussions with those people like the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) who feel so strongly out of good-faith in this issue, not out of support for dictatorships, but out of good faith, and I will continue our discussions because it is dangerous to broad-brush, it is indispensable that we not and that we recognize that sending signals to countries; for example, some terrorist states that have absolutely no way that they can pay, sending signals to them that they will no longer be sanctioned, that they will be in a situation where the American market will be open to them before liberation of political prisoners or free elections are held

can be very destructive at this particular time.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to further discussions on this issue which must not be broad-brushed and which must remain leaving to the United States the option in particular instances of not having to have recourse to military action as the only way in which the United States can act.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point.

I do not think this would be as much of an issue if we did not use embargoes like we have in this recent administration, and talk about sanctions, they are embargoes. No one likes to use that term because in agriculture that has real connotations, has real effects.

We remember the Nixon embargo, the Carter embargo, how that devastated the agriculture. This, in fact, is what we are talking about, our embargoes, and in the last 80 years there have been 120 embargoes put forth by this country and other countries, and in fact over half of them have been put in place in the last 6½ years.

So my colleagues can see the dramatic impact this has had on agriculture in recent years, a major reason for the decline in prices today, the fact that 40 percent of the world's population today is under some type of embargo from the United States, and it is extraordinarily destructive to agriculture, to free trade and our position in the world market.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration for the testing, development, or approval (Including approval of production, manufacturing, or distribution) of any drug for the chemical inducement of abortion.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to designate with whom the time will be divided?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, no, we do not.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control one-half of the time, 1 hour, and allow the opposition to control one-half.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member seeking to control 1 hour in opposition?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, yes, we will on this side control the 1 hour in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) will control the 1 hour in opposition. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will control the 1 hour in favor.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear a lot of debate this afternoon and statements about the intended purpose of this amendment. I want to say from the outset that this amendment is not intended to have an effect on any drug used for any purpose other than that which is specifically spelled out in this amendment.

The taxpayers of the United States spend a great deal of money each year in funding the Food and Drug Administration. There is something terribly wrong when we ask the taxpayers of this country to spend money in a way which is designed to give the Food and Drug Administration the ability to research and approve drugs that are designed to kill unborn children.

Now let me say that again. The purpose of this amendment is to limit the FDA's ability to approve any drug which has its sole purpose to eliminate and terminate an unborn child.

This should not be in a debate about abortion, and I do not intend it to be. It is about how we use taxpayers' money and for what purpose should that money be used.

Abortion is legal in this country. I recognize that. But allowing a Federal agency to spend taxpayers' dollars to perfect and approve a method under which we take life to me seems totally irreconcilable with the fact that our whole country is supposed to be about the pursuit of happiness, the pursuit of freedom and the pursuit of life.

So this amendment will not block Cytotech from being used in other medicines and in other ways, it will not block RU–486 if it has an intended purpose for giving life, saving life, prolonging life. It will not stop any utilization of FDA funds in terms of that effort. Its sole purpose is to say to the FDA none of their money should be used in a manner which will enhance the taking of unborn life.

It is a very simple proposition. Whether one believes in abortion or do not, both sides of this issue believe that we have way too many abortions. None of us think that abortion is a great thing. There are not many people who have been through an abortion who think an abortion is a great thing.

So I want to move our debate not to the issue of abortion, but whether or not we can in good conscience utilize taxpayer dollars to perfect drugs to kill unborn children. That is what the debate is about. It is not about whether or not somebody can have an abortion; we all know that that is possible.

□ 1430

Regrettably so, from my viewpoint. But, rather, the debate is about protecting unborn life from unwise use of Federal taxpayer dollars.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, on many votes we share similar values, a similar point of view, and this Member certainly does not have a voting record of supporting Federal funding for abortion. I have read carefully the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a bit different from the one the gentleman offered 1 or 2 years ago, if I recall.

I think that the wording of the gentleman's amendment has a worthy purpose. The problem is, I oppose the gentleman's amendment respectfully for three reasons. First of all, on the basis of science.

I do not think that we can really say with certainty and the kind of broad language that the gentleman has included in his amendment that you know for certain what every drug will be used for. I do not have a Ph.D. in science myself, but certainly in the area of medical science, if I think about the decade of the brain that we are now working our way through and all of the discoveries that have been made, for example, in the area of mental illness, most of them by accident; in places like France, for example, where patients were on operating tables, and in order to alleviate pain they were using certain types of pain medications, and, all of a sudden, they discovered, my gosh, why did that work to help to diminish hallucinations and other conditions relating to mental illness?

We certainly are in a period of time now where many of these medications that were by accident discovered to have application for the remediation of the symptoms of mental illness are being worked on, and medical science is at a new horizon in terms of hopefully finding answers for the millions and millions of people that suffer from those illnesses.

I think similarly to some of the lab experiments that have been done, even the discovery of the X-ray itself was an accident. They did not go in there, I think it was Mr. Roentgen, was that not the name, to actually discover x-rays, but it happened. All of a sudden we have a major technology like that that has been used around the world now because of the ability of science to probe into the unknown, but then to figure out practical applications.

I think the gentleman's desire to limit abortion is a very worthy objective, and I do not think anybody on this side of the aisle would disagree with the objective. The problem is that you cannot really say to medical science that you are going to know for

every drug or every chemical that FDA reviews, you are going to know that it would have an end result that you are talking about.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentlewoman did not hear my first statement. There is nothing in this amendment that will limit the research of any drug in any way, in any concept, whose purpose is something other than that. So if you were to take Cytotech or RU–486 and say you want to try to use it in a different way, this does not limit that at all. When you file an application with the FDA, you give what your intended purpose is.

What this amendment says is if you bring to the FDA a drug whose only intended purpose is to induce the separation of a blastocyst from the uterine wall, that is the technical term for what it does, that they should not spend money approving that.

If you bring the same drug to the FDA and say this is something that solves a problem with the liver, or this decreases portal hypertension, even though it might have that effect of causing an inducement of abortion, it is still approved.

Let me give you some examples. There is a new hair treatment to grow hair back on the head of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), yet it cannot be used around anyone wanting to get pregnant. Why? Because it causes severe birth defects and can in fact induce abortions. That was approved. This would not eliminate that drug from ever coming to market or the FDA spending money on it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I guess my point is to the gentleman that scientific inquiry and the work of the FDA by its very nature probes into the unknown, and even though the gentleman says that a given drug has to state a purpose, I am saying that we do not always know, once science begins to move, all of the various applications that science might ultimately have for that substance.

So I think that one of the reasons for my opposition to the amendment is I do not think we ought to prejudge science. We ought to let the Food and Drug Administration move forward, the scientists ought to move forward. Let them do what they do best.

I would guess that most drugs have more than one application, and the chemicals that go into them. Even today, many drugs are given, prescription drugs in fact, that may have side effects or other results that even the FDA scientists have not anticipated as they begin.

The second reason I oppose the gentleman's amendment is because I really do believe that this should be within the Food and Drug Administration. I do not think that we should be making this decision on the floor. We should leave it up to the people over at FDA to decide the procedures for drug approval and so forth, and Federal law currently provides that no Federal money can be spent for abortion. That has been on the books for many, many, many years. So I think that we should let the FDA do its job.

Finally, I would say to the gentleman, with all due respect, this subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture had absolutely no testimony on this issue. The gentleman is bringing a very important issue to the floor. I personally, as just one member of that subcommittee, would have appreciated to have the FDA testify before us, many scientists, to talk about the chemistry of what the gentleman is concerned about, to try to perfect the language of what the gentleman is trying to offer here.

We really have heard from no one in the public on this particular subcommittee. So I find it somewhat uncomfortable to try to accept the gentleman's amendment, when our subcommittee really had absolutely nothing, we did not spend one minute on this within the committee itself.

So for those three reasons, and I want to yield time to other Members to comment, on the basis of science, on the basis of the safety by having the FDA involved, and also committee procedure, I would respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond.

Mr. Chairman, again, what the gentlewoman just said is it is against the Federal law to use Federal dollars for abortion, but in fact when the FDA approves a drug whose sole purpose is to kill unborn children, that is spending Federal dollars to perform abortion. So I would counter that.

Number two, there was no intention to come before your committee on this issue. This is a well-known issue, this is well documented. There is lots written on RU–486 and Cytotech, and through this discussion I will be happy to give you all of the references in the literature on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Coburn amendment's efforts to protect the lives and health of our Nation's women and unborn children.

This amendment would bar FDA's approval and development of new drugs whose primary purpose is to induce abortion. Those are called abortifacients.

Some people believe it is in the best interests of women to make all forms of abortion available to women. However, even for those who support abortion on demand, approving RU–486 is shortsighted and it is a risky approach. Scientific studies have shown a link between abortion and breast cancer. Unfortunately, many who commit abortions do not want to let women know about that risk.

Breast cancer is the leading form of cancer among middle-age American women, but we do not even want to tell women who are considering abortion of this risk.

Ten out of 11 studies on American women report an increased risk of breast cancer after having an induced abortion.

A meta-analysis in which all worldwide data were combined reported that an induced abortion elevates a woman's risk of developing breast cancer by 30 percent. How can we in good conscience approve new forms of abortion before we study the breast cancer and abortion link further and let women know of the risk?

This is the kind of investigation that should be done. This kind of information should be held in hearings before the committee. So I urge the Members to support the Coburn amendment to protect women, both born and unborn.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I might just say to the last speaker, very quickly, that in fact the editor of the Journal of the National Cancer Institute has said that there is insufficient evidence that exists to link induced abortion and breast cancer. That is a medical opinion.

Let me move onto this amendment this afternoon. I am shocked, quite frankly, that we are going through this debate again this year after the outcry of the many medical and pharmaceutical organizations who opposed this amendment last year. It is an unprecedented invasion into the FDA's approval process.

Quite frankly, this is a place where Congress has no right to be. We are not scientists. We do not know what is best for the health of American citizens.

This amendment is intended to block research. It blocks not only drugs that are currently in the pipeline, but potential future breakthroughs in biomedical research. It is an attempt to promote an anti-choice agenda. I have respect for people who have a different view of this issue on choice than I do, but the proponents of this amendment are risking the lives of millions of Americans, because this amendment would also block the development of drugs to cure cancer, ulcers, rheumatoid arthritis, epilepsy, and other medical conditions because some of

those drugs can cause a spontaneous miscarriage.

Let me read you a portion of a letter from the National Coalition of Cancer Research that is just one of the many medical organizations that is firmly opposed to this amendment:

''Attempting to legislate any drug's approval or disapproval is inappropriate. It starts down a slippery slope of prohibiting development in certain drug categories. The comment that the ranking member of this committee made, not only does it threaten the credibility of the drug approval process, it would impede the development of pharmaceuticals to treat different diseases not related to reproduction, such as cancer. If disease or condition-specific approval is dictated by legislative action, drug researchists' efforts to develop new therapies will be stymied.'' By passing this, the FDA's approval process would be prevented from having the opportunity to do something about this issue.

Let me just talk to you for a second as a cancer survivor. I am a survivor of ovarian cancer; 25,500 women will contract ovarian cancer this year; one-half of them will die. Any chemotherapy drug that is taken by anyone with cancer, any chemotherapy drug has the propensity to cause a spontaneous miscarriage. Why do we take our personal philosophy about where we are on choice and try to foist it on the millions of Americans who, through no fault of their own, contract cancer or a serious illness?

□ 1445

Why would we relegate millions of women to die because we have a particular view on choice?

Mr. Chairman, it is wrong for us to prevent biomedical research. We have an obligation. We spend billions of dollars to promote what happens at the National Institutes of Health because we believe we have the obligation to cure disease in this country. Do not take an action here this afternoon that would in fact condemn millions to die because somehow we want to score a point on choice in this country.

It is wrong, it is unconscionable, and I plead with my colleagues to defeat this outrageous amendment this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time allotted to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) during his brief absence.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am happy and pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us agree that we would like to be seeking alternatives to abortion, rather than making abortion more accessible.

But the one issue that I wanted to speak on today is what has been shown scientifically as an increased risk of breast cancer. Supposedly there is a link between breast cancer and abortion. This should be examined much more thoroughly before any new forms are approved.

Ten out of 11 studies on American women report an increased risk of breast cancer after having an induced abortion, particularly among women with a history of breast cancer in their families. We know this is already a major problem which we are trying to effectively deal with because currently cancer is the leading form, or breast cancer is the leading form of cancer among middle-aged American women.

In the few countries in which RU–486 is available, it is strictly regulated by the government's health care systems. However, in the U.S., control of abortion drugs is more lax, and sometimes they are often dispensed without a doctor's approval, which again potentially endangers women's health.

But because of the potentially dangerous side effects of abortion, and this is not just physical, this is emotional, as well, these drugs should not be administered without consultation and medical follow-up with a doctor. So I hope we give this serious thought.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding time to me.

Before I address the overall issue, I would like to respond to my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) by reading another quote.

''The Danish researchers concluded that induced abortion has no effect on the risk of breast cancer.'' When reporting on a particular study, the New York Times stated: ''This longstanding issue shall now be settled. No evidence exists to link induced abortion and breast cancer.''

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Coburn amendment. The amendment would stop the drug approval process in its tracks by placing unprecedented roadblocks in front of the FDA. It puts ideology ahead of science and compromises women's health.

The Coburn amendment would block the final approval of a drug, RU–486, that the FDA has already declared to be safe and effective. I repeat, this amendment would block final approval of a drug that the FDA has already declared safe and effective.

This amendment would make FDA drug approval contingent not on science but on politics. The FDA is charged with protecting the public's health, and should not be subject to congressional interference. Should we subject each FDA decision to a congressional vote? Mr. Chairman, let us allow the FDA to do its job free from right-wing intimidation. The American people do not want the Christian Coalition in charge of our Nation's drug approval process.

This amendment may also prohibit the development of new, more effective contraceptive methods, if Members believe, as some do, that any form of hormonal contraception, like in this bill, is tantamount to an abortion.

What about other drugs that as a side effect may induce abortion, like many chemotherapy drugs and anti-ulcer medication? Will research be halted on these lifesaving drugs as well? This amendment is too vague even to give us a clear answer to that question.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about much more than RU–486. It is about whether the FDA will be free to test, develop, and approve needed drugs without congressional interference. It is about whether politics or science will govern our Nation's drug approval process.

Since Roe v. Wade, the anti-choice minority has attempted to stymie contraceptive research and suppress advances in reproductive health. For example, there used to be 13 pharmaceutical companies engaged in contraceptive research. There are now four. Thankfully, despite pressure tactics, scientists have made some important progress. Among the most significant is the development of RU–486.

RU–486 would make a dramatic difference in the options available to women facing unintended pregnancies. It could make abortion, already one of the safest medical procedures, even safer. Women in France have been using RU–486 for a decade. It is also available in Sweden and Great Britain.

Over 400,000 women have had abortions using RU–486. The New England Journal of Medicine has published clinical trials confirming its acceptability and effectiveness. Also, RU–486 has another significant advantage over current abortion procedures, it can be given in the privacy of a physician's office.

What will the right do when it is approved? Will it picket every doctor's office in America? Will it harass every woman in the Nation? Thankfully, it cannot. That is why it is fighting to block the approval of this drug.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I just want to respond briefly to the previous speaker. When I hear talk of the so-called anti-choice minority, I find that not only empirically unsound, because the data clearly shows America is moving increasingly toward the right-to-

life position. But its insulting as well. Minority? I don't think so. As a matter of fact, two polls recently came out. One was done by Faye Wattleton's group, the former president of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. According to The Center for Gender Equality Survey, January of 1999: ''Seventy percent of women favor more restrictions on abortions;'' women, 70 percent. That doesn't sound like a ''minority'' to me. The survey also found fifty-three percent of women today favor banning abortion except for rape, incest, and life of the mother. Rape, incest and life of the mother is about two or three percent of all the reasons as to why abortions are procured. So most women want most abortions made illegal.

Most of the 4,000 babies who die, each day in America from abortion would be saved if the opinions of a majority of women—if their sentiment—were enacted into law. The Coburn amendment does far less than what a majority of women want and we are not talking even remotely about banning abortion in this pending amendment. Yet, 53 percent of women today favor banning abortion, except for rape, incest, or life of the mother.

The survey interestingly points out that that is up from 45 percent of women just 2 years ago. So there is a sea change occurring. Americans are beginning to wake up to the fact that abortion is violence against children.

There is also a USA Today CNN Gallup poll that found that 55 percent of all men and women say abortion in America should be legal only under rape, incest, or threat to the life of the mother. So again, a majority of men and women and a majority of just women that have been found in the USA Today-CNN poll and the Center for Gender Equality survey that the majority is in favor of protecting the lives of innocent unborn children, except in the most extreme circumstances that, frankly, rarely, rarely happen.

If we had legislation that protected those children, again, we would be saving most of the lives. When polled on funding, an overwhelming majority of Americans in every poll, and I ask Members to look at their own polls in their own districts, most will show clearly an overwhelming majority of Americans are against using taxpayer-funded monies to pay for abortions, except in the rarest of cases.

This legislation, this amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is the Hyde amendment of the FDA. Let us be very clear about it, it is the Hyde amendment being applied to testing of those drugs that are used to procure an abortion.

I believe history and human rights observance are on our side, the pro-life side. Some day the viewpoint from the pro-abortion side will be seen as so misguided and even cruel that people will say, how could they have imposed such violence on innocent, unborn children, especially at a time when we know more about unborn children than ever before in the history of mankind or womankind. Today microsurgery on unborn children, is almost common place. Children are literally lifted out of the mother's womb and surgery is performed, and then they are reinserted to grow and develop and mature until birth time.

Birth has to be seen, I say to my colleagues, as an event that happens to each and every one of us. It is not the beginning of human life. That happens much, much sooner than that at fertilization.

What the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to do with his amendment is to say that babies are not junk. They are not throwaways. Some Members want to allow the FDA to invent the newest form of mousetrap, to come up with another more lethal way of destroying unborn children. We can't allow that to happen. And RU–486 is not really a morning after drug, it is used up to 7 weeks after fertilization. It causes the abortion to occur usually after 7 weeks into the gestational cycle. That is not morning after.

I find it offensive, that my tax dollars, American people, not some so-called anti-choice minority but a pro-life majority are used to test and approve deadly poisons for children.

The pro-abortion side does not enjoy a majority in this country. Through manipulation of poll data over the years the pro-abortion side has given the impression, the perception that that is the case, but now the pollsters are now asking more specific and enlightening questions, and all of a sudden it is revealing that, one, more people are pro-life, and also, when they ask the same question over the last several years, there has been a change in our direction.

My friend from New York Mrs. LOWEY says there is no linkage of abortion and breast cancer. Yet 10 out of 11 studies on American women report an increase in breast cancer when women under goes abortion. The ''denial'' people remind me, of the tobacco Institute denials who year after year said there is no connection between smoking and lung cancer.

There is a compelling linkage of breast cancer and abortion. Dr. Janet Daling, with a National Cancer Institute-funded study, found that after just one abortion there is an increase in the aggregate of all women of about 50 percent in the propensity to get breast cancer. She is not a pro-lifer. She does not agree with my position or that of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

She also found that if a woman aborts her first baby that number shoots up to 150 percent. Shame on those who say there is no linkage. They are misleading women. They are misleading women. And putting women at risk.

Dr. Daling also found that where there is a history of breast cancer in that family, the vote skyrockets to 270 percent when abortion is involved. So if the mother, or the grandmother or sister or someone in that family has had breast cancer, one abortion means that there is a greater likelihood that she will get breast cancer. Why the coverup

We would hope that the FDA would spend more time looking at drugs to mitigate breast cancer and to try to get rid of that terrible, terrible disease, and that the whole abortion establishment would stop the cover-up, and begin informing women about their risks.

Let me just also point out, Mr. Chairman, that RU–486 and chemical abortions, just like dismemberment abortions, just like those abortions where the baby's brains are literally sucked out, partial birth abortions, chemical abortions are just another way of killing the baby.

I think it is time to stop pro-abortion sophistry and the ignoring of the basic fact that every act of abortion takes a life. It is violence against children. Some day we are going to realize that, Mr. Chairman. We do not want our tax dollars being used to perfect another way, another chemical poison, another baby pesticide to kill babies. That is what we are talking about. Come up with drugs that heal, do not promote drugs and make me and my colleagues on the pro-life side on both sides of the aisle fund and pay for killing agents.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to refer my colleague again to statements from the National Cancer Institute, because we feel so strongly that we should not be mixing up politics and science, confusing our own personal views, and I respect the gentleman's, on whether or not women should have a choice. I would expect that the gentleman respects others'.

In 1996 the National Cancer Institute, concerned that some anti-abortion groups were misrepresenting the science on the subject, issued a statement, not my statement, their statement, and I quote, ''The available data on the relationship between induced abortions or spontaneous abortions, miscarriages, and breast cancer are inconsistent, inconclusive. There is no evident of a direct relationship between breast cancer and either induced or spontaneous abortion.''

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out earlier in the debate 10 of the 11

studies on American women reported an increase on breast cancer when the women had an abortion. You may say there needs to be more studies. I say there needs to be more studies. Everybody says that.

But when we get a preponderance of studies pointing in the same direction, I think we should alert women that there is a negative devastating side effect sometimes manifesting itself 20 to 30 years down the line that cannot be ignored and trivialized.

When Janet Daling's study came out, which was National Cancer Institute-funded it received adequate coverage in the Washington Post for one day. Then all trace of the story was killed with spin from the abortion rights side.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim control of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the National Cancer Institute study. The gentlewoman added one word there that totally throws out what they said, ''spontaneous.'' If we add all the spontaneous abortions in with the induced abortions, we will not get an effect, because the number of spontaneous abortions is close to 600,000 to 700,000 per year, 800,000 in some studies. So by combining that data, a normal response to a wrong and incomplete reproductive event to the termination of a normal event, we do not have good data. They know that. That is why they put that material in there.

I want to continue my point, if I may. I will be happy to debate back and forth with the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I heard from this floor statements exactly opposite of what I said was the intention of my amendment. I am deeply concerned that people would use untruth about what this intended amendment is. Everyone knows me well enough that I am not going to oppose good research for things that help people get well.

There is nothing, and it does not matter what the gentlewoman says, there is nothing in this amendment that will eliminate any cure for cancer, eliminate any process under which any drug can be studied for cancer, because the actual application that the Food and Drug uses, which is right here, it says, what is the purpose for the IND. And if the purpose is chemical inducement for abortion, then they cannot do it. If it says anything else other than that, they cannot.

Finally, I would like to comment about the comments on whether or not we ought to be involved in this.

□ 1500

If the issue of life is not something this House should debate, I do not know what we should debate. There is nothing more important, whether it is the end of life or beginning of life.

We can have our differences. We have a Supreme Court ruling; I understand that. But to say we should not be debating and then finally to say that Congress should not try to work what it thinks the will is, I would propose that most of those who oppose this amendment voted for the amendments that limited drive-through deliveries, that limited drive-through mastectomies, so they have already said that they believe that Congress should practice medicine.

My colleagues cannot claim both sides of this issue. Either they think it is a proper position for this government or this Congress to get involved in things that are wrong or they do not.

Now my colleagues may not agree with the issue, but to use the false premise that we should not be discussing this is intellectually dishonest; it is inappropriate and misstates the situation.

There is nothing in this amendment that will limit NCI's research whatsoever into any cancer treatment, into any treatment whatsoever in any way. To claim otherwise is to distort the truth for purposes of debate and to not carry out an equitable and fair debate.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair the remaining time on both sides, please.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 44½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 40½ minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that, as I listened to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and his desire to try to protect life, I think that his amendment and the words of his amendment, in fact, do not do that. So there is not a disagreement with the objective, but rather the means to get there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) very much for yielding to me this time.

This bill does not provide taxpayers subsidies for abortion. This bill before us is an appropriation to fund the Food and Drug Administration. The Food and Drug Administration receives applications from those private industries that manufacture drugs who come to them and say we want to market our drug. But the law says we must apply to FDA to assure the public that the drug is safe and effective. The FDA then uses its scientific method to determine whether the drug ought to be sold as safe and effective.

The Coburn amendment would prevent the FDA from using science. It would say to the FDA they may not approve a drug that is safe and effective because we are going to substitute a political judgment for what has been a scientific judgment under which the FDA has been mandated in carrying out its responsibilities. So what we are doing is preventing taxpayers' funding of the Food and Drug Administration to determine whether a drug is safe and effective.

Now, there is an interesting argument that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) makes, and I am sure he is sincere, that his amendment would only apply to a drug solely to be used for abortion purposes. But that is not what his amendment says. His amendment says that the FDA cannot use any of its funds for testing, development, or approval of any drug for the chemical inducement of abortion. Well, ''for the chemical inducement of abortion'' may be a side effect of a drug that may be intended to cure cancer. It may be intended for some other purpose.

Now abortion is legal. If abortion is legal, why should we not allow funds to be used by private enterprise to develop a drug that would lead to safer abortions, earlier, safer abortions?

We have heard the story about the link of abortions with breast cancer. I have seen no evidence of that. But let us say that there is a drug that would allow a termination of a pregnancy without any additional risk that may now be out there for those who do decide to terminate a pregnancy.

This amendment is a political amendment. It really is inappropriate in this legislation not to allow the FDA to do its job, which is to use science, to allow research based on science as the FDA considers whether a drug ought to be marketed to the American people.

I would hope that we would oppose this amendment and let FDA do its job and allow a procedure that is legal to be done in the safest possible way.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). Number one, the definition of ''for'' under the dictionary that we have in the House is with the object or purpose of.

The gentleman refuses to address our issue. Our issue is that Federal dollars should not be used to enhance the taking of life. Now, his claim that he has no knowledge of the connection between breast cancer and abortion, I can take that. He probably had not read the studies. I have read every study. Having been trained in science and having read all studies associated with breast cancer and abortion, I think

there is some legitimacy to it. I do not know how much there is, but I have read it at least.

Number two is, for the gentleman to object that this is not a place for this debate, again it is not inappropriate, for we have an opportunity as Members of this House to put limitation amendments on appropriations bills. We may not like it, and I understand that, but it does not mean that it is inappropriate or wrong for us to do it.

I also have the legislative history where my dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), has been very effective in doing some of these same things in the past himself. So the use of a limitation amendment on an appropriation bill is both appropriate and within the rules of the House.

So again I want to say this amendment will not, and I will take my colleagues to the application of the Food and Drug Administration, one has to list a purpose or indication for a drug when one applies. If that is something other than the inducement of abortion, then they can approve anything. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) knows that. He knows what the forms say. He knows more about the Food and Drug Administration than anybody in this Congress. I understand that. But he also knows full well that this amendment will have its intended purpose, and that no drug whatsoever which has a purpose other than that will be limited in any way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COBURN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will insert for the RECORD a statement from the Food and Drug Administration where they say very clearly they do not read the gentleman's amendment as he does. Their lawyers have said this will prevent them from dealing with any drug that is brought to them for approval that may have the consequence of terminating a pregnancy.

But my view is, even if its original intended purpose is to terminate a pregnancy, if it is a safer way to do that, we may be saving lives as a result. We may be saving the life of the mother.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, let me give the gentleman from California some reasons why we have breast cancer associated with abnormal pregnancies. When a woman is pregnant, there is a large increase of both estrogen and progesterone. The abrupt termination of those, one has turn-on factors in the breast tissue which are not modulated in a normal cycle that the body knows how to do it. That is why we also see an increased risk of breast cancer in women who have late onset pregnancies.

This is not something that is new to the medical community. This is something that we suspect, and now we are starting to see data for. I understand the gentleman's opposition. I would say I would be happy to take an amendment from the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) that puts the word ''solely'' in there. I would happily agree to that. But I think his real objection is that we should not be doing this. But the point is I am happy to accept an amendment that will say solely for that, because, as a practicing physician, I know we sometimes get consequences that are ill-effective, and I have no intention of stopping it.

The final point that I would make is the lawyers for the FDA ought to read the legislative history. This passed the House last year, and the history on it shows very much, we actually even had a ruling from the Chair which the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) had the point of order on, which said this would do that, and the Chair ruled it would not.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment from the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). The Supreme Court has told us that we have to allow the killing of unborn children on demand. It has not, however, told us the government has an obligation to facilitate this service.

This amendment would help ensure that American taxpayers do not end up funding the approval of drugs that are designed to kill our unborn children. FDA's mission, as it was created by this very Congress, should be to approve drugs that save lives, not end lives.

I would just hasten to add that Congress does have oversight responsibility with regard to all agencies of the Federal Government. It has been stated that Congress is sticking its nose into places it should not be. Well, if Congress should not be here now, then it is assumed that the proponents of that philosophy say that the Federal Government should not have been involved in the Food and Drug Administration's creation.

Second, there has been the point made with regard to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court decision that has been made. Earlier today we heard an oath from a new Member that said he swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. He did not say anything about according to what the Supreme Court says that the Constitution says.

Separation of powers says that the House of Representatives, the Congress, has the constitutional obligation to determine constitutional intent; and that is what the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is doing right here, saying that it is Congress' obligation to determine how the taxpayers' money is spent.

The point has also been made that Congress are not scientists. Well, there are several of us that happen to be scientists. We are not in the area with regard to medical science, but we have been told about other doctrines of science, other theories of science; and that is one of those old theories that we are asked to subscribe to today.

□ 1515

And that is that we are led to believe that if a child, if an individual is conceived, that 9 months later it turns into something that it was not. During the Dark Ages and shortly thereafter, that was a scientific theory that was subscribed to, called spontaneous generation, which said basically if rancid meat sat in the corner for 24 days, there will be flies there. So that meant that rancid meat ultimately turned into flies.

Well, that is not the point here. The point is that a child at conception is a child at conception, it is a child 2 months after conception, it is a child 9 months after conception, and it is a child 2 years after it is born.

We should not, as Members of this House, be asked to subscribe to a theory in science that was done away with hundreds of years ago by scientific knowledge at that time. Therefore, we are being asked to facilitate the FDA doing something safe and effective. If that child is a child at conception, and it does not automatically spontaneously generate into a child sometime later, then we are to make sure that drugs are safe and effective for children that are inside the womb as well and not be facilitating the destruction of that human life.

Finally, I will say that there has been much said here about cancer survivorship, and I would be one that would say that I am pleased at the rate of survivorship of Members of this House, Members of this Chamber. My mother is a cancer survivor. However, my father had cancer and he is not a survivor of cancer. This weekend I am going to take part in a relay for life where those survivors of cancer are going to come and celebrate life. My father will not get to take part in that process this year because he is not a survivor of cancer, but I can tell my colleague this: that the way my father raised me is such that he would not take one innocent child's life in order for him to survive cancer.

And that is not what this amendment does. It says and I quote, ''None of the funds made available in this act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration for the testing, development, or approval, including approval of production, manufacture or distribution, of any drug for the chemical inducement of abortion.''

This amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma simply deals with a

phenomenon of the day, and that is RU486, an abortifacient, that is not being used to treat people and cure people of cancer as it could have my father. Let us remove all the veneer, let us remove all of the camouflage over this and tell the story as it is. The gentleman's amendment will not stop one drop of research into saving people's lives that have cancer. I wish that research would have happened a few years earlier, so that my father could have taken part in that relay for life this weekend.

Let us do say a word for life today. Let us say that innocent preborn life is worth securing, is worth protecting and is at least worth not spending taxpayer dollars on to find a more efficient way to exterminate it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am frankly disturbed by the claims that are being made by the proponents of this amendment. The proponents of the amendment say that the drug cannot be used for the sole purpose of abortion or the primary purpose of abortion, but that is not what the text of the amendment says. What the text of the amendment says is none of the funds appropriated shall be used for the testing, development or approval of any drug for the chemical inducement of abortion. Those words are not in there.

But there are more problems than that. The other problems are that there is no recognized definition by the FDA of the words ''chemical,'' ''inducement,'' or ''abortion.'' So nobody is filing applications with the FDA saying we want to use this research solely for the purpose of the chemical inducement of abortion.

The truth is the way this amendment is written it would prevent research on many, many drugs which may have a side effect of causing abortion. And if my colleagues believe the last speaker, many people believe that that is appropriate. Many people believe that it is a worthwhile societal goal to have millions of cancer victims die in order to stop what may be abortions. That is unacceptable both from a human and a scientific standpoint.

The truth is under this amendment we would be banning research of drugs which would cause miscarriages by treating cancer, hypertension, cirrhosis, rheumatoid arthritis, and even some vaccines. We cannot sacrifice scientific research into abortion, which is legal, or equally importantly into cancer and all these other things simply because of a political agenda. And that is what we are talking about here. We are talking about a political agenda.

And the reason this amendment is written so broadly is because there are people who would ban drugs whose primary purpose is for other purposes, like cancer research, in order to stop abortion. And that is wrong. Defeat the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would restrict the FDA from its current system of research and testing of drugs that could eventually save lives.

Reproductive health drugs should be subject to the FDA's strict science-based requirements which any drug must meet before approval can be granted, but this amendment would prevent the FDA from reviewing any drug that could possibly induce miscarriages as a side effect.

Health research is threatened when we legislate decisions that should be left to medical researchers and doctors. Under current law, a company that wants to begin clinical trials on a new drug submits its application to the FDA for approval and, if the application has not been responded to within 30 days, the company is free to move forward. With this amendment, no funds could be used to oversee or even disapprove of such tests.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that there is nothing in the legislative history or the ruling of the Chair from last year or the legal parameters that we have had that makes the gentlewoman's statement a true statement.

The fact is that all drugs whose sole purpose is something other than the chemical inducement of abortion have free reign at the FDA, and I thank the gentlewoman

Mrs. MORELLA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, though, would say review of any drug that could possibly induce a miscarriage as a possible side effect.

Well, now this amendment is opposed by such groups as the National Coalition for Cancer Research and the American Medical Association, and they believe very strongly, as we do, that attempting to legislate any drug's approval or disapproval is inappropriate and that not only does it threaten the credibility of the drug approval process, but it would impede development of pharmaceuticals that may be used either as contraceptives or to treat diseases related to reproduction.

As a matter of fact, it was during last year's debate that drug companies stated that researchers and pharmaceutical companies would be less likely to invest in drugs that might cause miscarriages, and currently many drugs do have this side effect.

So if disease- or condition-specific approval is dictated by legislative action, we are in big trouble. So I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), and I would note for the House that he is a medical doctor.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and as Yogi Berra said, ''It's like deja vu all over again.'' We are having this argument now and it is the same set of arguments as we had last year when the Coburn amendment passed the House, I believe by a margin of 223 to 202. I would encourage all my colleagues to vote in support of the Coburn amendment.

I believe very strongly that this is a very reasonable and prudent amendment. As has been very, very clearly stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma, when these pharmaceutical companies, medical schools, individuals put in these applications for new drug approval, they put down what its indication is. And the Coburn language is very specific. We had a ruling from the Chair on this issue last year. If the specific indication is to induce chemical abortion, under the provision of his amendment they will be barred from doing that.

Now, I practiced internal medicine for 15 years prior to coming to the House. I still see patients occasionally on weekends. I have had the unfortunate experience of diagnosing people with cancer; indeed, the even more unfortunate experience of seeing many of my patients die. And I would not support any amendment that in any way would interfere with the new development and approval of drugs for the treatment of cancer. And I think it is very disingenuous for anybody to imply that this amendment would have that kind of an implication. This amendment is very, very clear in its language. It is very, very well targeted.

I would also like to point out that what we are talking about today is very, very significant. The FDA has been around for years, and it has safeguarded the American people from the introduction of many potentially dangerous drugs. A great example of this is thalidomide, a drug that was introduced in Europe and produced terrible birth defects. But our American Food and Drug Administration never approved that drug and, thus, prevented millions of American babies from being born with such a type of malformation.

The Food and Drug Administration has never had a drug application before it where the specific intent of the drug was to lead to the death of an unborn baby. Now, abortion, obviously, is a very controversial issue. Every time these issues come up, the arguments are very, very impassioned. And they should be because it is an issue of life and death.

We all know that the baby in the womb has a beating heart. At 40 days it

has detectable brain waves. Those are the criteria that I used to use when I practiced medicine to make a determination as to whether or not somebody was dead or alive. So this is a very, very significant issue. And to have the U.S. Food and Drug Administration reviewing a drug and approving a drug where its intended purpose is to kill the unborn baby in the womb, I think, is very, very inappropriate. I think it is very, very appropriate for us to speak on this issue. So, therefore, I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Coburn amendment.

I just want to touch on one additional issue that has come up in the course of this debate, and that is the reported possible link between abortion and breast cancer. My colleagues, I have reviewed the studies on this issue and the studies are very, very compelling that there really is a link. The statement released by the NCI, I believe, is a very disingenuous statement. It really sincerely ignores the facts on this issue.

If my colleagues actually take the time to read the studies, it is very, very bothersome to me that there are a lot of people within the cancer research community that are turning a blind eye to this issue.

Now, finally, let me close by saying the President of the United States once said in a speech that he wanted to make abortion safe, legal and rare. There are lots of us who hold that abortion is never safe for the unborn baby in the womb, and I do not think anybody would argue with that. Some people may want to turn a blind eye to the humanity of that child in the womb, but it is never safe for the child in the womb.

Might I also say that there has been absolutely no effort on the part of the administration to truly make abortion rare. Indeed, in trying to push through something like this, we are in many ways trying to facilitate abortion, trying to make it easier, make it more common. And I do not think we should be going in that direction.

I applaud the gentleman for introducing this amendment, and I encourage everyone to support it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to manage the time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The author of this amendment may, in fact, believe that it is narrowly drawn and will not affect other research that is being done, but I think his comments a few speakers ago, when the gentleman from California was talking, that he was willing to accept a clarifying amendment, indicates even a specter of doubt in his own mind that there may be a problem with this amendment.

The fact is, even with the ruling of the Chair, this issue would not be decided by the Chair; it is ultimately decided across the street at the Supreme Court.

□ 1530

That is what is to happen if we go through with this type of amendment because it may address RU–486 today, but it will open the door for lawsuits to address other types of research tomorrow and it will not be decided in this body or in the other body, it will be decided in the courts. This is a very dangerous precedent-setting amendment that takes the Congress, in my opinion, down the wrong path where we do not want to go.

The gentleman raised the issue of drive-through mastectomies and drive-through deliveries, and, yes, voted for those. I do not know if the gentleman did or not. I think that is a dangerous position for us to take. But here we are going even further. And I think this amendment is so broadly drawn that it creates a serious problem, and I think the House ought to reject it.

Our other colleague from Indiana talked about removing the veneer. Well, let us do remove the veneer. This is not just about RU–486. This is about chipping away once again at ''Roe v. Wade'' and getting this in front of the Supreme Court again and seeing if they can overturn a woman's right to choose. That is what this is about. But in the wake of doing that, it creates a lot of damage in the research world.

I hope my colleagues will oppose this poorly drafted amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) who is, I might say, in opposition to my amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, knowing that I oppose his amendment. And I do oppose his amendment very strongly.

The law of the land is that abortion is legal, whether we like it or not. The law of the land and Supreme Court decisions have given women total control over the decision of whether they will get pregnant and carry a pregnancy during the first trimester. That right is compromised as the fetus grows and women have essentially no right to abortion except under extreme circumstances that are life-threatening toward the end of their pregnancy.

Now, that is simply the law of the land. If my colleagues do not like it, bring a bill to ban abortion, and let us debate that on the floor as the representatives of the people. Let us see if America wants a policy that bans abortion.

Italy has reversed their policy banning abortion because if we ban abortion, we just raise the number of women who die, who die getting illegal abortions. And we know that that was true in our history.

When we first made abortions legal, the big change was not an increase in abortions, because there was not any increase in abortion. The big change was a radical, precipitous decline in maternal deaths. So, mark my words, this is about abortion. Women have a right to abortion and they have a right to a variety of safe, legal procedures. Women in Europe have had access to this method for 20 years.

This is not about thalidomide. This is about something that women in Europe have used for 20 years. Our FDA has reviewed it on the basis of science. That is their job. And under that standard, they have found it to be an effective agent. And women have every bit as great a right in America to a pharmaceutical agent as they do to the surgical procedures. Why would men, in America particularly, want to make the decision for women that they have to go, in a sense, under the knife rather than taking a pharmaceutical pill?

So this is, by gum, about a woman's right to choose and the right to abortion in the very earliest months when even there may not have been any fertilization of the egg. This is not necessarily an abortive phase. It depends on what happened and what did not happen, which they do not know at the time they take it. It is a very big advance. And to deny it and stop it on the floor this way is to indicate that we will approach contraceptive research the same way and that we will narrow rigorously the options available to women to manage their reproductive capability and, with it, their health.

I strongly oppose this amendment. This Congress should not be banning by procedure methods of abortion.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) who I believe has left the floor.

But he referred to this administration and said they have done nothing to make abortion rare. I would invite him and my other colleagues to join us in supporting our contraceptive coverage bill, because that is really the way we reduce the number of abortions. Having the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan and other private insurance plans cover contraceptives will reduce the number of abortions, and the administration has been strongly supportive of that.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the

gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Coburn amendment.

In my first term in the House of Representatives in 1993, during the Year of the Woman, with my good sisters and a good number of men, we fought here on the House floor so that the United States could have expanded healthy alternatives to surgical abortions. We supported research development and availability of drugs for medical abortions, like RU–486, in the United States.

Since then, I have witnessed RU–486 being made available in Europe, while here in our country in the United States, here in this Congress, we have had to fight back the far right's constant blows against RU–486 and women's health in general.

I am saddened to say it, but this is the same attack by the conservatives as last year and the year before and the year before that. This amendment seeks to deny women the right to early and safe drugs, such as RU–486, when faced with a crisis pregnancy. Further, because it bans the Federal Drug Administration from approving drugs like RU–486, it represents an unprecedented threat to the FDA's approval process.

Let us make no mistake about it. These repeat attacks are an unwarranted intrusion on a woman's life and a woman's right to good health, and this attack is by the extreme right. Let us get the far right out of women's health, get politics out of science, and allow the FDA to determine what drugs are safe for women.

Once again, I urge my colleagues, vote against the Coburn amendment, vote for women and women's health.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think, as a physician, I listen to this debate and it is very interesting to watch us practice medicine out here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It is pretty clear that if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) wanted to ban RU–486, that is what he would have put in this amendment. But it is very clear that this is not what the intention is. The intention is to get a law out there that they can then get involved in lawsuits. It is a very well-known political strategy over the last 10 years to start something and get involved in the courts and tie it up forever.

Now, if they have pharmaceutical companies, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) knows this, they screen all kinds of drugs. Right now, I heard thalidomide mentioned here on the floor. And it became a very bad drug because of its effects on newborn babies and causing defects. It is now being used for another illness. And when pharmaceutical companies screen, they do not know exactly what it is going to be used for. And what they are essentially doing here is opening the door for a lawsuit against the pharmaceutical company who comes to the FDA, having spent $20 or $40 or $100 million developing a drug, and if somebody says, this causes abortion, therefore, we have a cause of action against them and we stop it, they are interfering in a process that is presently legal.

A woman has a right to an abortion, and pharmaceutical companies have a right to develop drugs to do that in a very safe way. And for us to get into that position, the logical slope that they are headed down here, has already been mentioned. The next thing will be, when the sperm meets the egg, if that is a baby, then the next thing is going to be we must ban all birth control.

We already have difficulty getting birth control paid for by the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. And so we know what is in their minds. But beyond that, the next thing will be an amendment out here on maybe the HHS appropriation to prevent any money from being used for medical school training of any school that trains anybody to do abortions. Because if we go back and back and back up the stream, why should we waste money training physicians, obstetricians, in the skill of doing a safe abortion? We should not because they are ending the life of a child, and we get into all this inflammatory rhetoric.

Now, everybody knows that is wrong. And this amendment is just the beginning of it. It is designed to do that and it is designed to hide what it is up to.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. This is an antichoice, an antiscience science amendment. It is not just about RU–486. It is about FDA's ability to test, research, and approve any drug based on sound scientific evidence which may have as a side effect a miscarriage. It could slow or stop research on a wide range of life-saving drugs.

Science, not politics, should determine what drugs are approved. This is why the National Coalition for Cancer Research, the American Medical Assocation, the American Public Health Association, among others, oppose this amendment.

Many drugs, including chemotherapy and antiulcer medication, have the side effects of inducing abortion. This is why pregnant women are advised against taking certain medications.

One of the drugs targeted by this amendment, mefipristone, is not just a drug to make abortion safer. It has also shown to be useful in treating uterine fibrosis, endometriosis, glaucoma, and certain breast cancer tumors.

Another drug targeted by this amendment, methotrexate, has also been used to treat a wide array of conditions including arthritis, lupus, and some forms of cancerous tumors. Blocking research and development of safe and effective drugs in the name of abortion politics is just plain wrong. Never before has Congress told the FDA to approve or disapprove of a particular drug.

This vote is the 108th antichoice vote before this Congress since the new majority came to power. We should not be attempting to appeal or repeal a woman's right to choose procedure by procedure. This is antiscience, antichoice, antiwoman. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

□ 1545

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because I think it is important for this Congress to change the culture of this country by renewing our commitment to the value of life. This is not the time to send a signal to all Americans that abortions of convenience are a way to solve the problem of promiscuity and recreational sex. It is a hoax on the American people and women, in particular, to suggest that this is a healthy way to handle an unwanted pregnancy. We must not send the signal that it is easy as a pill to end an unwanted pregnancy.

This is one of the most important issues facing our country today, because as we look around at the violence and the apparent disregard for life in every walk of life, we have got to question if this type of ease in ending life is contributing to that. This amendment will do what it needs to do in stopping the approval of a way of life in America, in restoring value to life to all ages in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time, because I would like to devote my time to why I think there is confusion about this amendment. The gentleman may be a doctor, but in drawing his amendment it is clear that he is not a lawyer. He says he has drawn an amendment to stop the FDA from approving RU–486. The language he has used instructs us on an amendment to stop the FDA from testing drugs that can treat cancer, high blood pressure, ectopic pregnancy, fibroids, epilepsy. The list is very long. The reason is that although the gentleman mysteriously says that he would accept an amendment to limit the language, he does not propose language of that kind. Why has he brought broad language here?

The reason that his language is defective is that, in the law, it is overinclusive and overbroad. Therefore, in the words he used, it must have unintended effects. In the law it is called a chilling effect. What that means in this case is that a pharmaceutical company will not come forward with a drug that may cure cancer because that company believes it may be sued because of the overinclusive language he has used. It ought to stop every Member in this body when they know that every chemotherapy drug can cause a miscarriage. If, in fact, this amendment had been in the law at the time these drugs were being produced, people who are alive today by the hundreds of thousands would be dead.

I ask you, how many people would be dead today if we consider how many drugs are on the market that have unintended effects that none of us could possibly approve, deadly effects? That is why politics and medicine, or politics and science are like oil and water. You get into politicians overreaching when you insert political judgments into what should be only scientific matters.

Nor is this one of those great ethical issues on the frontiers of science, where ethicists and politicians have some reason to intrude, because abortion is legal, and I regret to say that miscarriages are also legal. We are entitled to ask, where does it begin, where will it end? I believe we must today let it end with legitimate scientific research. If we care anything about the many drugs that will be stopped by this amendment, we must defeat the Coburn amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, in the earlier debate I did not say something that I think needs to be said out here. We hear all these polls, that the American people do not like abortion and all this stuff. But I would tell you, in the election of 1998 in the State of Washington, the issue of partial-birth abortion was on the ballot, and the people turned it down.

Now, you can tell me all you want about polls but the only poll that really matters is when people actually come out and vote. I believe that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) has really put her finger on the whole issue. Because if you open up a cause of action against every pharmaceutical company that brings anything to the market or to the FDA for approval that might cause an abortion, you are going to chill the pharmaceutical industry, which is exactly the reverse of what I see in the appropriations process. We put all this money into the National Institutes of Health because we treasure our health care system, including the pharmaceutical industry. It is a bad amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment would ban FDA approval of RU–486 which has been found safe and effective for early, nonsurgical abortion and is awaiting final approval by the FDA. RU–486 would expand access to safe abortion for American women. Its consideration for approval should be dependent on the science, not dictated by antichoice ideologues.

This debate is not about RU–486 or abortion. It is about the FDA's ability to test, research, and approve any drugs for a legal purpose based on sound scientific evidence. Reproductive health drugs should be subject to the FDA's strict science-based requirements that any drug must meet before approval can be granted, but they should not be singled out because they are reproductive health drugs.

The FDA found mifepristone which has been available in Europe widely for nearly 20 years, safe and effective for early medical abortion 3 years ago. The approval was based on extensive clinical trials in this country and in France. They await information on manufacturing and labeling of the drug before final approval can be issued.

This amendment could have dangerous implications for the development of drugs that are used for purposes other than terminating a pregnancy. Many drugs, including those for chemotherapy and antiulcer medication, have the side effect of inducing an abortion. That is why pregnant women are advised that taking such a medication could imperil their pregnancy. New developments in the treatment of these and other conditions, for cancer and for other conditions, would be prohibited under the broad scope of this amendment. New contraceptive development would also be targeted.

Mr. Chairman, the right to abortion services should be safe and legal. The Supreme Court grants this right. What this amendment would do, even at the price of letting people who otherwise would not have to die from cancer, die from cancer because it would prevent the development, the approval of certain chemotherapies, what this would do is to deny the FDA the right to approve a drug simply because it would do what is legal and is a guaranteed right and that, Mr. Chairman, is wrong. That is why the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard again the tactic from the other side, it is to misdirect, to dodge. This is not about creating lawsuits. This is not about preventing drug research in other areas. This amendment is written very clearly. I would happily have taken an amendment from the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) because then I would have felt he would have been obligated to vote for the amendment, and that is why he would not offer it. We understand that.

This is about spending Federal money in a way to figure out how to kill unborn children. That is what this amendment is about. There is no ulterior motive to it. It is saying, is it a principle position of this country to tax working families and then take that money and spend it on science on how to figure out how to kill an unborn baby. That is what this amendment does. They know that is what it does. The only thing that we are hearing is that this will limit cancer research, this will make unintended consequences. That is not true at all. Having been in the drug manufacturing business, having applied for NDAs and INDs, I understand full well how the FDA works. There is an area on the application. You have to specify what you are applying that drug for. If it is for anything other than the inducement of abortion, this law will have no effect.

The other side understands that but they do not have an argument against that, so, therefore, they use an argument that is not based on any intellectual honesty. It is based on a dishonest pass out of bounds. This is about, and I am not ashamed to say, I do not think one dollar of Federal taxpayer money should be used to figure out how to kill an unborn child. I have no embarrassment for that whatsoever. I am proud to make that statement.

If we look at what is going on in our country, we understand where violence comes from. The first act of violence is to violate a baby in its mother's womb. When we decide that that life has no value, then no life has value, regardless of what the Supreme Court said. At 19 days postconception, a baby has a heartbeat. At 41 days postconception, the baby has brain waves. In this country, in every State, in every territory

you are alive if you have brain waves and a heartbeat, and you are only dead if you do not. So explain to me why a baby at 5½ weeks postconception is not considered alive when if you are considered the opposite of that, you are considered dead. We are schizophrenic in our law because we cannot have equal justice under the law for the unborn when we want the convenience of doing what we in fact know is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for making a necessary stand for life and against the culture of death. The question is about abortion. It is a shame that in discussing this life-and-death issue, the forces of prolife are demonized as antichoice ideologues.

One good thing that has come from this debate has been the use of the word ''abortion.'' You are getting away, however slowly, from the euphemism of ''choice,'' because, of course, there is no choice for the unborn whatsoever. The question is, should Federal funds be used to pay for learning how to make chemical warfare on a defenseless, unborn child? You relegate that child to nothingness because you do not consider the well-being of the child. You only consider the woman who for one reason or another wants an abortion, and that is a tragedy. But life is precious. And once it has begun, that life ought to be protected.

Now, yes, abortion is legal. More is the pity. What a shame on this country's conscience. But the policy of this government and this Congress has been not to coerce money from working people to pay for the extermination of a human life once it has begun. Those people arguing against the gentleman from Oklahoma are all for abortion. They think that is a good thing. God bless them for thinking so. I think it is a horrible thing. I think it is morally wrong. I do not think people ought to be coerced into supporting it because it is morally wrong. I hope Members will support the Coburn amendment as I do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the committee for yielding me this time and for her great service on the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to some of the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and distinguished and respected he is. He talked about the chemical warfare that we would be waging on the unborn. But I want to point out to my colleagues that the Hyde amendment allows for termination of a pregnancy in cases of rape, incest and life of the mother. If this is indeed the Hyde amendment and what the gentleman from Illinois believes and those who support the Hyde amendment, then why would they not want to have women have access to safe, early, nonsurgical abortion?

□ 1600

I certainly respect the gentleman's religious beliefs and understand them, as a Catholic, myself, and mother of five, grandmother of four, and that we do not think abortion is a good thing. Abortion is a failure, it is a failure across the board. But to deprive the FDA of the opportunity to engage in research which would provide safe, nonsurgical terminations of pregnancy in case of rape, incest and life of the mother seems entirely contradictory to what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is, if he sincerely believes in that, and I do believe he is sincere. It would trample on the FDA's ability to test, research and approve drugs based on sound scientific evidence, and in that respect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is starting to have this body, this room, this Chamber, look like the Flat Earth Society again, Mr. Chairman.

We have our Flat Earth Society days around here, and this appears to be one of them. RU–486 has been available to women in Europe for nearly 20 years. After extensive clinical trials in this country and France, the FDA has determined that this drug is safe and effective for an early medical abortion such as the kind allowed under the Hyde amendment for rape, incest and the life of the mother.

But this amendment is not about access to one safe and effective drug. The Coburn amendment would have a dangerous chilling effect on the development of drugs that are used for a wide variety of purposes, Mr. Chairman. Drugs used to treat other conditions including cancers and ulcers can induce abortion. The FDA's ability to consider approval of these therapies would be abolished.

And RU–486 also has promise for other potential medical uses including treatments for breast cancer, HIV and burns. The Coburn amendment forces researchers to turn away from these promising treatment opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, the Coburn amendment puts a social agenda ahead of a woman's needs, ahead of needs of individuals confronting a variety of diseases, ahead of rulemaking authority of the FDA. Once again, this Congress must decide whether to put political agendas ahead of health research.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Coburn amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wonder if the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) might stand and take a question? Might I inquire, and I would be happy to yield her to answer, what part of my amendment would eliminate RU–486 from being used in breast cancer research, burns or any other portion?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I say the gentleman's amendment would have a chilling effect on the research. Medical research thrives, we have free and open inquiry.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, there is nothing in the amendment that will have such an effect.

Again, we are seeing an attempt at characterizing the amendment in something other than it is. I understand why, because there is not a good factual argument against the Federal Government taking taxpayer dollars to figure out how to kill children. It is another part of the problem that we find ourselves in our society today.

There is nothing in this amendment that will limit in any way what the FDA can do if a drug manufacturer comes and uses, says I want to take 486 and get an indication for it for burns and breast cancer treatment; there is nothing in this amendment that will limit them from it. All they have to do is say that is what we are going to do with it.

And if they want to then let a doctor use it in an unapproved way, that is up to them. But to approve a drug for the very purpose of taking life goes against everything our country is founded on: the pursuit of life. And we are pursuing ways to take life.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a distinguished Member.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma is aware that NIH is currently looking at RU–486 as potentially a very effective method of addressing both breast cancer and brain tumors. They feel that there is a substantial potential with RU–486. That ability to research the capability of RU–486 would be completely terminated under this legislation.

So my colleague's suggestion is inconsistent with the facts.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this amendment that will keep a drug manufacturer or the manufacturer of RU–486 from making an application to use that drug in any way

they want except the chemical inducement of abortion. That is a fact.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. The lawyers' opinion is quite different, but I think we will make that point subsequently on the record.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I would like to pick up where the gentleman left off, particularly acknowledge the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), that none of us rise to the floor of the House to challenge any of the beliefs, and I know the very sincere beliefs held by you and many who oppose the women's right to choose along with my respected colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

But if I might share with those who are listening, the language of this amendment, which indicates that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration for testing, development or approval including approval of production, manufacturing or distribution of any drug for the chemical inducement of abortion. It may sound narrowly focused, but if I may draw the gentleman's attention to the fact that chemotherapy drugs can cause a miscarriage, most of these drugs would not have been developed and future drugs may be jeopardized just by the broadness of the language.

I rise today in opposition to the Coburn Amendment that would limit FDA testing on the drug mifepristone or RU–486. This amendment, as drafted, would limit FDA testing on any drug that might induce miscarriage, including drugs that treat cancer, ulcers and rheumatoid arthritis.

The FDA is charged with determining whether a drug is safe and effective. Mifepristone satisfied that requirement in 1996 based on clinical trials and it is expected to receive final approval soon.

Mifepristione was developed as a drug that induces chemical miscarriage. It has other potential use in treating conditions such as infertility, ectopic pregnancy, endometriosis, uterine fibroids and breast cancer.

For example, chemotherapy drugs can cause miscarriage. Most of these drugs would have not been developed, and future drugs may be jeopardized. Research of potential treatments for each of these conditions is crucial to women's health. Controversy concerning this particular drug should not be a barrier to treatment.

Science should dictate what drugs are approved by the FDA, not politics. Congress has never instructed the FDA to approve or disapprove a drug. The FDA protocol for drug approval depends upon rigorous and objective scientific evaluation of a drug's safety. Ultimately, this is a decision that should be made by the researchers and doctors.

This amendment could jeopardize the integrity of the FDA approval process. Under this process, a company that wants to begin clinical trials on a new drug must submit an application for FDA approval. If that application has not been approved within 30 days, the company may move forward.

This amendment would prevent the FDA from reviewing any application for a drug that might induce miscarriage. No funds would be available for the FDA to even oversee any trials.

Therefore, I urge my Colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot afford to inhibit research on certain health conditions based upon the controversy of the particular drug. We also cannot allow the FDA to be limited in its ability to approve drugs based on politics.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is very clear that we have a difference of philosophy and maybe religious beliefs. I happen to think that I am a person who believes in life and that I support the right to life. I also support the right-to-life decision-making being that of the woman, her God and her family, and what we are doing here is to now just intrude into the very infrastructure of government to be able to say that not even our Food and Drug Administration, which has the main responsibility of dealing with the drugs that Americans take to heal themselves, now we are suggesting that even the most benign of drugs that may ultimately cause or induce a miscarriage, we now are prohibiting women, we are prohibiting those who have ulcers, those who have breast cancer, from even getting that fair treatment by the FDA doing that right kind of testing.

This interferes with the 30-day process that the Food and Drug Administration has for any new drug that, if they do not comment on it, the manufacturer can move forward. I think it is tragic when we as a government globally decide to interfere with the private rights of a woman and deny the good testing of a drug that may save lives.

I believe in life. I want to save lives. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to speak on this amendment.

As my colleagues know, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is fraught with two fundamental problems. One is a philosophical inconsistency. I have come, in my brief time here, to view Mr. COBURN as a consistent, conservative voice in this Congress, something that he should be proud of perhaps.

Yet by the same token we have an amendment here that is so counter to that philosophy that we here in this Chamber are now going to wade into the operations of doctors and physicians and clinical experts to decide how to interpret the word ''for,'' because that is what this comes down to. How Mr. COBURN interprets the word ''for'' is very narrowly. It says it is only RU–486.

The American Medical Association, the American College, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Medical Women's Association and others interpret it is that a whole litany of research will now be off the table because that word ''for'' is ambiguous, and that is the second problem with this bill. It is intellectually ambiguous.

It is difficult to determine when research begins what the outcome might be. It is difficult for scientists sometimes to know when they are doing research on figuring out how to put a shuttle into space, that they might get technology that produces something far different.

The same is true here, that the problem with this amendment is, it is crafted in such a way that the gentleman says it is to simply stop RU–486 except if RU–486 turns out to cure cancer, then it is okay.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a way for us to be operating in this Chamber. This is a very dangerous amendment.

I understand the argument that the gentleman is making about abortion. I disagree with it with every ounce of my strength, but I understand that. The problem is with this amendment is it conceivably opens the door to prohibitions about all kinds of other types of research.

It is simply not the type of business we should be doing here, and it is not the type of business that anyone that considers themselves in this body a conservative and is intellectually honest in that position should be taking.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as we close this debate, I would like to address some remarks again to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) because I respect his point of view. We may differ on this issue, but I certainly respect his point of view.

As a mother and grandmother of four-and-a-half, I have to tell my colleague after 10 years of serving in this body I am so tired of debating abortion on the floor of the House, restriction after restriction, ban after ban, amendment after amendment. If we really want to reduce the number of abortions, please work with us to increase funds for family planning. Work with us to ensure that women have access to prescription contraceptives.

I have been working to prevent unintended pregnancies, reduce the numbers of abortions. We need to make abortions less necessary, not more dangerous, and I am sorry that this amendment is being offered to an otherwise outstanding bill.

The amendment was offered last year. Although it passed the House narrowly, it faced a veto threat from the administration, rejected by the

Senate members of the agriculture appropriations conference committee, and strong opposition from medical groups, patient advocacy organizations and the biomedical community. It was wisely stripped out of the final version of the bill signed by the President.

The amendment faces the same widespread opposition today, but I hope that this year my colleagues will send this amendment to the defeat it frankly deserves right here in the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, Congress should not inject politics into the FDA's drug approval process. This amendment ignores sound science, it puts women's health in jeopardy, and it should be defeated.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

The prior gentlewoman from New York was so right. We spend an enormous amount of our time in this body trying to restrict women's access to the best and safest reproductive health care. If we can channel this energy into more productive activities, maybe we can find more money for the women and infant care program or even help to prevent more of the unplanned pregnancies that are the cause of this problem. None of us want to support abortion, and hopefully all of us want to create an environment where there will be far fewer abortions.

But what we are talking about today is really the political practice of medicine, and this amendment should be opposed. The drug mifepristone known as RU–486 has been proven a safe and effective method through clinical trials.

We now know that there are researchers at the National Institutes for Health that believe that RU–486 could be a very effective drug in treating breast cancer, in treating brain tumors, and yet this amendment would preclude that kind of research from being conducted because as part of the FDA approval process, drug trials can proceed only if the FDA does not disapprove of a trial. If the FDA is prohibited from reviewing applications under the Coburn amendment, research may be conducted without the safety of review and oversight of the FDA. So women would be asked to participate in trials with no review of the safety of the protocol.

So that is not going to happen, and as a result, we may be precluding very important advances in medicine. But we also are told by the lawyers that there is, and I accept the fact it is unintentional, but it is a very important side effect because there are many drugs whose principal purpose may not be abortion, but in fact, are effective in chemotherapy, cancer treatments, hypertension, cirrhosis, rheumatoid arthritis, ectopic pregnancies, ulcers, epilepsy, severe viral infections, all kinds of drugs that may have a corollary effect of inducing abortion.

Those drugs are important. We should be supporting them. We should not be engaged in the political practice of medicine. I urge rejection of this amendment.

□ 1615

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my friend from Ohio and the gentleman from Virginia and the gentlewoman from New York this is not a fun debate for me either. I am not happy that we are here doing this. But, you know, if one child is not aborted because we have this debate, I am willing to do it all night long, 365 days a year. That is how much I value life.

Now, I want to discuss for a minute, you say we should not be politicizing the FDA with this action. Well, I want to tell you, the FDA is already politicized. How many drugs do you know of that have been approved of basically on research done overseas? There is zero, except one. Guess what drug that is? Guess what drug that is? That is RU–486.

The vast majority of the studies on RU–486 were not conducted in this country; they were conducted overseas. That totally is a whole new precedent for the FDA. They have never before done that on any new drug approval.

The second thing I would say is this amendment will have no effect whatsoever on any other utilization of any other drug. Cytotec, which is the second drug used with RU–486, is used to protect the lining of the stomach. It is a prostaglandin inhibitor. We use prostaglandins today. We are actually starting to use Cytotec, a very strong component of this, to induce labor. I did it about a week ago, first time.

So we did not learn that from it being studied on the basis of it being an abortifacient or a drug to induce abortion. We learned that because that drug was developed to protect the lining of the stomach for people who have ulcers, consequently learning that you do not dare take that drug if you are pregnant.

Well, if it works in terms of causing uterine contractions, what about using it to induce labor? Maybe it is safer than pitocin or other prostaglandins. So there is no limitation that is going to come about from this amendment.

Five percent of the women who take this drug get a uterine infection, which, when you have a uterine infection, number one, it will affect your ability to conceive in the future. One hundred percent of the women lose more blood with a chemically induced abortion than they would either through a spontaneous or a surgical abortion. It may not be important to you, but if it is you losing the blood, it becomes very important.

Number three, more than one-third of them end up delivering the conceptus outside of the clinic. In France, they have very selected rules on how you can use this drug. None of those are protected and planned in this country.

So is the issue all of the things that we have heard: Not being able to use research? Not being able to get cancer drugs? No, it is not. The issue is nobody from the opposing viewpoint, either from the Republican or Democrat side of the aisle, answered the question, should Federal money be used to help find ways to kill babies? Nobody wants to answer that question. That is because there is not a good answer. Nobody agrees with it. So, therefore, we see arguments that are something other than that. We distort what the argument is because there is not a good argument.

We will not limit in any way the ability of the FDA to do any research. What we will say is, is if your number one goal is to figure out how to kill an unborn baby, number one, first of all, this does not work in 2 days or 3 days or 5 days or 6 days postconception. I am sorry if that is what people think. This works 4 and 5 and 6 and 7 and 8 weeks after. It is not a morning-after drug. That is now how it is going to be used.

What this is going to do is say if you are intending to bring a drug to the market, then the FDA should not spend the first Federal taxpayer's money to figure out how to kill a baby. All right, if that is a consequence of it, of some other intended purpose, maybe that is okay. Because these drugs, Cytotec is going to be used for that. You do not have to have approval of the FDA to use drugs in ways other than how they are indicated. We all know that.

So Cytotec is already being used to induce abortions. The point is should we spend the money, your children's, your grandchildren's, our community's money, to figure out how to take a life? My answer is no. I ask you, should we really do that? I do not believe most people think we should.

That does not say that abortion still is not legal. It is. The question comes, when you have done, as I have, and sat there at the bottom of a table when a woman delivers a 10-week fetus or a 12-week fetus, and hold it in your hand, and she is distraught and crying because that baby was created by her and her partner, and is totally unique to anything else that has ever been created or ever will be created. It has a totally unique genetic structure, it is a God-ordained being, and we are going to say it is okay, we are going to figure out ways to kill those God-ordained

beings, and we are going to say for convenience sake, because we made a mistake, because somebody erred, because somebody failed to protect themselves, that it is okay to destroy that life, I reject it. I do not dislike anybody who disagrees with me on that, but I reject that as an argument of the heart and of the soul.

If we are going to decide in this country that you are dead when you do not have heartbeat and brain waves, but you are alive in all 50 States and territories when you do, how can we reject the argument that at 41 days every fetus, every unborn child, has a heartbeat and a brain wave? Now, you cannot deny that scientific fact. That is absolutely proven. So the response to that question is ''we will talk about something different.''

It is a hard issue, I understand. I wish we did not have unintended pregnancy. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I have the same goal on that. We believe in getting there a different way. I am not supporting some of her contraceptive research, because I am seeing what is happening with contraceptives and sexually transmitted disease and cancer of the cervix, which is at an all-time high in this country, under the false assumption you are safe, when a condom offers no protection from human papilloma virus whatsoever, yet we tell all our kids they are safe.

Well, I am tired of all the deceit around the arguments. There is good science. I am a scientist by training. I have read the studies. I have looked at it. This amendment is designed for one thing only.

The gentleman from Washington State gave me more credit. I have never thought out about to figure out how to be devious enough to set up lawsuits. My purpose was to say no taxpayer money from Oklahoma or anywhere else ought to be used in figuring out how to kill children.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment for many of the reasons that were stated earlier. The first one is that I do not think that this Congress should be prejudging medical science. We have talked this afternoon about how scientific discoveries and how science proceeds, often with unintended consequences. We have talked about how many of the drugs currently being used to treat mental illness in this country were discovered by accident.

They were not discovered in this country, they were discovered in France. They were discovered during operating room procedures when patients were trying to be put at ease and the process of pain remediated during operations, and, all of a sudden, for some reason, certain drugs worked. Eventually they came to this country, and even today we do not understand why they work to help patients with serious mental illness. But for some in our population, they have been able to be given great relief and help through those drugs.

The same was talked about with x-rays. When the scientists invented x-rays, it was an accident. They really went in there with one objective, and, all of a sudden, they made a mistake and it turned out to be an x-ray, and sometimes science is not quite as scientific as it seems. I think that this particular Chamber should not be judging what is science and what is not science.

For the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), which I would really encourage the Members to read if they are going to be voting on this, because I do not think his amendment says what he purports to do in his oral remarks here, but this amendment would absolutely set a dangerous precedent.

This Congress has never legislated the approval or disapproval of any drugs. That is the job of the Food and Drug Administration. We pay for scientists. We, as taxpayers, pay to make sure that what reaches our shelves is safe; but we do not prejudge what is medically relevant.

We also know that many drugs are tested at the end of use for treatment of more than one illness, disease, or condition. We do not really control that. So I would say that on the basis of science alone this amendment should be rejected.

I think that the committee also on which we serve, and we are a very responsible committee, we are the first one on this floor, we are trying to clear this bill under regular order, and I do believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has been given sufficient time, actually a lot of time over the last several weeks, to express his points of view, which have been very well articulated.

But the truth is, our subcommittee never had any hearings on this particular matter. The reason is we are the Committee on Appropriations. We do not try to tell FDA what to do. We expect the authorizing committees will deal with that.

If my experience proves me right, my guess would be that if there are concerns about something that is inappropriate, that is best taken to the authorizing committees.

This amendment is not going to be in the Senate bill, and it is not going to become a part of the final legislation.

So I would say based on science, based on safe procedures, that this is something the FDA should be implementing, and also based on regular order, the gentleman's amendment should be defeated. I would urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Coburn amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill that would ban the Federal Drug Administration from using funds to test, develop, or approve Mifepristone (RU–486)—a drug which has been found to be safe and effective for early, non-surgical abortion.

This is yet another political vote and political debate on a drug whose benefits have been scientifically proven. This amendment is an unwarranted intrusion into the work of the FDA, whose job is to decide whether to approve RU–486 or other drugs based on health and safety—not abortion politics.

Medical abortions and RU–486, if approved, would allow more choices to women seeking abortion. Medical abortions are a better health option for some women. Medical abortions allow women to avoid surgery as well as protect their privacy—women can receive RU–486 in pill form in a regular doctor's office, and be spared the trauma of protesters and violence that continue to stigmatize these women for exercising their constitutionally protected right to choose.

Approval of RU–486 is critical so that doctors may use this procedure when they believe it is the safest way to end a pregnancy and leave the woman with the best chance to have a healthy baby in the future.

New contraceptive development would also be targeted. Many anti-choice groups believe that some contraceptive methods cause an abortion. This is untrue. If that contention were accepted as fact, research and development of man new contraceptives would come to a halt. This amendment would deprive women of the benefits of significant contraceptive advances.

Make no mistake, a vote for this amendment endangers the health of women, and adds to the long list of barriers set by the majority in Congress that make reproductive health services more dangerous and difficult to obtain. I strongly oppose the Coburn amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 214, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Barton	Borski
Archer	Bateman	Brady (TX)
Armey	Bereuter	Bryant
Bachus	Berry	Burr
Baker	Bilirakis	Burton
Ballenger	Bliley	Buyer
Barcia	Blunt	Callahan
Barr	Boehner	Calvert
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Camp
Bartlett	Bono	Canady

Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
McCollum
Waters

□ 1646

Mr. REYES changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DREIER, TAYLOR of North Carolina, OXLEY and BATEMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . (A) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to award any new allocations under the market access program or to pay the salaries of personnel to award such allocations.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the rationale behind this amendment is simple. Hard-working taxpayers should not have to subsidize the advertising costs of America's private corporations, yet this is exactly what the Market Access Program does.

Since 1986, the Federal Government has extracted well over $1 billion from the pockets of American taxpayers and handed it to multimillion dollar corporations to subsidize their marketing programs in foreign countries. In other words, the U.S. taxpayer is helping successful private companies and trade associations advertise their wares in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I think the American people would agree that their money could be better spent on deficit reduction for education. Rather than subsidize private businesses and corporations, that money could much better be spent on deficit reduction or on education or on saving Social Security, on the environment, or on tax cuts.

In the past, we have witnessed MAP supporters present some good-sounding arguments for preserving what is in my view a corporate welfare scheme. The only problem is that when we cut through the pro-MAP propaganda, there is no credible evidence to back up their claims.

Let me give my colleagues an example. MAP supporters have argued that this so-called business government partnership creates jobs. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the American people know that the only jobs usually created by big government spending programs are for big government bureaucracies.

This view of the MAP program is backed by the General Accounting Office. GAO studies indicated that this program has no discernible effect on U.S. agricultural exports. So if the program cannot increase U.S. exports, how can it possibly create more private-sector jobs?

For years, supporters of MAP have lauded the economic benefits created by the program. However, in April 1999, a GAO report, requested by myself and Senator SCHUMER and a bipartisan group of House Members, concluded that the economic benefits of this program are uncertain at best.

According to that report, it seems that the Foreign Agricultural Service, the bureaucracy which administers this corporate welfare program, has used certain assumptions that the OMB has determined to be inadequate for economic benefit analysis. For example, the Foreign Agricultural Service assumes that there are no opportunity costs for promoting one product over another.

But even if my colleagues do believe these supposed benefits, they have all the more reason to support this amendment. These numbers, if accurate, prove that, given these positive returns on an investment overseas, MAP-supported corporations and trade associations ought to be spending their own money and not the money of the taxpayers of this Nation.

My opposition to MAP is not based solely on the false premises of its supporters. I am offering this amendment today because we simply do not need this wasteful program. Let us be honest. Most American businesses do not benefit and do not try to take advantage of government handouts like this MAP program.

In the case of MAP, as in most corporate welfare programs, beneficiaries consist primarily of politically well-connected corporations and trade associations. Most, if not all of these organizations, would advertise their products overseas, even without MAP funds. They probably would work much harder to ensure that the money is well spent.

Let me give just one example of the kind of waste and mismanagement that this program breeds. We all remember a few years ago when the California Raisin Board sponsored the ''I heard it through the grapevine'' raisin commercial. Based on the success of that commercial in the U.S., MAP decided that it would be a good idea to use that commercial to attempt to boost raisin sales in Japan and put $3 million into the project.

Not surprisingly, however, the ads played in English, leaving many Japanese confused, unaware that the dancing characters were raisins. Most thought they were potatoes or chocolate. In addition, many Japanese children were afraid of the wrinkled, misshapen figures. This, of course, is the kind of wasteful spending that inevitably occurs when we give someone the ability to spend other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, Congress should end the practice of wasting tax dollars on special interest spending programs that unfairly take money from hard-working families to help profitable private companies pad their bottom line. MAP is a massive corporate welfare program that we should eliminate today.

Finally, in MAP, MAP's proponents have argued that due to recent reforms, big corporations no longer receive MAP funds. It is true that in June 1998, in order to correct some of the more egregious abuses of the MAP, Market Access Program, the Foreign Agricultural Service revised its regulations to limit a company to 5 years of assistance in a particular country. After this 5-year period had expired, companies were to be graduated from the country's market. Translation: These billion-dollar corporations were no longer to receive tax dollars to fund their product promotions.

So I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote to get rid of this very wasteful program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an annual debate, and I am not sure why we have to have it. Virtually all of our competitor nations spend money to promote their products against ours. We have had testimony from both USDA and many private-sector companies about the success of the program, particularly for small enterprises.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and am somewhat surprised that a Member from Ohio, where agriculture is our leading industry, would offer this particular amendment. If one reads the changes that have been made in this program, particularly targeting its benefits at small- and medium-sized operations, I think some of what the gentleman has said might have been true many years ago, but they are certainly not true today.

If one looks at what is happening in rural America, which is swimming in surpluses, and we know that for this country to help rural America make it we must expand our exports in spite of collapses in the Asian economy and other places, there is one program we do not want to cut at all and it is this program.

I think what is really hard sometimes for Members who represent only urban or suburban areas, where production does not occur, where people largely reside but perhaps where agricultural development does not happen on an everyday basis, it is hard to understand how a farmer, who may raise beans or may raise animals and who wish to export a product, many times those same farmers cannot even sell in Cincinnati. A farmer over in Butler County, the only way they can get product into the City of Cincinnati is to perhaps sell at their farmers' market. They cannot even get their products on the shelves of the stores in Cincinnati. Imagine how difficult it is for that same farmer to move product into Japan or any other part of Asia or Latin America or Europe.

This market access program is the only mechanism we have to help growers move product abroad. This is not Procter & Gamble. This is not where we can take production and move it anyplace in the world and then distribute the product. This is not U.S. Shoe, where all of their products are made abroad and then imported into Cincinnati and distributed to the rest of the United States. This is trying to help our producers in this country to be able to lift product off our market and take it somewhere else.

And, Mr. Chairman, I underline ''producers.'' This is really a very, very important program. And if my colleagues know the trade accounts of this Nation, where every year we are going into more and more serious trade deficit, every single year more imports coming in here than exports going out, the one rosy light in a very bleak set of tables is agriculture. And the light is not getting brighter; it is getting dimmer as the years go on, but it is still lit up. And the reason is because we have been able to move product elsewhere around the world.

So I would just say to the gentleman, in a State where our leading industry is agriculture, in a Nation where the agricultural accounts represent the only positive side of the trade ledger, this is exactly the program we do not want to cut. And we do not want to cut it particularly at a time when rural America is in deep depressions. This is a time to help our people, not to penalize them, and especially to meet the subsidized kind of programs that our trade competitors have on the books all across the world.

Stand up for American agriculture when she is calling us and asking us to hear her voice.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose this amendment by my colleague. While I am sure it is well intended, it is like some of the other amendments we often get but, fortunately, this year have not gotten on this bill dealing with important crops like peanuts, sugar, and tobacco. But let me speak to the MAP, the Market Access Program.

The United States is outspent more than 20 to 1 by our foreign competitors spending money on export promotion and export subsidies. In 1997, the leading U.S. competitors spent $924 million to promote agricultural exports, much of it in this country, and the United States spends $90 million. Ninety million dollars spent by the United States compared to $924 million by our competitors.

There is no limit placed on the amount that can be spent by exporting countries for agricultural promotion. The WTO does not limit that. And right now, while the U.S. has diminished the amount they have spent, other countries in the world are expanding the amount that they are spending to promote their products in this country and other places in the world.

Foreign spending in the U.S. on promoting our competitors' agriculture is growing. A hundred million was spent in 1997 for that purpose. That much more. The biggest spenders are New Zealand, Italy, Spain, Australia and Canada.

The U.S. exports have gone down over the past 3 years. This is not the time when we should be cutting the funds necessary to promote our exports. SUDA estimates that agricultural exports will be only $49 billion this year. Just 3 years ago they were $60 billion. We have serious problems in American agriculture. The way to address them is not to cut the promotional funds needed to make us competitive around the world, and I reluctantly would rise and ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should wake up and smell the coffee. That Juan Valdez, who is in all our homes, on our television sets, telling us about the virtues of Colombian coffee, and we see him in those advertisements in every grocery store promoting that coffee, where do my colleagues think that money comes from? It comes from the Colombian Coffee Growers Association. And why are they doing it? They are paying to promote their product. Not a brand name but a generic name.

Well, what is wrong with us doing the same thing? How are we going to sell agriculture around the world? We produce in agriculture, which is essentially if we really look at this, a lot of small farmers getting together and promoting a product. They have to, under this program, come up with 50 percent of the money. The Federal Government comes in only after they have initiated it and they do a match.

Remember Riuniti Wine that was advertising all over America a few years ago? Where do my colleagues think the advertising for that came from? Marketing promotion from Italy to get Americans to drink Italian wine.

Now, we export $60 billion worth of food around the world. Why do my colleagues think people buy our food? Because we help promote it, just like anyone would sell anything else. Well, this is the program that helps promote it. Only this program does not allow, as the author of the amendment indicated, big corporate agriculture to benefit. This program ties it to small- and medium-sized companies. He says this is big corporate welfare. Well, there is no big corporate welfare in the Seed Trade Association, in the Asparagus Association, in the Kiwi Commission, in the Prune Board, in the North American Blueberry Council, in the Catfish Institute, in the Apple Association. That is not big corporate welfare. Last time I checked, these products were being grown by small farmers, and they are trying to get their products sold.

Now, why is it good for America? Because the one area where our balance of trade is strong is in agriculture. We export $60 billion and we import $30 billion. We cannot say that about any other industry in America. We are actually selling more than we are taking in. That is what it is all about. Well, this is the program that helps do it. Why would we want to undermine that program?

A lot of the data being quoted is old data. In the last few years we amended this program and we said participants had to come up with a match, they had to be for small businesses, they cannot be those big conglomerates, and so we have limited the amount of funding that can be given to anybody. This helps sell American agriculture. It is the only way we are going to be able to sell it. Support this program. It is not big corporate welfare, it is small American farmers being able to sell their product abroad. I ask for a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have great respect for the sponsor of this amendment, but not so much respect that I want to vote for it. In fact, I am going to oppose it, simply because what my friend from California just stated is absolutely true.

What happens in this Market Access Program is this. Growers and consortiums, Sunkist for orange juice, Tree-Top for apple juice, which is very prominent out my way in the State of Washington, get together and they decide how they can best promote their products overseas. They pay half the freight. The taxpayer pays half and the sponsor, the marketer, pays the other half. And that is what is fair about this program.

It has been cut down dramatically since I have been in this House. I have seen Members on both sides of the aisle have some concern about this; people, by the way, who do not care much about agriculture and do not understand exports, but they have managed to whittle down this particular expenditure in the agriculture appropriations bill such that it is down to virtually very little when it can do so much. It can do so much.

What I think the sponsor does not appreciate, and maybe others who might support this do not appreciate, is that when we submit this amount of money, the small amount of money relative to the rest of the agriculture budget for market promotion, for promotion of our products overseas, that has direct impact on the farmer. It has direct impact on rural America.

And talking about big corporate welfare, that is not the case in this particular program. This helps the grower, the farmer, the person who works the land and presents a product that can be exported overseas and dramatically helps our balance of trade.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) said, agriculture is a huge benefactor to the balance of trade. It helps our country by exporting products. So, number one, it is a small amount relative to what it used to be and what it is in the agriculture budget; number two, it helps the small farmer, it helps the grower; number three, it helps the American economy, especially the rural economy, because we are essentially buying shelf space and competing with European and other products around the world; and, finally, the governments of these other countries are subsidizing tremendous amounts of money to their growers and their producers to sell products in our country.

So this is a small way, a fair shared way that our products can get on the shelf in Europe, and our growers, our producers, our farmers, our market system, the export market system can work in our country.

So, again, I have great respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). He is a good Member and has good ideas, but this one is one that should be defeated. I hope my colleagues will vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

We have had some good discussion here already, and I am not going to try to repeat it over and over, but I appreciate the things that have been said. I might just give my colleagues a little lesson in history that some Members might not be aware of about the American farmer. We are in a crisis in agriculture, no question about it. I live out there, as many of my colleagues do. I just spent a week in my district, and it is tough and it is real.

A few years ago, when we had the Ag crisis of the 1980s, it was interesting to me, and that is what motivated me to get involved in this arena, the political arena, we had people going to their lenders and different organizations, and I will not get into that, and they told our farmers to go back and sell their cow herds or sell their sows, or do this or that. In other words, dispose of their factory, in a sense. We do not want to do that again. We have to get out there and be competitive in the export market.

In my State we have to export about 40 percent to make things work. That is kind of a reflection of the country. We have to do about the same thing to make things work. As we have heard many of our colleagues say already, agriculture puts a plus on the trade deficit in our favor, so we cannot let this happen. It is not a time to let up and say we are not going to go out there and be competitive.

In our Committee on Agriculture here a number of weeks ago, we had the Secretary come and talk to us and mention the unprecedented 3 years in a row that there has been overproduction. And so when our people go to sell to someone else, they say, excuse me, we have something we want to sell. And so this is a time when we want to cut back on the promotion. We cannot do that.

So I encourage a ''no'' vote and hope that we can do that; that we can give a leg up for the American farmer and agriculture production. It is important to all of us. I do not care where we live, what part of the country, what we do, it is important to all of us and let us not forget that.

□ 1715

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, since the Great Depression, American farmers were shackled by the Federal Government

with programs and regulations that kept them from producing all they could. We all remember how many farmers were paid not to grow certain crops; they were paid subsidies to grow others.

Over the last few years, our colleagues on the agriculture and agricultural appropriation committees have done an excellent job in reducing harmful government interference in American agriculture and putting it on the road back to the market system that works so well. American farmers are now unshackled and free to produce as they see fit, not as Washington tells them.

However, more work remains to be done. The market access program is a relic of our former government-heavy agricultural system. The MAP program, the Market Access Program, provides millions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies per year to agribusinesses to supplement their international advertising and marketing.

We have heard that agriculture is one of the most important businesses in America, and we have also heard that advertising American agriculture overseas is critical. And I agree with these points. They are certainly true.

The question is not whether agriculture and American farmers are important. Without question, they are very important to this economy. And we all know that advertising is an essential part of doing business. The question is whether MAP is a proper use of taxpayer money. And it is not.

The cost of advertising should be borne by the firms which stand to benefit, not the taxpayers.

Let me also say that I do not believe that working men and women should continue to foot the bill for advertising subsidies to multinational corporations. Promotional advertising for product is simply not the role of government. It is the role of those private concerns that benefit from the sale of those products.

The future and continued performance of American agriculture is not contingent upon handing out taxpayer money for advertising. The success of American agriculture results from the energy and ingenuity of American farmers, not government subsidies.

Let me also say that as far as the GAO report, the GAO report found that there is no clear relationship between the amount spent on government export promotion and changes in the level of U.S. exports.

In a separate report, the GAO questioned whether funds are actually supporting additional promotional activities or if they are simply replacing private industry funds. What is obvious on its face is that money handed out by government bureaucrats does not magically become several dollars.

And let me say that another argument that is often made is that we are being outsubsidized by the European Union and other countries throughout the world. I might point out that our economy is outperforming those countries by every measure.

Our gross national product dwarfs most every other country in the world. We have the most productive workers. Our per capita income is highest. Unemployment is almost nonexistent.

I, for one, do not wish to follow the European model of subsidies. I do not think that many of my colleagues do either. We should continue striving to shed these vestiges of central planning instead of defending those that have crept into our economy in the past.

Government has no business deciding which companies are worthy of advertising funds. That is precisely what the free market is there to do, to allocate resources in the most efficient way possible. The government ought not to be taking tax money from companies to finance the advertising of their competition, which is the direct result of redistribution.

I make no argument that advertising sells products. This is obvious. The point, however, is whether private conditions should pay for the promotion of their own product or whether the American taxpayer should be forced to do so. We do not force the American taxpayer to pay for other corporate expenses like office supplies. American taxpayers should not pay for this cost of doing business.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that, obviously, as we look at this program, the question is, is this a program that is of value to the American people? Is it a program of value to the American farmers? And should we be investing in promoting the American farmers' product abroad?

I think there is value in investing in the promotion of the American farmers, because not only is that a public policy that we support our farmers. True enough, in 1996, we had a farm bill that said we were removing ourselves from the subsidy model and we are going more to a market model. I personally did not support that. But nevertheless, even in a market-driven model, not to have this tool is counterproductive.

This tool simply says that it is a tool to market our farmers who were heretofore dependent and subsidized. Our farmers are having a very difficult time. If we are not going to make the market available as a tool to them, as we pull away the safety net, how do we expect our farmers in rural areas to survive? How is it that they are going to be on a competitive basis with other countries subsidizing large quantities if we expect they have no safety net, and yet we are not going to give them the tools to survive?

We are struggling in rural America. I cannot think of a commodity that made money in my State. And without this tool, they certainly would not have it. And the claim that this only goes to large corporations, indeed, that has been in the past, but this program has been improved. Indeed, it goes now to small farmers, to associations.

What kind of commodities does it support? It supports dry beans, eggs, frozen potatoes, grapes, peanuts. My colleagues would expect me to say peanuts because I am from North Carolina. But also pears. All of these small farmers' products, associations getting together, having their government to recognize the importance of their coming together and promoting their goods.

We travel abroad and we find that other countries are subsidizing the marketing of their products. We make our farmers less competitive when we remove this tool.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, as well-meaning as it might be. This is counterproductive to the needs of the farmers in the rural areas.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few points. The idea that this money goes to large corporations is simply bogus. This money is matched by money which is raised from producers, such as pork producers, who are hurting so badly today. The cattlemen, the corn growers, the soybean growers put their own money with this. This is not to enhance a particular brand name. It is to sell U.S., high-quality pork, corn products, feed products overseas.

One part of the argument that I think is really missing is what effect do agricultural exports have on Americans as far as their jobs? And one gentleman made a statement about people working hard to pay taxes and using their money for this. Well, the fact of the matter is, in the State of California, where that gentleman was from, there are 124,000 jobs directly dependent upon agricultural exports. Think of it, 124,000 jobs which could be greatly reduced if we lose our export markets and if we do not continue to grow in our exports.

In Ohio there are 27,000 jobs directly related to agricultural exports. It is extraordinarily important in a State like Ohio to maintain those good, high-paying jobs which are dependent upon agricultural exports.

In the State of Iowa, a smaller population State, it has a huge impact. We have 80,000 jobs in Iowa that are directly related to agricultural exports. So when we talk about this program being some kind of corporate welfare, I hope people here will recognize the fact that our constituents at home are dependent upon agricultural exports.

It is very important that we go and promote high quality American pork overseas, not a particular company, but American pork. It is very important that we promote American soybeans and find new uses for those product overseas for corn products, for beef overseas.

It is extremely important. We have a tremendous number of jobs that are directly dependent.

So let us not just talk about exporting and competing with other nations. Let us talk about at home in our own districts how important it is that we continue to use the tools available that the producers themselves are willing to contribute to to sell their products overseas which create good jobs at home in our own districts, high-paying jobs, and really are the future for agriculture in the international marketplace.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill. I commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member, and all my colleagues on the subcommittee for bringing this bill to us, a bill which supports American farmers in rural communities. This bill comes to us after much time, deliberation, and discussion. I thank the subcommittee for their hard work.

I want to address the current amendment to eliminate the Market Access Program. This program is vital to the success of our farmers. If this amendment passes, we as a Congress are to blame for handing over U.S. agricultural market share to foreign competitors.

I believe with my whole heart that the American farmers are the most efficient in the world and produce the best products at the lowest prices and provide the safest food of anyone in the world. With this knowledge, I confidently say that given an equal opportunity, American farmers can compete and succeed against agricultural products from any other country.

However, American farmers are not being given this equal opportunity. The United States is outspent by more than 20 to 1 by our foreign competitors, promoting and subsidizing their own product.

In 1997, the leading U.S. competitor spent $924 million to promote their agriculture exports, $100 million of that spent on promotions here in the United States. Conversely, we grant our farmers assistance to the tune of $90 million to help them compete against our competitor's $924 million.

Rather than having this annual debate aimed at eliminating the program, I argue that Congress should rather be discussing a funding increase for the Market Access Program. This is the only program aimed correctly at helping U.S. agriculture products around the world.

Our competitors have no limits on what they will spend to assist their farmers in edging out our product. Their success is evidenced by the fact that U.S. ag exports have decreased by $11 billion since 1996.

In conclusion, let me simply say the Market Access Program is a valuable tool we are able to provide our farmers. This tool not only helps them compete abroad, but it also supports thousands of U.S. export jobs, 24,000 in my State of North Carolina alone.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of U.S. farmers by voting against this amendment.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that has been offered by my colleague, who intends on eliminating the Market Access Program.

We revisit this issue annually. Reforms have been undertaken. The Foreign Agriculture Service reviews proposals submitted by the agriculture cooperatives and nonprofit organizations. They must provide matching funds. The FAS scrutinizes expenses and the performances.

Farmers across the country are suffering from prices having dropped. Export opportunities have been withering, and they are trying to gain a market share in countries around the world. They are competing with odds against them.

Eliminating the cost share assistance of MAP would make that struggle even harder.

As we have eliminated the trade barriers between our country and other countries, and we have not required the same relaxation in other countries as our farmers are competing with their hands tied behind their backs, we are trying to help them to search out other markets, other opportunities, beyond their traditional markets. We have tried to do this and we have been successful at it.

The money spent in this program, $90 million, has returned, according to estimates, $12.5 billion trade surplus in agriculture. And when our country has a trade deficit of billions of dollars, this is the only part of our trade and our export that actually has a trade surplus.

□ 1730

In the Northeast and in Maine in particular, there are families that own apple orchards that are hurting. The money that would be helping to generate business for them in the United Kingdom is a generic promotion for MacIntosh apples which they are providing the match for. This is not a government handout but a match is required for them to participate in this program. It is a Federal program that is helping family farmers in a region where family farmers are struggling. I have been working with lobstermen, using the MAP funds trying to open up Asian markets to them. And I have helped family-owned sardine canneries secure assistance.

This is not some huge welfare for huge corporations. This is for fishermen, for farmers, for people who are working in family-owned businesses who have chosen a rugged way of life to put food on the tables of America and the world. This program is aimed at small- and medium-sized companies. It has been reformed and it is working. It is one of the few areas of our Federal export-import program that is working very successfully and is working for small- and medium-sized family farms. I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and to keep this program working.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this shortsighted amendment which would have a huge impact on the constituents in my district, Sonoma and Marin Counties in California, a district where some of the world's finest wines are produced. If this amendment passes, our world famous wine would certainly have a more difficult time competing in the world market. So would our neighboring districts, Napa County, Mendocino County and neighboring States, Oregon and Washington, and States across the country, like Arkansas.

This amendment would impact the small wine producers, those who rely upon Federal export assistance to enter and compete in the global marketplace. Let us be clear. The playing field in the world export market for wines is not level. Unlike Europe and unlike South America, U.S. wine producers receive no production subsidies, no subsidies whatsoever, for their production. Furthermore, our competitors outspend the United States in export subsidies by more than 6 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, small California wineries suffer in such a lopsided marketplace without some marketing assistance. Let there be no mistake, this amendment targets small, family-owned businesses. Eighty-nine percent of the wineries that participate in the Market Access Program are small wineries. Furthermore, the Market Access Program is not a handout. It is a partnership, a partnership between small businesses and the USDA. And it provides funds on a cost-share basis. The European Union export subsidies amounted to approximately $10 billion last year, Mr. Chairman. In fact, the European Union spends more on export promotion for wine than the United States does for all of our agricultural programs combined.

We need only look at last year to see this unfair disparity. Market promotion funds for the American wine industry totalled approximately $5 million. The heavily subsidized European wine industry received $1.5 billion. That is $5 million in the United States and $1.5 billion in Europe. The money we spend to increase the markets for American agricultural products is money well spent. Because of assistance from the Market Access Program, U.S. wine exports had their 14th consecutive record-breaking year in 1998, reaching $537 million. This level is $100 million over the year before, which means that each Market Access Program dollar generated a $20 increase in exports.

Just as important, California wines can now be found on the retail shelves of over 164 countries. In the last 10 years, an additional 7,500 full-time jobs and 5,000 part-time jobs have been created by exporting wine. This is not only good for the American balance of trade, it is good for the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, we should help export U.S. products, not U.S. jobs. Oppose this amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Chabot amendment to the Market Access Program (MAP). Unfortunately, some of my colleagues appear not to understand the importance of MAP to our producers.

Two weeks ago, the director of the Nebraska Department of Agriculture was in town to discuss agriculture policy with Members of Congress and the administration. We discussed in general terms all of the options for supporting American producers, and keeping US agriculture competitive in the world market. But there was one thing the director specifically asked for, and that was continued funding for the Market Access Program.

Nebraska's central location and small population base make it difficult for many individual producers to compete internationally. MAP funds help our producers, and the Nebraska Department of Agriculture, to overcome this hurdle by partially funding market service, and trade and research missions to foreign countries. These funds help support and promote the buying, selling, and development of Nebraska agricultural products. In today's market, this is critical.

Let's face it, our producers must export in order to survive and prosper. And their products must be competitive on the world market. The Market Access Program is one small way we can help our producers. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and to support our producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 355, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—72

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Berkley
Bilbray
Campbell
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Cox
Crane
DeLay
DeMint
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Graham
Hayworth
Hoekstra
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Istook
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Largent
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Paul
Petri
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rivers
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sununu
Tierney
Toomey
Wamp
Weiner
Wu

NOES—355

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
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
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (CA)
Buyer
Chenoweth
Ford
McCollum
Ney
Waters

□ 1755

Mr. VENTO and Mr. GILMAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. DELAY, COBURN, KIND, ISTOOK and LAZIO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 174, I was present and voted "no", but was not recorded, this is my third new voting card. I will now seal a 4th voting card.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG OF FLORIDA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

At the end of the bill, immediately preceding the short title, insert the following new section:

Sec. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, appropriations under this Act for the following agencies and activities are hereby reduced to the following respective amounts:

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments:	
Repairs, Renovation and Construction	0
Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service:	
Integrated Activities	0
Agricultural Research Service:	
Buildings and Facilities	0
Rural Housing Service:	
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:	
Administrative Expenses	$375,879,000
Food and Drug Administration:	
Salaries and Expenses	1,198,384,000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (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 Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1800

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the agriculture bill as we present it was at the 302(b) level, but was over last year's spending limits. In consultation with many Members on both sides of the aisle, we had some agreement and some disagreement that we would make some adjustments in the total of this bill in order to make additional funding available for some of the other bills that will come along later. So we developed this amendment in lieu of all of the amendments that our friend from Oklahoma had filed in advance of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill in its original form is approximately $14 billion new discretionary budget authority. This amendment would reduce that amount by $102,500,000.

We have gone carefully through these accounts. What we are doing in most of these cases is delaying some construction, at least until next year, construction that is not essential to the farm programs that we are all trying to preserve.

By doing this amendment, we are able to guarantee that the money that is going into the system to help our farmers as they are planting and as they are preparing to harvest later in the year, that we help our farmers do what we have to do to help them to stay alive, to keep the family farms and to keep those people who are producing the food for America, to keep them in business.

This amendment, while it is a substantial cut based on the overall amount in the bill, it is not that great. It is merely in most of the cases postponing until next year some of the construction that we would have done originally in this bill. So I would ask the Members to expedite the consideration of this amendment so we can complete this bill and get it into conference.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

[Fiscal year 2000]

	Amount in committee bill	Amount in amendment	Revised amount by amendment
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments [1]	$166,364,000	($26,000,000)	$140,364,000
Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service:			
Integrated activities	10,000,000	(10,000,000)	0
Agricultural Research Service:			
Buildings and Facilities	44,500,000	(44,500,000)	0
Rural Housing Service:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account administrative expenses	377,879,000	(2,000,000)	375,879,000
Food and Drug Administration:			
Salaries and Expenses [2]	1,218,384,000	(20,000,000)	1,198,384,000
		(102,500,000)	

[1] Of which $26,000,000 shall be reduced from repairs, renovation, and construction.
[2] Of which $10,000,000 shall be reduced from payments to the General Services Administration.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we had heard on this side that this amendment might be coming, and I want to say to the chairman of our full committee, there is no Member that I would respect more in this House than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I believe he is a man of integrity who would want to do what is right for America, and especially for rural America, as troubled as she is right now.

We have had an opportunity to review this amendment just for a few moments, and I would have to say overall to the membership that what this amendment does is it cuts an additional $102 million of the funds that are available to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to meet the needs of rural America.

Now, let me say that I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I strongly oppose it. I am sorry that I have to do that, because the chairman of the subcommittee and I came out of subcommittee in hopes we could have the kind of bipartisan unity that has always characterized this bill when it reaches the floor. But I think that I have to oppose the bill today for many reasons.

One of them is that, overall, if you look at the amount of funds that we will spend in our country today to serve the needs of rural America, we are about 33 percent under for the Year 2000 what we will spend this year just to prevent the hemorrhages that are going on from coast to coast, whether it is cattle country in Florida, whether we are talking about grain producers in the Midwest, whether we are talking about cotton ranchers down in Texas or whether we are talking about the Salinas Valley in California. We are talking about a situation that just does not need Band-Aids, but serious repair.

When we brought this bill for the Year 2000 to the floor, as uncomfortable as we were, we felt that, well, okay, so it is a big Band-Aid to get us through, but we know later in the year we are going to have to do more. Now for us to accept an additional $102 million in cuts is beyond what we feel is the right thing to do for America.

This may be, with all due respect to the majority in this House, the right way to get you out of a political box among various warring factions inside the Republican Caucus, but it is not the right thing to do for America.

For example, one of the major areas you cut is under the Agricultural Research Service. I do not know how many of you have ever been out in these Agricultural Research Service buildings. These are not fancy places. I mean, this is where the structures of the building kind of get rusty. These do not look like America's defense facilities or America's NASA facilities. Yet, in fact this is where the future of America is being reborn every day because of the general use of research that goes on.

Yet in this cut, what do we do? We are cutting the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center by over $13 million. It affects the State of Maryland. For New York, the Plum Island Animal Disease Center. In Pennsylvania, the Eastern Regional Research Center. In California, both in Albany and in Davis, their research labs. In Illinois, and this one really surprised me, in Peoria, the

National Center for the Agricultural Utilization Research Service.

Now, that is only one of the many cuts in this bill. There is an additional $10 million in research that is cut from the Cooperative Research Service and our extension programs. When we cut that additional $10 million, that adds to the $3 million that was already cut below last year, so it is a net negative of $13 million in those cooperative research accounts below this year.

Research really is the seed corn of the future, and, with what is going on in rural America today, we need every single dime of that research working to invent the new technologies for the future that can help us preserve our food and fiber and fuel production inside the boundaries of this country.

We are very troubled by the additional $20 million cut proposed in this amendment in the Food and Drug Administration. Here we are talking about the inspection service for food safety. We all know what is going on across this country with added needs for food safety. We have had plenty of outbreaks, in everything from cyclosporin to E. coli, everything that has affected citizens across this country. We do not need to cut the salaries and expenses account for the Food and Drug Administration.

I heard ad nauseam in our subcommittee about the need to approve different devices and prescription drugs, that FDA was not moving fast enough, we needed to do more. America was not moving fast enough to meet the commercial marketplace. We had to do more for FDA. Well, this budget does less for FDA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to mention that one of the cuts in here relates to the repairs to the South Building along Independence Avenue here, the Agricultural Building, $26 million, a building whose heating and cooling systems dates back to the 1930s, the first major repair as we get ready for the 21st century. We have been waiting and waiting and waiting. This measure actually completely eliminates any construction, real improvements that could occur in that building, one of the relics around this city.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say I know the gentleman is struggling. For those of us on this subcommittee who have worked very hard for many months on this bill, this is an important moment for us.

So I would say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I strongly oppose the gentleman in his efforts to remove an additional $102 million from the accounts for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, at a time when America is asking us to do more in these areas, and particularly now when rural America is in crisis. This is absolutely not the place to make these cuts.

I would encourage the gentleman to go back and look at some of the other accounts, and would strongly urge the membership to vote no on this Young amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, back in North Dakota this afternoon there are a number of farmers I represent wondering whether they will even be able to get through until next fall. We have had an unprecedented level of rain. It has destroyed the planting season, on top of the hardship they already faced because prices are below the cost of production, at a time when they have not been able to get for their crop what it costs them to grow the crop, and then on top of it production difficulties that have utterly disrupted their ability to get the crop in the ground.

This is a time of crisis in North Dakota. I would think it is a time of crisis well beyond a provincial concern as a North Dakota Congressman, because I am talking constantly with many Members representing farmers around the country. While your production dimensions may be different than ours, the fundamental is the same: Prices have not covered the cost of production, and that is irrespective of commodity and irrespective of region, and it has given us a crisis in agriculture.

I believe the floor consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill has been an utter travesty. At one point we had more than 100 amendments filed against it. Fortunately, we have worked that out. But now I cannot tell you how dispiriting it is to be an advocate for farmers in this country and have the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations bring forward a $100-plus million cut.

Let me just tell you where $10 million of that would fall: Research and extension. Now, when this body, under a Republican majority, passed the freedom to farm law, you told farmers things were going to be different and they were going to be wonderful. They were going to have freedom to do new things, freedom to plant, freedom to do all kinds of things based upon the marketplace.

We know what has happened. Prices have collapsed and farmers are unprotected and farmers are going broke all over the country.

The agriculture research and extension component of this budget is what we need to deliver on the promise you made to rural America, research to develop the new crop alternatives for people that cannot make money based on what they have been growing; new production methods that are more cost efficient, that will help keep these people in the game. It is part of the promise you made. Then extension, because it is extension that gets the research out of the universities and the land grant universities and out to the farmers so they can put it to work.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. A question: Is the gentleman aware that just a month ago in the supplemental we did add an additional $600 million over and above all the budgetary figures? So we are not ignoring the plight of the farmer. We are trying to expedite this bill to get this amendment considered, whether it goes up or down, and get the bill into conference, so this additional money can get into the hands of the farmer. We did just a month ago add another $600 million over and above every budget figure.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that was relative to a disaster, an emergency disaster occurring in agriculture. The Farm Bureau, another supporter of the freedom to farm bill, said you should have passed $6 billion, not $600 million.

I do not lay this on the chairman's shoulders. I have an enormous amount of respect for the chairman. But the fact of the matter is that that $600 million did not deal with extension and research, the $10 million I am talking about, and I cite that as an example.

Just a few months earlier than that, you set a 302(b) allocation for the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) went to work, working with the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and all of the Members. They came up with a bill within the allocation. They did everything right, and it is not right that agriculture should be bushwhacked on the floor of the House in this dark hour of despair by a $100 million cut.

I urge Members, put party aside, put urban-rural aside, think about what is right and think about what is fair and reject this amendment.

□ 1815

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 195, not voting 6, as follows.

[Roll No. 175]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Ford
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
Waters

□ 1834

Mr. STRICKLAND and Ms. KILPATRICK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. KELLY and Messrs. LIPINSKI, TIERNEY, DELAHUNT, NETHERCUTT, TAUZIN, and SPENCE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 175, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the passage of this bill. I regret doing so, and I intended to support it. The comity in this body requires, I think, that we give notice to one another of actions that are being taken.

Now, I understand the Republican Conference met, and they have had trouble passing this bill, and they had a discussion. I do not know what went on. I was not in the conference. Apparently there was a determination, well, we will cut some programs from the bill. We will cut some items from the bill, $102.5 million. These items were cut after going through the subcommittee and full committee.

My belief is that they were not cut substantively, that is to say, I do not believe for one second that a substantive judgment was made with reference to the merits of these particular projects. In my opinion, these cuts were made essentially as somewhat an across-the-board cut in order to get the requisite number of votes to pass this bill on the Republican side of the aisle.

Now, when we were in charge, I opposed those kinds of amendments, and I oppose them when we are not in charge.

My colleagues will not be surprised to learn that one of the projects cut was mine. Now, it was not mine personally, it was a lab facility, the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, which this Nation has created. It happens to be located in my district. But it is America's research facility, and it is the best research facility in the world.

Every farmer, not just in America, but throughout the world relies on the research that that institution has produced. In fact, productivity at every farm in America and every farm in the world that uses our technology is very substantially up because of the product of the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center.

I was not singled out. Peoria, Illinois, had a project; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) took a hit. Others took a hit. So I do not perceive this to have been a partisan hit. I do not ascribe my colleagues' motives as partisan. I ascribe them to needing to get votes.

But I suggest to my colleagues, and I suggest to my colleagues on the other side, my side of the aisle, this is not the way to legislate. This is not the way to make critical judgments on the priorities of America.

Now, I know one of my colleague's Members had a lot of amendments, and he was going to offer hundreds perhaps until next week, and perhaps this got him on board. It appears that it did. He is not offering amendments anymore.

I talked to the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for whom I have not only great respect, but unrestrained affection. I think he is one of the finest Members of this body. Frankly, one of the other Members with whom I am very close, and he would say that, I hope it does not hurt his reputation, is the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). I do not think they would have done this. I do not think they did do it. I think they were the instruments.

But I do not think this is a good day for agriculture, for farmers, for consumers. I want to say something else about this bill. It plays a game, this

$102 million. It takes $10 million in rental payments from FDA and says, we will not pay it.

My colleagues just passed a bankruptcy act that said something about personal responsibility, about paying one's bills. But in the amendment for which my colleagues just voted, they said, but one does not have to pay one's rent, do not worry about it. So that when GSA goes to refurbish or maintain or build new facilities, there will not be any money in the pot.

Why? Because we did not pay our rent. Guess what? It is free. It is supply side maintenance and building of capital assets. That is what this amendment does that my colleagues voted for.

I would hope that my colleagues would vote against this bill. I would hope that we could go back to the board. If my colleagues want to cut, if the majority will is to cut, then let us do so in a rational, considered way, not by this, it was not midnight, but I had no notice of it, and I suggest that perhaps most Members did not have notice of it.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have watched the debate over agriculture appropriations for the past two days. Farmers are the backbone of my state. The economy of Wisconsin is based on agriculture—if our farmers suffer, the economy of our entire state suffers. These issues are vital to the people of the district I serve; however, no issue in agriculture is as vital to the farmers of Wisconsin as the reform of the dairy market order system.

This country, one of the most technologically advanced countries in the world, continues, at the behest of Congress, to force an antiquated system of price-fixing in the dairy industry that violates every free market principle. Congress has been manipulating the dairy industry for far too long. This system had a purpose in the 1930's; it was designed to encourage milk production in regions of this country that were suffering dairy shortages. But this system has outlived its usefulness. Advances in technology and transportation have eliminated the need for this system.

The current marketing order is unfair and inefficient for a number of reasons. Not only does it force higher prices for dairy products based on distance from my home state of Wisconsin; it also allows the Northeast Dairy Compact to operate. This is not a free market system; in fact, it is a system that violates most free market principles. It encourages overproduction and inefficient methods of production.

The farmers in my district are suffering because they live too close to Eau Claire, Wisconsin. How many members of Congress even know how far their district is from Eau Claire, Wisconsin? Yet the way dairy products are priced is based on that distance. Does that make sense to anyone? It surely doesn't make sense to me or the farmers of Wisconsin—a State where we are losing more family farms each year than many of you have in your entire state.

Make no mistake about it—this system hurts Wisconsin and hurts Wisconsin farmers—and this Congress is responsible for that. The USDA reform initiative is a small step to alleviate a situation that has been plaguing dairy farmers in the Midwest for far too long. According to USDA analysis, incorporating the changes in the Federal Milk Marketing Order Class I differential prices lowers average annual revenue in all federal order markets by only $2.8 million and raises farm revenue for the U.S. by $3.2 million. As we all know, these price differentials do not represent the actual market price. This reform is essentially revenue neutral for a $25 billion industry; yet many of my colleagues continue to use scare tactics claiming that these changes will cost hundreds on millions of dollars. The USDA estimates that the reform will result in a loss to farmers in some districts of approximately $.02/per hundredweight.

This system needs to be reformed because it unfairly penalizes the Midwest dairy farmers and it hurts consumers and taxpayers. They are being asked to subsidize inefficiencies in the production of dairy products. They are being asked to pay for a program that continues to waste their tax dollars. They are being asked to pay higher prices at the supermarket for food.

We are no longer giving farmers in certain areas of the country an incentive to product more milk. We are now giving them an incentive to overproduce milk. This type of system does not provide an incentive for farmers to operate efficiently or to produce items that are natural to their agricultural environment. How can we vote against a system that encourages the market to operate more efficiently?

If this House forces its will on the USDA, you will be silencing the voices of millions of farmers around the country who have been heard on this issue by USDA and deserve the right to vote on this reform. This reform must be supported by ⅔ of the farmers in a region before it can be implemented in that region.

The USDA assures us that this reform will only create a more equitable free market system; it will not seriously impact prices paid for dairy products in any region of this country. It will be a win-win for everyone; I urge you to support these minute changes the USDA has made that will mean everything to the farmers in the first district of Wisconsin.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 1906, the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000.

It had been my intention to support H.R. 1906 because it contains many worthy, programs that are of benefit not just to our farmers, but to all Americans. However, in a last-minute ploy, the Republican leadership decided to make deep cuts to this bill that call into question their commitment to both American farmers and American consumers who rely on adequate funding for these programs. Those cuts included important agricultural construction projects in California, including improvements to the Agricultural Research Service's Western Regional Research Center at Albany and construction of the Western Human Nutrition Laboratory at Davis. These projects are supported by the Department of Agriculture, they were in the President's budget request, and there was no opposition to including the necessary construction funds prior to today. I am very disappointed that the Republican leadership has chosen to pull the rug out from under these vital facilities.

H.R. 1906, as reported by the Appropriations Committee, was not a perfect bill, but I believe Chairman JOE SKEEN and Ranking Member MARCY KAPTUR and their subcommittee members did a commendable job under tough budget constraints to fund the many deserving programs in this bill. The last-minute amendment offered by Rep. BILL YOUNG to appease the right wing of his party works against that spirit of bipartisanship.

This bill's scope, the so-called ''agriculture'' appropriations bill, is sweeping, from agriculture research, rural development and land conservation programs to food safety and operations of the Food and Drug Administration. Administration of our farm programs and marketing of our agricultural commodities is also included, yet the greatest share of the funding goes for nutrition programs, including food stamps, school breakfast and lunch, and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children or WIC.

I'm particularly grateful to the committee for adding funding within the extension activities of the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service for an after-school program in Los Angeles. Our 4–H after school activity program is operating at 21 sites, and over 4,000 kids are participating in educational field trips, getting homework assistance and receiving other types of mentoring. This program is a wonderful antidote to the drug and gang activity to which many of the kids in my district are susceptible. I very much appreciate this one-time infusion of funding so we can sustain the program and establish a long-term partnership between the government and businesses in our community.

I am also grateful that the bill contains an increase of $5 million for farm labor housing in the Rural Cooperative Service and $9 million for rural housing assistance grants, which can also be used for non-profit organizations of farm workers. Migrant and seasonal farmworkers are some of the nation's most poorly housed populations. The last documented national study indicated a shortage of some 800,000 units of affordable housing for farmworkers. However, farmworker households are some of the poorest, yet least assisted households in the nation. So, the need for housing is great, and the committee has responded, within its overall budget constraints, to make some needed progress in this area.

The nutrition programs in this bill benefit many of my constituents and people of all ages across the United States. However, I share the concern that has been expressed about adequate funding for the WIC program. Prior studies have demonstrated that for every $1 spent on the WIC program, up to $3 is saved in costs to Medicaid and other federal programs. That easily makes WIC one of the most cost-effective programs administered by the federal government. Although the committee increased funding by $81 million over last year, the amount provided is $100 million less than the President's budget request.

WIC serves 1.2 million Californians, and we are making enormous strides in using the funds to serve all the mothers and children in

need. On May 24, the California Department of Health Services lowered the maximum price it would pay for milk, eggs, cheese, cereal, juice and other foods in the WIC market basket in order to avoid having to cut 25,000 poor mothers and children from its roster. While other states may easily serve their WIC recipients with the funds distributed to them, California must use its funding shrewdly in order to serve all those in need. The Effective Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) of the Extension Service also plays an important role in working with WIC mothers and others to help them build positive lifelong nutrition habits and skill. I urge the chairman and the committee to reassess the WIC funding level during its conference with the Senate in order to ensure that no qualified women and children miss out on the benefits of this program, which contribute to a healthy America.

California is the largest agricultural producing state in the nation, and I am phased that the committee has recommended funding for other programs of benefit to our farmers. Unlike many producers in the Midwest who have long benefited from agriculture price support programs, many of our California producers have been engaged in market-oriented agriculture for many years. That's why the Market Access Program (MAP) is so important to our cooperatives, small farmers and other producers who are making aggressive efforts to expand markets overseas. I'm pleased that the committee has funded MAP at its full authorized level.

In addition, agricultural research into the special problems that affect California commodities takes on added importance to our producers. Research into integrated pest management and into alternatives to methyl bromide are just some of the vital research projects under way at the University of California, and funding for the Agricultural Research Service, for cooperative federal-state research, for competitive research grants, and for special research grants are all important parts of this bill.

There are many other programs in the bill that I could comment on, including the food safety program and the youth anti-tobacco initiative in the Food and Drug Administration. These are areas where we would all like to do more if possible, but the committee originally reported a responsible bill based on its budget allocation. Now these partisan floor shenanigans call into question our ability to improve funding for these programs if opportunities present themselves later in the appropriations endgame.

In short, I would like to support this bill and the programs of benefit to my constituents and the people of California and the nation. However, I cannot in good conscience vote for final passage because the Republican majority has made a decision to depart from the usual bipartisan manner in which we consider this bill, in pursuit of their own political purposes. I hope that the House-Senate conference committee will make the needed improvements in this bill that will draw the customary widespread, bipartisan support before we send the final version to the President late in this fiscal year.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Food Contact Notification (FCN) program. The FCN program was authorized in the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997, and received start-up funding in FY 1999. However, FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations does not provide additional money. Without a funding source, either in the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations or through user fees, this program will not be implemented.

By reducing a significant regulatory burden, the FCN reforms expedite the approval of food contact substances, like plastic, paper and aluminum used in food packaging. Under this new streamlined regulatory system, it would be possible for safe food-contact materials to be marketed after only 120 days of filing notification with the FDA—shortening the current process from as much as six years to only a few months. Both consumers and manufacturers would benefit by the availability of better products in a more timely manner.

In fact, during the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations hearing the Committee recognized the value of the FCN program. Despite that endorsement, I am concerned that both the Committee and the Administration are relying on the future authorization of user fees to fund the FCN program. Yet to date, no fee authorization bill has been introduced, much less discussed in any detail. Without either an appropriation or an assurance of user fee authorization, the FCN program will not be implemented, and important progress in food packaging will be delayed.

It will be unfortunate if this innovative new program was unintentionally thwarted. For that reason, I urge the Chairman and Ranking Member to assure that at least the authorized level of funding be made available in the event that a fee system cannot be enacted in time for FY 2000.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, 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. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 185, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1845

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1906 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount otherwise provided for salaries and expenses for the Food and Drug Administration is hereby increased by $20,000,000.''

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. In substance, we will be providing one-third fewer dollars this year than we are providing at the present time to support the needs of our farmers, and that creates no compulsion at all to vote for this bill as far as I am concerned.

This recommittal motion restores $21 million to the Food and Drug Administration just cut by the previous amendment. Now, those who are opposed to this amendment will say the money is not needed. If that is the case, I would ask one simple question: Why did we put it in the bill in the first place?

This cut, as the gentleman from Maryland indicated, was not made to solve any substantive problem with the bill. It was made to simply solve a political problem within the majority party caucus because the problem was that last week they had a worse week than Charismatic and they were trying to figure out how to recover. And so what they decided to do is to try to take a nip and a tuck out of some bills without regard to the substantive effect.

This amendment was not meant to solve a substantive problem. It was meant to simply help the majority party get another week through the legislative agenda while they try to figure out how to correct the fact that they are essentially $35 billion from reality in terms of overall appropriations.

If Members are opposed to this amendment, I would simply ask: Are we really doing too much to achieve food safety in this country? Are we really doing too much to inspect foreign fruits and vegetables? Are we really doing too much to speed the delivery of new life-saving drugs to the marketplace?

We will, sometime this year, be voting on about $15 billion for the National Institutes of Health. About $5 billion of that will be for cancer research. We have been told that the

chairman of the subcommittee on the majority side wants to double spending for the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years. That is a lot of ''blagole.''

But no matter how much we put into research, if we contribute to bottlenecks at FDA, we are delaying the day when new life-saving drugs will reach the marketplace; life-saving drugs that deal with cancer, that deal with Parkinson's Disease, that deal with every other disease known to man.

I would urge my colleagues when they cast their votes tonight on this amendment to vote on substance, not politics; vote to restore this badly needed $21 million. That is the least we can do to correct some of the damage just done by the previous amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that this particular Member is going to support the gentleman's motion to recommit and then will end the evening by voting against the bill, which I apologize to the subcommittee chair and to the full committee chair. It was not my intention as a loyal member, having gone through all those meetings, to do that. And I would urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on final passage as well, and I feel sad to do that today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Just 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, we all popped the champagne corks and celebrated the passage of a bipartisan budget agreement signed by the President of the United States, the Democrats and the Republicans in the Congress, and now it is time to follow through on that agreement. We must, on both sides of the aisle, follow through on our obligation.

Look what is ahead in terms of spending: Veterans' bills, processing of their health care claims, water and sewer grants, housing for the low income, education, money for teachers, Medicaid, children's health and immunizations, money for the National Park Service for land acquisition, for trails, for shelters, for the Department of Interior, research money for diabetes, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, heart, jobs programs of all natures. In essence, this is only the first appropriations bill. Everything else that is in our $1.7 trillion budget lies down the road.

By supporting this decrease in funding on this bill right now, we free up more money down the road to have more options on these very, very important programs, and that is why we need to pass the bill in its present form, as amended.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me simply say that we in the House and our colleagues in the Senate and our President at the White House agreed to a balanced budget proposal in 1997. We set budget caps for this fiscal year and for the next fiscal year. And if my colleagues think this year is tough, wait till next year, because that budget cap goes down even more than it did this year.

But if we are going to be true to ourselves, if we are going to be true to the fiscal restraint that we put into effect and that all of our leaders signed off on, if we are going to stay within that budget cap, we are going to have to make some tough decisions, and today we are making some tough decisions.

Vote against this motion to recommit, vote for the bill. Let us get this bill into conference and get the money on the way to the American farmers where the help is really needed and bring that amount up to over $14 billion just in the supplemental for 1999 and this fiscal year 2000 bill.

Make the tough choice, vote against this motion and let us pass this bill and get it to conference.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 220, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease

Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Brown (CA)
Buyer
Chenoweth
Ford
Hilleary
McCollum
Mica
Waters

□ 1907

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DOYLE and Mr. McINTYRE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 176, I was avoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 183, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—246

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—183

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Ford
McCollum
Waters
Wexler

□ 1923

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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.

MY TRIBUTE TO DR. HOWARD CAREY: A GOOD NEIGHBOR

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of Dr. Howard Carey's commitment to the Neighborhood House Association and to his role as president and chief executive officer since 1972. Dr. Carey brings more than 35 years of experience in the field of social work, from both administrative and program perspectives to this leadership position. Serving more than 300,000 San Diego residents, Neighborhood House is one of the largest nonprofit organizations in San Diego, a multipurpose social welfare agency whose goal is to improve the quality of life of the people served. Since Dr. Carey assumed leadership, Neighborhood House has grown from a budget of $400,000 and a staff of 35 to its current budget of $50 million with a staff of 800.

Its multitude of services to strengthen families and to assist them in becoming self-sufficient include not only the two for which it is best known, Head Start, which reaches 6,500 preschoolers in 70 centers and its food bank program which collects and distributes 12 million pounds of food annually, but also housing, counseling, adult day care, emergency food and shelter and inner city youth enrichment program, employment training

centers, health services for the mentally ill and elderly, and a senior citizen service center.

Dr. Carey's motto, ''being a good neighbor,'' is emulated by the extended families of employees at Neighborhood House and reaches from the Mexican border to the northern reaches of San Diego County. His legacy is one of excellence. A professional in the best sense of this word, he is a man of honor, strength and determination. He is dedicated to service and to making life better for his neighbors who are in need.

Dr. Carey is a native of Lexington, Mississippi, a graduate of Atlanta's Morehouse College, and holds graduate degrees from Atlanta University and United States International University. He became enchanted with San Diego during his 4 years of military service with the United States Navy and returned with his wife, the former Yvonne Arnold of Newnan, Georgia, a graduate of Spelman College. Dr. Carey and his wife are the parents of two adult children who are themselves graduates of Morehouse and Spelman. One would think that his service to the community through his work at the Neighborhood House would fill his days entirely but Dr. Carey's service extends to leadership and participation in many community organizations and local activities.

□ 1930

He is chairman of the board of Neighborhood National Bank, a San Diego-based community bank which spurs development in inner city neighborhoods. He was a founding member of Union Bank of California's Community Advisory Board to advise bank managers on the financial needs of low-income and underserved communities. He has held policy-making and advisory positions at the Neighborhood Development Bank, San Diego Unified School District, United Way, the Minority Relations Committee, the Black Leadership Council, former San Diego Mayor Maureen O'Connor's Black Advisory Committee, a Congressional Black Affairs Subcommittee, the Black-Jewish Dialogue, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Coalition for Equity and San Diego County's Child Care Task Force.

Professionally he has contributed as a professor at San Diego State University, as a lecturer at the University of California, San Diego, and at National University of San Diego and as instructor for Wooster College in Ohio and at San Diego Community College. His further professional associations include charter membership in LEAD, the National Association of Social Workers, the National Association of Black Social Workers; a founding member of the San Diego Chapter of Alpha Pi Phi Fraternity, Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity, Alpha Kappa Delta, Morehouse College Alumni Association, San Diego Dialogue and the National Conference of Social Welfare.

As impressive as this list is, it does not do justice to Dr. Carey. It is his passion for service that leads him into these activities. He knows that extraordinary measures are sometimes needed to strengthen communities and families, and he is always willing to go that extra mile. Because Dr. Carey and the work of Neighborhood House reaches deep into the hearts and minds of his neighbors and changes lives, his contributions to our community are far-reaching, long-lasting and immeasurable. I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to honor Dr. Carey and his many contributions to San Diego during the past 3 decades.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1501, ADDRESSING YOUTH VIOLENCE AND CHILDREN'S SAFETY; AND H.R. 1000, AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of June 14 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1501, a bill addressing youth violence and children's safety. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H–312 in the Capitol by noon this Friday, June 11. Amendments should be drafted to H.R. 1501 as introduced. Members should know that the Committee on Rules may consider amendments relating to the causes of and solutions to youth violence and certain firearms proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is also planning to meet the week of June 14 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment Reform Act for the 21st century, the so-called Air 21 bill. Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit, again, 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by noon this coming Monday, June 14, to the Committee on Rules, once again, upstairs in Room 312 here in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 27. The committee filed this report on H.R. 1000 on May 28. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RAILWAY SAFETY AND FUNDING EQUITY ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Railroad Safety and Funding Equity Act of 1999, legislation that I have introduced today along with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER). Also known as RSAFE, this bill will increase funding for a far-too-long-overlooked aspect of highway and railroad safety grade crossings.

With record levels of motorists on our Nation's roads and highways and with a record amount of freight being moved by rail, the lack of our nation's commitment to funding safety programs is nearing dangerous levels. RSAFE will bolster our Nation's commitment by almost doubling the current Federal grade crossing improvement program.

As two recent train crashes in Illinois showed, one a fatal crash in Bourbonnais and the other in my district in LaGrange, much more can and should be done to upgrade safety at railroad to highway grade crossings. For too long policymakers have accepted it as fact that grade crossings are dangerous, and they have left it at that. RSAFE will take the 4.3 cents per gallon diesel fuel tax that railroads currently pay towards deficit reduction and transfer it into the Department of Transportation Section 130 Grade Crossing Safety program. This money will then be distributed to the States on a formula basis.

Based on estimates of railroads' tax receipts, RSAFE will add approximately $125 million or more to the current $150 million in the Section 130 program. Therefore, among other things, RSAFE will give States much more ability to construct gates at grade crossings, develop and acquire new technology that could serve as alternatives to whistle-blowing and generally remove hazards at grade crossings.

RSAFE also mandates that 5 percent of the new funding will be spent for education and awareness campaigns, such as Operation Lifesaver. Operation Lifesaver works with local law enforcement officials and others to make pedestrians and motorists aware of the dangers at grade crossings. RSAFE also puts 10 percent of the new funding towards upgrading rail-to-rail crossings. The danger posed when two freight trains collide or when a commuter train collides with a freight train are immeasurable in lives and environmental costs.

Since railroad crossing safety is often a local and State issue, RSAFE mandates that the States pay at least a 20 percent share of any project financed with funds under this bill. I

think that this is a small price for the States to pay for the safety of their citizens.

The railroads often argue that the 4.3 cent per gallon tax is unfair, that they maintain their own infrastructure unlike the trucking industry. But I think it even more unfair that the taxes go to deficit reduction instead of a program that benefits the railroads and public safety. That is what RSAFE does. It puts railroad money back into the railroads for the benefit of the public.

In addition, after 5 years of increased investment in grade crossing safety, RSAFE repeals the 4.3-cent diesel tax on October 1, 2004. Hopefully, Congress will continue the higher funding for the Section 130 program in the next highway and transportation reauthorization bill. However, until then, every day that the tax goes towards deficit reduction is a day that statistics tell us someone will die at a railroad crossing. In 1998, 428 people died from an incident at a grade crossing, 30 of whom died in my home State of Illinois. Clearly, 428 deaths in 1 year is unacceptable.

So I say to my colleagues and to those in the railroad community:

Please work with Congressman CRAMER and me to pass this legislation so that each day we will not see another life perish due to our own inactivity and inaction.

CHINA HAS YET TO EARN PREFERENTIAL TRADE STATUS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this week China's Communist dictatorship sent its tanks and armored carriers crashing through the prodemocracy protests in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. Hundreds of innocent protesters were crushed to death, hundreds more were mowed down by machine guns, hundreds more were arrested and executed.

The men and women who lost their lives in Beijing and the ones who remain jailed are the heirs to the legacy of our Founding Fathers. They quoted Thomas Jefferson, they built a monument fashioned after our Statue of Liberty, they look to the United States as a beacon of hope and of freedom. In the United States, the nation which the thousands of dead at Tiananmen hoped to emulate, is once again coddling the same dictators who had them murdered by renewing China's annual trade privileges. After all, the lure of one billion Chinese low-wage workers is the catalyst of our China policy.

Think about it: no pesky unions, no minimum wage laws, no labor standards, no effective court system to scare away investors. The potential for profit, regardless of human rights for American corporations, is enormous. After all, Wall Street bankers could not care less if the shelves at the Lorain, Ohio, K-Mart are lined with goods manufactured by Chinese slave labor. The lawyers in Washington could not care less if Chinese workers are imprisoned for trying to form unions.

Win Jingshang, a democracy activist who spent nearly two decades in a Chinese prison, told me that American corporate executives, not Chinese spies but American corporate executives, are the vanguard of the Chinese Communist Party revolution in the United States.

It should bother us, all of us, that exactly 10 years after the slaughter of those demonstrators in Tiananmen Square that American CEO's actively roam the government corridors of the Chinese Communist Party dictatorship. It should bother all of us that after cavorting with the butchers of Beijing, these American CEOs streamed into Ronald Reagan National Airport to argue for continued favors, continued trade advantages for the world's worse abuser of human rights. It should bother all of us that the brutal nature of China's Communist regime is totally ignored by all too many in America's business community.

The harsh reality is that the ongoing genocide in Tibet, continued arrest, and torture of democracy activists, proliferation of nuclear technology to North Korea, none of that matters very much to too many people in America's business community. To this I say, the most effective way to toughen our relationship with China is to deny it special trading privileges.

Every year I and others in this body have prodded the administration and the Republican leadership to force China to improve its behavior before giving it preferential trade status. These benefits give China's Communist Party dictators billions and billions of dollars, last year it was 60 billion to be precise, and the commercial technology needed to modernize the People's Liberation Army. Yet each year the same GOP, the same Republican Members of Congress who are the loudest in their criticism of the Clinton administration and its China policy turn around because of corporate business influence in this body, turn around and give Beijing preferential trade status.

Mr. Chairman, what we need to do before granting special trade status to the Communist Chinese is to condition their behavior on something other than what they say. I, for one, am weary of continued Chinese Communist promises that they will behave, they will play fair, they will stop human rights abuses, they will end child labor, they will stop forced abortions, they will begin to behave, they will stop selling nuclear technology to rogue nations, that they will begin to play by the rules.

It was Mao, quoting Soviet leader Lenin, who liked to state promises are like pie crusts, they are made to be broken.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the administration, I ask the President, I ask Republican leadership in this body, I ask the American business community, all of whom are far too strongly supportive of the World Trade Organization entry for China, I ask them to step back and let us see if China can behave for 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop its human rights abuses, can stop its child labor and slave labor practices, can stop threatening Taiwan before receiving another dollar from U.S. business interests. We must not give China special trading privileges, Mr. Speaker, until we see proof that its Communist Party leaders are capable of abiding by world standards.

FUNDING FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we approved an amendment related to outreach funding for socially disadvantaged farmers. This amendment was offered by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and she is also to be commended. The amendment was accepted by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). He, too, is to be commended for his support.

This amendment passed, and the House is to be commended for doing that. Let me tell my colleagues why.

□ 1945

This amendment permits the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional funding for USDA outreach programs for socially disadvantaged farmers. Under the amendment, the Secretary may transfer up to $7 million to this program.

The 2501 outreach program targets small and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. The program is carried out by colleges and universities, including the 1890 land grant institutions. With funds from this program, these institutions are able to conduct the vital and important work of training and management assistance. Individualized farm plans, upgrading accounting systems, effective utilization of the vast array of other USDA programs, and the best approaches to applying for credit are but a few of the services available at the institutions and through this program.

Mr. Speaker, while the additional dollars provided by this amendment will be a great help to our small farmers, especially those who are socially disadvantaged, there are other steps that Congress should take to assist the

1890 institutions in assisting small farmers. It should concern all of us that of the 1,200 Ph.D. degrees recently awarded this year in agriculture science in the United States, almost half were awarded to non-U.S. citizens, while less than 3 percent were awarded to Afro-Americans. We need a program to encourage more Americans, particularly Afro-Americans, to pursue graduate-level education in agriculture.

The 1890 institutions could use additional support in their research and extension efforts. This additional support is especially needed to strengthen the level of performance and the productivity and the research and extension of the 1890 institutions.

A modest increase of not less than 5 percent in formula funding for existing 1890 programs would go a very long ways in helping the 1890 schools to help small farmers. Additional funding resources for facility funding and extending such funding to institutional facilities is but another prudent resource that would be a wise investment that will produce immeasurable returns for small farmers.

We must also work with the administration to produce either legislation or regulations that assures continuation of the Federal support when a State fails to provide the matching dollars for the land grant institutions. Many of the programs Congress intends to make available are not available to these institutions because the State matching funds are not often provided.

Finally, given the state of affairs of small farmers, especially socially disadvantaged farmers, a special appropriation of not less than $10 million over the next several years should be targeted, and we should consider this now as we are now considering the agriculture appropriation for the next few years. Targeting to reduce the rapid decline of these farmers will be a meaningful investment if we are to stop the erosion and the demise of small farmers.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America. In fact, small farmers and ranchers are a dying breed. Indeed, in my home State of North Carolina, there has been a 64 percent decline in minority farmers just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farms in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992. All farmers, all farmers, are suffering under the severe economic downturn we are now facing, but particularly small and disadvantaged farmers are facing severely.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for their sensitivity to the needs of socially disadvantaged farmers, but there is very much more we need to do. I hope Congress will be committed to do that in the coming years.

THE PROBLEM OF DRUG ABUSE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again tonight to talk about the problem of drug abuse in our Nation and the tremendous toll that illegal narcotics have taken across our great land.

It is getting so that almost every family, certainly every community across the United States, can today claim that they are victimized by illegal narcotics trafficking in their communities and their schools, among their family members. The statistics are really mind-boggling and do not make the front page of today's newspaper, Mr. Speaker, but indeed they are dramatic.

Last year, over 14,000 Americans died in drug-related deaths. That is only the tip of the iceberg, because now we find that many thousands more that were killed in other accidents and suicides and other causes of death are not counted in that toll. In fact, the figure is much, much higher.

I said before on the floor of the House when we had the terrible tragedy at Columbine with a number of students and faculty who were killed in that tragedy, that we have multiple Columbines across our Nation every day. They are sometimes in the silent but violent deaths of our young people through the use of illegal narcotics.

Today heroin has become the drug of choice, and it is destroying lives by the thousands. I come from Central Florida and represent the area from Orlando to Daytona Beach, a relatively peaceful area. But Central Florida now has had such an epidemic, particularly among our young people, of deaths from illegal drugs and overdoses, that a recent headline in the Orlando Sentinel said that illegal drug overdoses now exceed homicides in Central Florida. That is how severe the problem is in my district.

That is one reason why I chose to accept the Speaker's appointment as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Drug Policy and Human Resources. I had the great privilege and opportunity to serve in the last Congress with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), someone who folks are just learning more about, who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

When the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman I refer to, served as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Criminal Justice and International Affairs, I served with him and at his side. I had the privilege of watching the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) bring together a consensus in this Congress and in the House of Representatives to re-start the war on drugs. You must remember, and I will detail that in just a few minutes, that the war on drugs basically stopped with the election of this President and his taking office in 1993. I will talk more about that in a minute.

But, again, someone who restarted our national effort now leads the House of Representatives, and I am very proud to have served with him in that effort during the past several years as the new majority gained control here in the House of Representatives.

The record of death and destruction across our land we were very much aware of when we took control of the House of Representatives and we saw the change from the Reagan and Bush administration, where we saw a decline year after year in drug use and drug deaths across the Nation. What should be astounding is that since we really had this new policy with this new administration, that the figures began to really go off of the charts. In fact, I brought a chart tonight to illustrate the problem that we had.

Remember what I said just a minute ago. If you look at this chart for a minute you will see these different lines of drug use illustrated in color. You see that drug use was on the decline. This shows that from 1989 on down to the 1992–93 period here, where the Reagan-Bush administration ended their efforts, the ''just say no'' campaign, the eradication, the enforcement efforts stopped, and a policy of working primarily on treatment, treating the wounded in this battle began. We saw the increases in drug use that these colored lines represent in almost every area.

Only in the last 2 years, again under the leadership of Speaker HASTERT as Chair, have we seen any leveling off, but we still see incredible figures, particularly among our young people in illegal narcotics usage.

Let me give you one figure. Since 1993, again when this administration took control, changed the policy, the figure is this; that we have had an 875 percent increase in heroin usage by our teens. I think if we looked at the charts we would see a dramatic increase in the deaths of our teens. If we look at those more than 14,000 deaths I cited, many of them are among our young people who are now being victimized by very potent illegal hard narcotics that are coming in in an unprecedented stream.

The cost of this whole drug debacle is immense to this country and to the Congress. Right now we are working in our subcommittee to try to coordinate the expenditures of $17.9 billion directly into the war on drugs. That is only the tip of the iceberg, because we spend around a quarter of a trillion dollars in a year. When you take in incarceration, the cost of our judicial

system, the social cost, welfare for these drug victims and narcotics users leave a trail of social disruption that is unbelievable, not to mention the pain to their loved ones and families.

So that is a little bit of the direct toll and cost in dollars and in lives, and, as I said in Central Florida we have had just a dramatic increase in deaths, particularly among our young people.

In our prisons across this land we have almost 2 million incarcerated citizens and other individuals there. Seventy percent of them are there because of drug-related offenses. Our U.S. Attorneys tell us that statistics, our Federal Marshals, our DEA agents, and even in conducting hearings in my local community, our local sheriffs told us that 60 to 70 percent of those individuals behind bars at public expense are there because of drug-related offenses.

So if we look at the crime in this country, we can directly relate it, 60 to 70 percent of it, to illegal narcotics.

One of the interesting myths of this whole drug problem is that people behind bars are there for casual use or for possession, and that is simply not the case. I just reviewed a report from the Commissioner for Crime and Enforcement in the State of New York, and they had a very revealing report which in fact indicated that very few individuals are there for mere possession. Almost all the individuals in that State prison system that are there because of drug-related offenses are there because they were selling substantial quantities, participating in the act of a felony, when they were under the influence of illegal narcotics. So many of the crimes are not victimless. Most of them have victims and are felonies and serious offenses against our community.

□ 2000

So we have an incredible problem, but we have also incarcerated almost 2 million Americans at great cost to the taxpayers because of this problem.

Let me say that, again, the war on illegal narcotics, the war on drugs, died in 1993 with the election of this President and with a majority on the Democrat side that controlled both the House of Representatives, the other body, and the White House from 1993 to 1995.

Sometimes people come to me and say the war on drugs is a failure. I say, yes, the war on drugs is a failure because it died. It not only died, it was killed in 1993. In fact, what this administration did was dealt a death blow to the real effort started under the Reagan administration.

I know because back in the early eighties I worked with Senator Hawkins from Florida when we had a cocaine problem and a drug problem. Under her leadership and under the leadership of the Reagan administration, they began a series of legislative initiatives to stop drugs at their source, to have tough interdiction of drugs as they came from their source, to involve the military and the Coast Guard and other resources in getting drugs before they got to our border, stopping drugs at our border, and then tough enforcement across the land.

We know that works. The statistics prove that that works. Unfortunately, this administration abandoned those policies in 1993. In 1993, and these are facts, this is not partisan rhetoric, but the other side with Democrat control in the White House and the Congress, they stopped many of the eradication programs, the source country problems.

I will tell the Members, if they want to have the most effective way to stop hard drugs at their source, they have source country eradication programs, where we have those countries become involved in alternative crop production, where we have tough enforcement, and where we have eradication of the growth of illegal narcotics. Again, at their source is most cost-effective. There is no question about it.

This administration, the Democratic-controlled Congress, killed those programs in 1993, or severely crippled them. What happened is we saw more and more production.

In 1993, the administration took the first steps towards really cutting the military, not just as we see today and we are trying to make up for, and the many deployments in Kosovo, in Bosnia, on and on, military exercises. But they basically, under the guidance of President Clinton, took the military out of the war on drugs and really changed their mission. It was not their mission to help stop drugs once they came from the source; again, stopping the source, eradication programs, country programs, and then stopping the military involvement, then also cutting the Coast Guard dramatically.

The President led the effort to cut the Coast Guard. That particularly affected my district and the State of Florida, because we had a rush of heroin and cocaine come through Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico is really guarded. It has a coast all the way around, and it is guarded by the Coast Guard.

The cuts in the Coast Guard dramatically increased the flow of heroin and cocaine and other illegal drugs into Puerto Rico, which is of course part of the United States, and the entry-way. And with no protection, those drugs started coming back into Florida in incredible quantities. The deaths we see in central Florida and throughout the State of Florida, again exceeding homicide, are drug-related, and those drugs we can trace coming through that trail.

Then of course the President made a horrible decision in appointing Jocelyn Elders, the infamous now fortunately ex-Surgeon General who said, just say maybe. When we have a mixed message coming from the White House, when we have a mixed message coming from the chief health officer of the United States to our young people, our young people are not dumb, they pick this up. They get the message that maybe, just say maybe; or if I had it to do over again, I would inhale; or kids, do it if it feels good.

That message went across this land. Fortunately, that Surgeon General has been replaced, and we do not have a Nancy Reagan or leadership at the national level really to bring this message of ''just say no'' and what drugs can do to our young people.

Those direct actions, and again, this is not political rhetoric but those factual actions took place, and they resulted in, again, this chart we see and the dramatic rise of young 12th grade use here we see by this chart, but also in drugs by numerous strata of young people; again, not just in 12th graders. That is what we are suffering from today.

Stopping illegal narcotics, hard narcotics coming into this country is not a rocket scientist's venture, really. It requires a simple review of where narcotics are coming from. Let me get another chart up here, if I may.

We know where illegal drugs are coming from. This is very interesting because DEA has produced this chart, and this chart is 1997 heroin signature program results. This is an interesting program because technology is so amazing. Just like we can trace DNA to individual human beings, we can trace and DEA can trace through their labs in this case heroin, and they can tell almost the field that it came from and certainly what country of origin, or where it came from.

This little pie chart shows that 75 percent of the heroin came from South America in 1997. We know that from sampling seizures across the land. We know that 6 percent came from Southeast Asia; I am sorry, 5 percent from Southeast Asia, 6 percent from southwest Asia, and 14 percent from Mexico.

This is a very interesting chart because it tells us where the source of most of the death and destruction to my communities and many communities across the land is coming from. That is heroin, 1997.

Let me tell the Members an absolutely startling statistic. If we took this chart back to 1993 or 1992, there was almost zero heroin coming from South America, almost none in South America 6 years ago, at the beginning of this administration. How did we get 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States in 6 years? It is simple. It is through the policy of this administration. This administration for 6 years blocked any aid or assistance to the country of Columbia in the way of

helicopters, in the way of eradication equipment, in the way of ammunition, in the way of resources to stop cocaine and heroin production.

Here we are talking about heroin. Again, it would be almost zero at the beginning of the Clinton administration, and it is 75 percent now coming from South America, and almost 99 percent of that is coming from Columbia. Six years ago there was almost none. So their policy, their direct policy has resulted in these startling figures.

Mexico, which on this pie chart accounts for 14 percent, was also way down on the bottom. It was in single digits as far as Mexican heroin coming into the United States. In 6 years they have managed to make Mexico not only a trafficker and conduit and transit country, but they have also made Mexico a producing country rather than stopping it.

Repeatedly this administration has certified Mexico as cooperating in the war on drugs. As required by Federal law, the President must certify whether this country is cooperating, any country is cooperating to stop the production and transiting of illegal narcotics. Certainly Members can see that production is up by this chart. Again, we would be in single digits in the early 1990s, and almost no heroin coming from that area.

What is absolutely startling, and this chart does not show it, and this is just an unbelievable statistic, but 6 years ago there was almost no coca, no base for cocaine produced in Colombia, almost none. In 6 years, again the policy of this administration stopping aid, stopping resources, stopping equipment in the war on drugs from going to Colombia, Colombia is now the number one producer of cocaine in the world. So we have heroin and poppies growing in unprecedented amounts, heroin coming in in unbelievable quantities in these sources from Colombia. Most of this, again, is due to the policy of this administration.

I do want to say that there is some hope on the horizon. Through the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), who chairs the Committee on International Relations, through the efforts of the full committee on which I serve, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and so many others, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), we have repeatedly requested, we have repeatedly helped appropriate, and again, through the tremendous leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who now presides over the House of Representatives, we have succeeded in getting the first equipment to Colombia.

I participated with several of the committee chairmen recently in a ceremony at the Sikorsky Helicopter Division, where the Black Hawks are produced in Connecticut, in a contract and delivery ceremony. Soon those helicopters that will be able to get to the high altitudes to eradicate, to go after the drug traffickers at their source, will be there. We will see a dramatic decrease in the amount of heroin, the amount of cocaine coming into this country; a small amount of money, a great amount of results, stopping drugs where they are grown, where they are produced, and interdicting those illegal narcotics as they come from that source, not when they are on our streets, when it is the most difficult to get those.

What I need to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, is show Members and the American people how we got into this situation. It is a direct policy of this administration and the Congress that was controlled by the other side.

I wanted to also talk about the other primary source of illegal narcotics. In addition to the source country now becoming Colombia, and through the policy I described, this chart shows Mexico's statistical tables and it shows opium seizures, cocaine seizures. I believe the dark blue here shows the opium seizures for 1997. The red, the first column is opium seizures, down in 1998. The second is cocaine seizures, down in 1998.

The next is the production. The red shows the yield in 1998 is up. Here is Mexico, our close ally that the United States and this Congress and this House of Representatives have done incredible deeds to assist. In financial trouble we have backed them and actually given them financial stability. In trade we have given them benefits as far as assistance. NAFTA, we gave them almost an open commercial border. We have lost thousands of American jobs to give to lower-paying Mexico jobs.

We have done everything as a good ally, and what have they done? The law requires under certification that the President must certify a country as cooperating in helping to eliminate both the production and the trafficking of illegal narcotics. This administration, this president recommended to this Congress, and we have pending before us a recommendation, to certify Mexico.

From 1997 to 1998, last year there were less seizures of heroin, there were less seizures of cocaine, actually reduced seizures in the country, and more production of illegal narcotics; in this case, heroin.

□ 2015

I showed my colleagues the other chart that showed how production has risen again repeatedly over the past 6 years, and it was in single digits. So this is the result of what we get from Mexico.

Let me talk a little bit about Mexico, which is the source of 60 percent of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States. We know that DEA, our Drug Enforcement Agency, has confirmed that. The hard narcotics, the heroin, the cocaine, the methamphetamine are coming in unbelievable quantities through our Mexican border.

Now this Congress has, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who brought to the floor several years ago a resolution asking Mexico to take certain actions. It has been now over 2 years ago that we asked Mexico to take those actions, again, the source of 60 percent of the hard drugs, the death, the destruction, those 2 million people that are behind our bars in our prisons. We asked Mexico to help us.

What did we ask for? We asked Mexico, first, to extradite to the United States Mexican nationals who are major drug traffickers, send them to the United States for prosecution. We have indicted them. We have requested their extradition. They are guilty of breaking the United States Federal law. We want to try them.

We do not want them in a kangaroo court. We do not want the corrupt judicial system of Mexico to deal with them. We want to try them and bring them to justice. The biggest thing drug dealers fear in the world is being brought to justice in the United States, because they will pay a penalty for their crime here.

To date, the Mexicans have not extradited the first Mexican national. Only after coming to the floor of the House repeatedly, only just before Memorial Day when I, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR), and other leaders on the issue introduced a drug kingpin bill that will tie up the assets of these drug dealers did we start to see any action.

Do my colleagues know what the Mexican Government did? They extradited in the last week one U.S. national who was on our list, one U.S. national, but to date, not one Mexican national. We have requested over 40 major Mexican national drug dealers to be extradited. Instead, what they did with the Masquez brothers just a few weeks ago, and before we introduced this bill, was to kick dirt in our face by judges in Mexico releasing the Masquez brothers, who are the kings of methamphetamine production and trafficking into the United States.

So until we got tough just before Memorial Day, they kicked sand in our face, allowing the kingpins not to be extradited. Fortunately, some of the brothers are still held in prison there.

But we will not give up till these 40 Mexican nationals, whom we know are involved, who have been indicted in the United States, on whom we have a request for extradition pending, some for 6, 7 years, are brought to justice.

So we asked for extradition, and what did we get? Nothing to date. Zero,

zip, nada. We asked for the enforcement of Mexican laws. Mexico passed laws, their National Assembly, but they did not enforce the laws. They have not enforced the laws.

What did the Mexicans do to the United States after we made this request again, 2 years, this House of Representatives, what did they do last year? One, the most offensive thing that has ever taken place to our law enforcement officials, what they did is disrupt Operation Casablanca

Operation Casablanca was a U.S. Customs sting operation which was to identify money laundered in the United States and through Mexican banks and Mexican banking officials; and our U.S. Customs officers led that effort. I know that we informed them of what was going on.

Do my colleagues know what they did? The only reason for informing them was limited, because we can trust so few of the Mexican officials; most of them are corrupt from the policeman on the beat all the way to the office of the president. I will talk about that in just a minute.

But what they did was threaten to arrest our Custom officials. We knew that hundreds of millions of dollars was being serviced through these Mexican corrupt bankers. They had the audacity and nerve to threaten our officials.

Only until just before President Clinton went down to meet with President Zedillo did they back off of this threat, and only just before the question of certification by this administration came up did they back off of the threat of going after our Customs officials.

So we asked for enforcement of the laws. What did they do? Again, we got dirt and dust kicked into our faces, and actually threatening our officials.

We had asked over 2 years ago for our DEA agents, and we have a small number in Mexico, and we did have an incident where one of our agents was brutally and savagely murdered back in the 1980s, so we want our DEA agents to be able to protect themselves, and we want assurance of protection and, in some cases, to be able to carry arms. We still have been denied that right by the Mexicans to ensure the safety and security of our drug enforcement agents in that country.

That was another request that we had. We asked that the drugs that are coming in from Colombia that are produced there in South America and transiting, the 60 percent of the drugs, hard drugs, coming into the United States be stopped at the southern border of Mexico; and that could be done by installing radar and other devices at the border. To date, zero, nothing has been done to comply with our request; and that request of this House of Representatives is over 2 years old. Again, the Mexicans have ignored a simple request of cooperation.

Finally, signing a maritime agreement: We know if it is not coming over land, it is coming over water. The Mexicans still deny us a maritime agreement. They refused to sign a maritime agreement, to my knowledge, in the Caribbean, in Central, South America. Only one other country, Haiti, which is still in total disruption, even after we spent 3-plus billion taxpayer dollars to improve their legislative, judicial, and law enforcement system, they have not been able to have their parliament meet and sign a maritime agreement or confirm one. But the Mexican Government still has refused to sign a maritime agreement with the United States.

So here we are again, you know, with the situation. After the introduction of the bill that I described, major drug kingpins bill, which will go after the assets of these drug traffickers, we got a little attention of the administration. The Secretary of State, Mrs. Albright, was to go to Mexico. She was diverted to Kosovo.

I believe they sent the Attorney General to Mexico over the weekend. We also, I believe, had our Drug Czar, who is doing the best job he can, General McCaffrey, under very difficult circumstances. Hopefully, in this high-level working group with the Attorney General, with other officers from Mexico, some additional progress will be made.

But I can assure my colleagues in this Congress this House of Representatives will not sit idle until they begin an honest effort for enforcement, interdiction, cooperation on the agenda, items that are over 2 years old. So some action hopefully was taken this weekend. We do not know; it is not public yet. But we will continue to pressure Mexico because it is the source of so much of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States.

We also know that in order to get from Peru and Bolivia and Colombia, where 100 percent of the cocaine and coca is produced now and where 75 percent of the heroin comes from Colombia, we know that it must transit again by land either through Panama, through the isthmus, and those Central American countries, and/or through Mexico to get to the United States.

Now, what is the policy of this administration relating to stopping drugs in Panama? This is an absolutely unbelievable scenario. What was started under the Carter administration to give away the Panama Canal and 10 billion American dollars in assets, 5,500 buildings is being sewed up into a neat package by the Clinton administration and given to the Panamanians, and at the same time, we have made one simple request. Could we please continue the drug surveillance flights from Howard Air Force Base in Panama, which cover the entire South American region, which cover the area that is producing the hard drugs that I have cited here? That was our question and request.

Now how could a State Department bungle negotiations for a simple request like that with the Panamanian Government? I do not know. But, Mr. Speaker, the administration's State Department managed to bungle the negotiations for having our forward drug surveillance flights go out of Howard Air Force Base.

They did that in an incredibly bungling fashion, and we were basically kicked out May 1. Since May 1, there has not been one drug surveillance flight over the drug-producing or drug-trafficking area of South America from Howard Air Force Base. The United States of America was kicked out of Panama. We closed Howard Air Force Base. We had 15,000 drug surveillance flights last year from Howard Air Force Base covering the whole region.

When I took over as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources in January, we went down there to Panama. We met with folks. ''Can you negotiate?'' No, they did not think they could negotiate.

''If you cannot negotiate, can we move our forward surveillance drug operations to other areas?''

''Oh, yes, we will have it taken care of, Congressman MICA. Chairman MICA, it is going to be in place. It will all work out.''

I am here to tell my colleagues that it is June 1, and May 1 is when we were kicked out. The two other operating locations that were chosen, one was in Mana, Ecuador, in Ecuador. The other was in Curacao and Aruba, Netherlands, and Antilles.

From Mana, today is June 8, not one flight has taken off for surveillance in the drug-producing areas or drug-trafficking areas from Ecuador. There is only an interim agreement in place.

Aruba and Curacao, we sent staff down there this weekend to examine what is going on. At best, we might be at 30 percent capacity of surveillance flights. So we have a gaping hole in our drug surveillance program, almost no flights taking off to cover that area either where drugs are produced or where drugs are trafficking.

An incredible situation, incredibly bungled, as I said, by the State Department. Now the Department of Defense is scrambling, only with an interim agreement in Ecuador, and our staff reported to me on their return from Ecuador that that airfield may take $100 million to $200 million to get it into working order.

Now, is the United States of America going to invest, with an interim agreement that expires in September, any money, hard-earned taxpayer dollars, in a forward surveillance location and increasing and improving the infrastructure in that area when we have no

assurances of a permanent operating base?

So they bungled it in Panama. They bungled it in Ecuador. Aruba is operating at maybe 30 percent of capacity, and a gaping hole again in our drug surveillance program.

□ 2030

So that really is where we are tonight in some of the war on drugs: Panama, a disaster. No forward operating bases. What that does, too, and what is sad about that is it denies countries that have been cooperating, like Peru and Bolivia, and now Colombia that is going to get additional equipment, it denies them the information they need to go after drugs at their source; it denies them the information they need to go after traffickers.

Peru has had a very brave shootdown policy. They ask planes to identify themselves, and when they do not identify themselves and they try to scramble away, they shoot them down. And they have been provided intelligence and surveillance information by those forward operations, again out of Panama, that have been closed down.

Now, it is easy for me to get up here and to criticize this administration, and I do not mean to do it in a partisan manner. I mean to do it in a factual manner. And, hopefully, we will not repeat the mistakes of this administration in this Congress or in the years ahead, because we know we can stop drugs at their source. We know we can interdict hard narcotics. We know if we give information to other countries and a little bit of assistance they can help us in a cost-effective manner before that ever gets into our streets, into our communities, into our schools and becomes a tough task for law enforcement.

But let me, as I conclude, just say again what the Republican Congress has done, what this new majority has done, and under the current Speakership. And again I must give full credit to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the Speaker of the House, who chaired this responsibility and who I worked with in the last Congress, who brought together the source eradication programs that, again, were destroyed by a previously Democratically-controlled Congress and by this White House.

Let me mention, Mr. Speaker, what just 2 years of effort in working with Peru and Bolivia have done. The cocaine production in those two countries is cut in half. In half. There has been tough enforcement. We must salute President Hugo Banzer, President of Bolivia, for his courageous efforts. We must help Bolivia, because Bolivia has committed in 2 years to eliminate that drug trafficking, and they have cut in 2 years by 50 percent. So this is not a ''pie in the sky'' proposal. It is something we know we can do, and with very few bucks; with very few taxpayer dollars in assisting them.

So, additionally, President Fujimori in Peru, with a tough enforcement, with a tough shootdown policy, with a tough eradication and a productive alternative crop program is making great progress in that country. So we know these programs will work.

This Republican administration, again under the leadership of the current Speaker of the House, when he chaired the subcommittee, has helped us now get aid to Colombia. We are reversing a failed policy there. We will stop the production of heroin and poppy production in Colombia. We will eliminate major drug traffickers. We will give the Colombian National Police, that have done a courageous job, losing 4,000 of their police officers in this battle, hundreds and hundreds of public officials have died in this war, we will give them the arms and the assistance and the aid, the resources to eradicate, to enforce and to interdict drugs cost effectively. And those Blackhawk helicopters are on their way. That is something we have done.

And this Congress, this House and the American people will see a reduction in the amount of heroin coming into the United States. And also cocaine, which again they have turned in 6 years, Colombia, into the major producer of cocaine. Not just a processor or a transiter but the major producer. In 6 years they have managed to do that. We will start eliminating that through the policies of this new majority in the Congress.

We have restored the cuts in the Coast Guard and we are dramatically increasing the assistance that the military provides in getting them back into the war on drugs. I know it was very nice for the Vice President to take the U–2s out of South and Central America in the war on drugs and bring them up to check on oil spills around Alaska. I know it was nice to divert the money for eradication programs of drugs at the source country, which President Clinton did, and put it in Haiti, which basically was more money down the tubes; but, in fact, we do know that getting the military involved in interdiction close to the source does work.

We know that the Coast Guard protecting Puerto Rico and restoring their assets does a great job in protecting our coastlines, both of Puerto Rico and the United States, and we have brought them in 2 years back.

We know that tough enforcement works. In the next week I will be holding hearings on legalization of illegal narcotics and decriminalization. There is a big wave across this country that we must look at decriminalization, make it a health problem, and we should not be tough on drugs and it will all work out.

Mr. Speaker, it does not all work out. Look at the statistics in New York City. We can see since Mayor Rudy Giuliani has taken office what tough enforcement has done. The murders, which were at 2,000 when he took office, 2,000 murders in New York City a year, and most of them drug related, I would venture to say without any question, have been reduced by 70 percent. Just over 600 murders. From 2,000 to 600.

It is safe to walk in New York City because Mayor Guiliani, through a tough enforcement policy, has stopped the violence, the crime, the drug trafficking and he has gone after these folks with a tough enforcement policy that works.

Now, Tom Constantine, who unfortunately is leaving as the head of our DEA, and that is a very sad fact for this Congress and the American people, he produced this chart. This chart should be an eye opener for every Member of Congress and for every American. This shows the heroin addiction population in a city that decided to adopt a lackadaisical enforcement, a tolerant policy. In 1950, the population of Baltimore was over 900,000. In 1996, it was 675,000. In 1950, they had 300 heroin addicts in Baltimore. Listen to this. Three hundred heroin addicts. In 1996, through a liberalized policy, they had 38,985 heroin addicts in Baltimore. This is what a liberalized policy gives us. And on the other hand, look at New York City; 2,000 murders down to 600 murders through tough enforcement, tough prosecution. So we know this policy works.

Now, we are going to have a full hearing and we are giving all sides the opportunity to be heard in our hearings next week about this process of decriminalization, about tough enforcement, about legalization. And I try, as chairman, to be fair, so we will hear from everybody, but I believe that these statistics, these facts, are irrefutable.

So this new majority on our side has started a program, and again I started to mention the things that we have done in replacing the military, the interdiction, the source country, getting the Coast Guard cuts restored, but we have also put in almost $200 million in the past year in education programs, which is matched by the private sector. So it is almost a half billion dollars in education. And we are putting our money where our mouth is so our young people and all Americans know the dangers of illegal narcotics.

So we, again, I believe, are taking the right steps. They took the right steps under the Reagan and Bush administration. Education, enforcement, interdiction, eradication at the source, and treatment are important, but it cannot just be treatment. This cannot just be treating the wounded in a battle. If we went to war and we did not spend any money on armaments, any money on forward surveillance, any

money on eradication of the enemy, any money on ammunition, we would not have a war on drugs, we would not have a war. And if we only treat the victims in this war, it does not work. We have seen it does not work.

So tonight, as I close, I ask for my colleagues' assistance to move together in a bipartisan cooperative effort. Mistakes were made in a bipartisan fashion, hopefully, we can make progress in a bipartisan fashion. It is my hope that we can get every Member on both sides of the aisle not to repeat the mistakes of the past and to move forward together. We know that these policies will work. They are tried, they are proven, they are tested.

It is my hope that we can do that because I never want to talk to another mother or another father or another brother, another friend of a young person in my district who has died of a drug overdose. I talked about the cost, the people behind bars, and I talked about what Congress is going to have to appropriate, but we cannot restore a human being, a son or a daughter, to a parent who has lost that child in the war on drugs.

So it is my hope that I will not have to make these speeches every week in my next term in Congress; that I will not have to come before the Speaker and the House and plead for their assistance in restarting the war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, although I have a few minutes left, I will yield back the balance of my time and pledge to be back here again next week.

WORKING FAMILIES OF AMERICA BEING MISTREATED BY 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the working families of this Nation are still being trampled on by this 106th Congress. They are being grossly mistreated in two basic ways: One is indifference and neglect on certain key issues, and the other is active oppression in certain ways.

Indifference and neglect is reflected in the fact that we are not concerned about a minimum wage increase. There is a rumor that the leadership of the majority party has decided that it will agree to a minimum wage vote and that it will take place sometime later rather than sooner, and they are delaying because they want to make sure we get close to the election and be able to say, well, we voted for a minimum wage, or we allowed it on the floor and let the Democrats vote for it, so we did our job.

And, of course, there is a rumor also that the minimum wage being proposed by the majority is 25 cents a year for the next 4 years. An increase of 25 cents per year for the next 4 years means in 4 years the American worker would have a dollar increase instead of the two-step increase being proposed by the Democrats.

But there is no hurry. We have an unprecedented prosperity in the Nation. We have a situation where the value of the stock market in 10 years has grown by $10 trillion. We had the assets and the value of the stock market in 1989 at $3 trillion. Now it is $13 trillion. With a $10 trillion increase in the value of the stock market, we can see that there is a great increase in the wealth and prosperity in America at certain levels. Why not share that with the working families? Why not in the most basic way make certain that the wealth of the Nation in some small way benefits the entire Nation?

A minimum wage is just one tiny part of that effort. Being willing to finance or support more generous health care is another. The President is proposing soon a new benefit in Medicare, should be in Medicaid also, a new benefit which would cover prescription drugs. In this time of great prosperity, the least we could do is to make the miracles of science available at a cheaper cost to all the people who need them in terms of health care. Prescription drugs ought to be covered by Medicare and Medicaid.

We talk a lot about Medicare and we forget that Medicaid is designed to serve the very poorest and they deserve to have the same kind of increase. We should not have two tiers of health care in America. Second class health care is inadequate health care. There should only be one class of health care. But we are refusing to deal with that in a forthright manner on a timetable that is meaningful because we just do not seem to care.

□ 2045

There is an indifference, an indifference to the poor, an indifference to the plight of the working families who are not sharing the great boost in our wealth. That great jump from $3 trillion in 1989 to $13 trillion in 1999 is not felt by a lot of people who are still out there struggling to make it. So jobs, health care, investment in education are all obvious kinds of actions that should be taken by the government. This Congress, acting in concert with the President, should make certain that we take advantage of this boom in prosperity to take care of some of our problems.

But there exists in this Congress an attitude which goes in the opposite direction. It is stubborn, it is unyielding, it is wrongheaded, but it keeps going on. Take, for example, what happened in the vote on the supplemental budget, or the development of a long-awaited supplemental budget, which included the President's request for $6 billion for the Kosovo war, a war which I think is very necessary, a war which I think we could not afford to have not conducted or been a part of. I do not think we could have walked away from the genocide being committed by the Yugoslavia regime and held up our heads. We have seen it happen too many times already in this century.

What Hitler did was on a grander, more massive scale. They had gas chambers and ovens and millions died, but the numbers are not as important as the action and the kind of thing happening in Kosovo. Certainly if it only means thousands dying, it is still significant and it is happening over and over again. We have seen it happen in Cambodia, we have seen it happen in Rwanda. It is about time that we did something to send a message to the dictators and the sovereign predators that exist throughout the world that somewhere the civilized nations of the world are willing to take a stand against this kind of murderous activity against human beings.

We have done that in Kosovo. So we needed our participation in that effort. The $6 billion was requested by the President. But instead of that bill moving ahead with $6 billion plus the emergency aid requested for South America, for Central America as a result of the floods and the extra aid that was needed for the weather disasters that took place in the Midwest, we had a whole lot of other things piled on top of it and a $6 billion request became a $15 billion request, a $15 billion request most of which came out of the surplus. It was deemed emergency funding and the surplus which is around $100 billion, I think, about the same, a little more maybe in the coming fiscal year, it is going to be about the same amount; the surplus was used for most of it. They could have used the surplus to cover it all, but to make a point the majority decided to offset $2 billion, take away from other programs $2 billion worth of money to cover part of the spending.

Now, the emergency in Central America, the emergency in the Midwest with the tornadoes and storms, et cetera, those were emergencies. They clearly rank as emergencies. Why did we have to make the point that they have to be offset? The point that I want to make is that in the process of the offset, who did they go after? The poorest people in America. The bulk of the cuts for the offset came from domestic accounts, including $1.25 billion from the food stamp program, and $350 million from Section 8 low-income housing programs as well as $22.4 million from the Labor Department contingency fund related to unemployment insurance.

They reached into the programs that serve the poorest people, programs that may benefit the working families on

the very lowest levels, and they took out the money to offset and make the point that they want to make cuts in social programs.

There is a coming need, according to the budget that has been promulgated by the majority, a coming need to cut further, maybe $20 billion out of the domestic budget. Some of it could come from defense if they wanted to, but it will probably come out of the domestic budget; $20 billion will be cut and the preview of coming attractions we have seen already. The way the supplemental budget was handled tells you they are going to get it from the people who are the weakest, the people who have no power, working families, poor families, poor people who are not even working, the elderly, those who need Medicaid as well as Medicare; they will suffer as a result of the coming $20 billion cuts or more that may be proposed.

Certainly they are not proposing investing any more money in education. Education, most of which would go into our public school system, is the place that you benefit working families most. Working families' children need an education. There is no way to survive, there is no way for them to take advantage of the prosperity that keeps growing and growing as a result of high technology. The jobs that are available are jobs that require education. You are not going to be in on it, it gets worse all the time, the demands are greater and greater.

I was at a job training consortium in New York City yesterday and they were telling me about the fact that we just need mechanics. In addition to the known need for information technology people, 300,000 vacancies in information technology, they need mechanics. They could hire 30,000 mechanics in the metropolitan area if they could find them. Why do they not have mechanics who would work on trucks and tractors and some of the machinery that industry needs? Why do they not have them? Because the demands have gone up educationally. There are computers and various devices being employed now in trucks and cars and various vehicles that require a little more education than a mechanic had to have 10 years ago or 5 years ago.

So we have a problem, a creeping problem of people in basic areas, as basic as mechanics, auto mechanics, that cannot survive because they do not have the personnel to do the job because the education system is failing to produce that pool of people which is educated. A broad pool of people educated, you can reach in and pull out all kinds of people. The range of people with various kinds of skills and know-how would be great. You would get the technicians, the mechanics, the theoreticians, the scientists, the geniuses. That certain percentage of people would come out if you have a broad range of people in the pool because we are educating the masses. Mass education is needed more now than ever before.

But working families who need to have free education in the public school system, free but first rate, it cannot be education in facilities that are falling down, it cannot be education in situations where kids are afraid to go to school because of threats to their health and safety. It has to be the kind of education that everybody wants for their child here in this Congress.

I know large numbers of Members of Congress send their children to private school. It is most unfortunate that they have given up on the public education system, but as public officials, whatever choice they choose to make privately, it is disloyal and dangerous to have public officials give up on our education system.

So when you consider what happened in our $15 billion supplemental appropriation, you can see how trampling on working families is a problem. And there is going to be more trampling on working families. It is not just neglect. It is also active oppression to take the money out of the programs that benefit the poor the most. It is even worse than that. The active attack, the oppression which is very aggressive, continues to go on in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. As the ranking Democrat on Workforce Protections, I will be the first to tell you that the name of the committee under this majority Republican administration ought to be changed. It is not workforce protection that they are concerned about. It is workforce persecution. It is workforce oppression. Because every bill that is introduced by the majority on that committee is an attempt to make life more difficult for working families.

We have three coming up very soon we have just passed recently in the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, and now it is going to go to the full committee, and they are a continuation of what was started in the 104th Congress and continued in the 105th Congress, and now it is done on a sort of a guerrilla warfare basis. It is not talked about as much but it is still the same agenda. They are attempting to take away rights that workers have won over the last 50 years.

There is a bill, H.R. 987. It is an attempt to block the implementation of any ergonomic standards, standards which relate to the fact that there are jobs which require repetitive motions that end up in injuries and debilitation of people's muscular faculties; they cannot function. Carpal tunnel syndrome is one of them. Back injuries are a large part of it, people who have repetitive kinds of activities that strain certain parts of their bodies. That is the broad topic of ergonomics the majority on the committee do not even want to have discussed. They do not want to allow the Department of Labor, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration under the Department of Labor to do what they have been doing for years, establish a set of standards to relate to these workplace injuries, workplace dangers.

So they have H.R. 987 which ironically the Republican majority on the committee calls the Workplace Preservation Act. It is an attempt to make the workplace more dangerous by blocking an effort to deal with a clear and present form of injuries that we have been discussing for the last 15 years. So H.R. 987 is one of those examples of an attack on working families through a reduction in the safety provisions in the workplace. There are more than 6,000 people who die every year in our workplace situation, and then many, many others who are injured. This attack on the workers continues by the Republican majority.

They have another one, H.R. 1381. It is an attempt to sabotage overtime payment rates by excluding bonus income. H.R. 1381 is ironically called Rewarding Performance in Compensation Act. But they have a way of reaching in to take out the income that is figured in the bonus in order to reduce the rate of hourly pay so that that is not included when you pay a person overtime. It is a little guerrilla trick, it is almost something you would not see or not respond to if you were not very alert. But it is an attempt to sabotage overtime payment rates by excluding bonus income. H.R. 1381, another attempt to reduce the benefits of working families.

H.R. 1439 is another one. That attempts to undermine the OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Administration's enforcement by misusing the self-audit process. We have a self-auditing process that we encourage. We want to make a partnership between government and industry. But they want to allow industries to audit themselves and then not allow the result of the audit, which determines whether or not they have certain hazardous conditions in the workplace, in the plant, in the garage, whatever unit of employment this is. After they complete the audit, if they identify things that are wrong, they are allowed to keep it secret and we are saying, ''No, you have to reveal what is there.'' The self-audit process would be misused if you made your survey and audited yourself, identified hazards, and then refused to correct them because, of course, it might cost a great deal, but you keep them secret, nobody else knows about it. Of course you would fire any employee who also knows about it and then would report it. So we have H.R. 1439 which again, an ironical title, is described as the Safety and Health Audit

Promotion and Whistleblower Improvement Act of 1999. The Safety and Health Audit Promotion and Whistleblower Improvement Act of 1999 is an attempt to do just the opposite. It is going to make the workplace less safe.

We have another bill, an alternative which we will offer at the final markup of the full committee which is entitled ''The Whistleblower Protection Act.'' That is H.R. 1851 which I introduced as a countervailing force against the phony H.R. 1439.

But I give you examples of concrete bills, the business that is going on here in this place. We are moving at a very slow pace. Things that ought to be done and ought to be on the agenda are not on the agenda. But the guerrilla warfare against working families, against workers in the workplace, the guerrilla warfare goes on. We ought to come to grips with the fact that this is wrongheaded, stubborn, unyielding, and at a time like this very dangerous in America. We should be investing in our workers in every way instead of oppressing them and neglecting them.

□ 2100

In another area, education, which I talk about often, education reform is still rhetoric. We are talking, always when we talk about education about nickels and dimes and lots of words.

Everybody has adopted some kind of education platform, everybody is in favor of improving and reforming education, but nobody wants to spend significant amounts of dollars. Words instead of dollars is the order of the day with respect to education. Education reform is rhetoric, too much rhetoric in the area of the majority; and in many cases, in the minority, too, there is too much rhetoric and too little commitment to real dollars for education.

School construction is one of the tests of whether or not we are only concerned with rhetoric and only going to play word games with the voters. Or are we really going to do something significant about education?

The voters have given us a mandate. As my colleagues know, it is one of the few times in history where we have the focus groups and polls, everything keeps repeating the message over and over again. The voters of America want the Congress of the United States, and the President and the entire government to significantly take steps to improve education, to give Federal aid to education in the process of trying to improve education.

Now, because the voters are saying that we will get plenty of rhetoric from both sides, but there is contempt for the whole public education process that is expressed in many ways. They express it in ways which relate to neglect and abandonment and indifference, but also it is sometimes expressed in a very active way. As I said before, there are actions taken which are aggressively against working families and things that working families need. Education and investment in education by the government is one of the things that working families would benefit from greatly, and they need it.

We saw on the floor of the House today a vote which demonstrates great contempt for education, a great contempt for the whole research process. It happens to be an agricultural appropriations bill, and the agriculture appropriations bill, in the hassling back and forth for reasons that I do not clearly understand, the majority knows what it is doing; but for reasons that certainly are not noble and reasons that are not reasonable and were not laid out and described to the Members of Congress in any respectful details, a huge across-the-board cut in agricultural research, something like $100 million cut in agricultural research.

Now, agricultural research is at the heart of America's great food production system. As my colleagues know, agricultural research, the research, the educational part of it, the egghead part of it, that draws great contempt obviously from the majority party members. Instead of them dealing with subsidies which may be wasteful or the Farmers Home Loan Mortgage Program, and there are a lot of wasteful programs in agriculture just as there are in some other places in the government, but because they have constituencies and because the ol' boys network demands that they be protected, they are protected. But academia and research, the people who are on the cutting edge of improving agriculture and responsible for the fact that Americans enjoyed the best food production system in the world, we get the best food at the lowest prices, and everything happened by accident.

There is a long history involving education and research starting with the Morrill Act which created the land grant colleges. The model for land grant colleges was Thomas Jefferson, and the University of Virginia was the first State university. It was a very wise move by Thomas Jefferson who made, of course, numerous wise moves and set certain standards for our entire country that we still should be very grateful for and set us on a course that has proven to be very positive.

Jefferson was not in favor of a national university. He did not want one big, huge university in Washington similar to the Sorbonne, to the Oxford chain in London. He wanted each State to have its own university, and Virginia, of course, was the first example, and later the Morrill Act established land grants for every State. The Federal land grant colleges were established, colleges and universities were established; and going beyond just the establishment of land grant colleges, they were given a mandate for practical education, practical education starting with an assumption that agriculture could be improved greatly if it benefited from science and education.

So applied science in the area of agriculture became the driving force that took our farmers, long before farmers anywhere else in the world, into a whole new realm of production, greatly improving the yield of the land, greatly increasing the kind of production that resulted in our having a tremendous amount of surplus products, as we still do in many areas.

This agriculture research, as my colleagues know, the experimental station, the theoretical base in the universities, the county agents to take it out to the farmers and show them how to apply it, it is one of the great things we should be very proud of, dissemination system for knowledge. As the knowledge was generated in the universities and the experimental stations, it was taken out to the farmers; the farmers applied it, and you got a result.

That is all based on agricultural research. It begins with the research.

So we just walked onto the floor today and found an amendment to wipe out $100 million worth of agriculture research. Is that responsible legislation? Are working families going to benefit from a crippling of our agriculture production system? There are always problems, as my colleagues know, in terms of new kinds of bugs and viruses and various kinds of things that go on and on that can wipe out gains that are made over the years if they are not researched, if they do not keep up with them.

So even in the area of agriculture where we have such a sterling record of performance, today we found the reckless attitude towards the things that matter most to ordinary Americans take hold and in one fell swoop we wiped out some basic parts of our agriculture research system.

Then, as my colleagues know, I think that a lot of this preoccupation with the reduction of programs that benefit working families, that benefit people who are in greatest need in our Nation, a lot of this preoccupation and obsession is based on the fact that eventually we are going to have a proposal on the floor for a huge tax cut, a huge tax cut for the people who are benefiting most from the prosperity that we have generated already.

I said before that the stock market value has gone from $3 trillion in 1989 to $13 trillion in 1999. So do the rich need a tax cut? Do they need some help? As my colleagues know, why are we preoccupied with making the budget safe for a tax cut? Why are we willing to cut food stamps and willing to cut low-income housing in order to make the budget safe for a tax cut? But that is what is coming. The Republican

tax cut crouches in the bush like a wounded lion. It is there, it is not going to go away.

One of the problems we have is that the people who represent and care about working families, the great majority of our Nation, of course, made up of working families, those people do not have a tax program for working families. Working families have suffered the biggest tax increase of any group in the last 20 years, the payroll tax, Social Security and Medicare. Those payroll taxes have jumped more percentage-wise than any other taxes. They hit the people on the very bottom. Nobody is proposing to relieve them. I have a few proposals that I would like to offer, and I will offer them in a few minutes.

As my colleagues know, my point is, you need a whole platform, I guess, for working families, and we do not have it. My friends in organized labor, as my colleagues know, they have things that they care about that they are always telling us about, and those are the right kinds of things that working people need; but it all comes in bits and pieces.

We need a whole platform which lays out the need for working families being given their fair share of the great American prosperity in many ways. The Republican tax cut should be answered by a proposal for a tax cut for working families as well.

Between now and Election Day in November 2000 we must lift up a meaningful platform for working families. The showdown will come sometime in the fall of the year 2000. The pattern has been the same for the last, and it will probably be the same as it has been for the last 4 years in the conflict between a Republican-controlled Congress, a Democratically-controlled White House.

The really important measures are going to come down to a negotiation session at the White House between the majority in the Congress and the White House, the President. The really big decisions are going to be made then. What we do with this surplus is really going to really be determined then. Whether we are going to allow working families to have a share of the wealth of America through programs that benefit them will be determined then.

So we have a scenario. We have time, but we have to start now visiting a platform for working families which has all of these components; and you know we have to come to grips with the fact that there is a mind-set in this Nation maybe among powerful people that they do not have to be concerned with the poor. The poor are poor because they did not make it, they are poor because they deserve to be poor. They are not wealthy, they are not able to take care of themselves without some help because that is the way it is, and that is the way it deserves to be, and why should the Nation care?

As my colleagues know, we have whipped the welfare mothers to death, and they are becoming a nonentity in the political discussion. They have been whipped so often and so much, until they almost just disappeared. They may be still aching out there, there may be situations where we are causing more harm than good because we are putting families in a bind, and the children are suffering, and those suffering children are going to create great problems in the future for our health care system, our education system, our corrections system, prison system. As my colleagues know, we may be generating a lot of problems.

Right now, they are invisible. We beat them to death, and now we are going after working families in the workplace, take their overtime, take away safety provisions, et cetera, because there is no ethic which says we have a responsibility to these people.

Let me just take the conversation in a new direction. Because of the war in Kosovo, I think we ought to stop and think, as my colleagues know, and it certainly brings to mind it is one more situation where we are at war, there is no threat to the United States, and there are a lot of elements there that do not fit the description of the war against Hitler.

As my colleagues know, World War II was a war where there was a real threat to the whole Western world, and it was just a matter of if we stood in line, if we did nothing, our time would come. So between, as my colleagues know, Tojo and Hitler we had to act, and it was a war which definitely was a war to save our own way of life. There may be doubts about other wars, but we had the same rationale in the Korean war and in the Vietnam war, and we always made the assumption that, you know, you had to do this, the domino theory of fighting the Communists; if you do not stop them there, they will keep going.

I do not want to get into all of the various arguments, pro and con. Let us just accept war as a fact of life. Let us accept the fact also that the most any citizen can do for their country is place their lives at risk in a war. I mean, I do not know of anything greater that any citizen can do for his Nation, whether they are drafted and forced to go or whether they volunteer, that they are in a situation where they are on the firing line, their lives are at risk, than they are offering this supreme price. And of course, if they are injured and become casualties, they pay a great price, and of course, if they are killed in combat, they die. That is the supreme price, as my colleagues know, to have to give your life. So I do not think there will be any disagreement.

Let me just point out the fact that, mind you, and I got these figures on casualties from the Pentagon, from the Archives, which got them, of course, from Pentagon research, so they are sound figures.

□ 2115

Who dies in the wars? Who dies? There is a lot of contempt always directed at our big cities, our inner-cities, where the poor live mostly. One of the things that is coming out over and over again, and some Democrats are as guilty as Republicans, is they do not want to do anything about the public school system, because if you had legislation which appropriated large amounts of money for school construction and you did it on the basis of need, where the oldest schools are and the needs are and they do not have libraries and laboratories, buildings are more than 75 years old, if you did it on that basis, most of the money would go to the big cities. They have the greatest need in that area.

Just like we have an insane argument now that is being promulgated by the Committee on Transportation, I think in the Senate, in the other body, that need relates to the fact they say Los Angeles and New York are getting too much transit money, too much mass transit money.

Los Angeles and New York are the places where you have most of the mass transit. New York has more than 30 percent of all the mass transit in the country, of the riders, and yet we do not get 30 percent of the funding. The amount we get, however, has aroused the ire of certain people and they want to cut down the amount New York gets or Los Angeles gets in transit money. That is where the people are.

Why do we have large amounts of casualties come out of the big cities in every war. World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, the Vietnam conflict, where did most of the casualties come from? The big states with the big cities.

New York has always led in casualties, even back to the Gettysburg battle. The largest numbers of casualties at Gettysburg were soldiers from New York State. They did not break it down by city, but I assure you most of them were poor immigrants out of the cities.

But I will not go back to that. I am not interested in discussing the fact that valor and willingness to fight and all kinds of conditions are in motion to generate casualties. But the fact is that the casualties come out of the places where people live, where the population is. That is where you are going to have the people to put their lives at risk, the people who died, who paid the supreme price. They will be the people that come from the areas where the most people are. It is simple arithmetic.

New York in World War I, there were total casualties of 35,100 official casualties. Out of those there were 7,307 combat deaths, those causalities, larger than any other state. For some reason

California in World War I was very low. I think maybe because it was not as highly urbanized and the poor were not as concentrated then as they are now. Whatever the reason, New York.

Pennsylvania had 29,576 casualties, 5,996 deaths in World War I. By the way, Pennsylvania has Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, the big cities. Illinois has Chicago, Springfield, big cities: 15,000 casualties, 3,000 combat deaths. Ohio, Cleveland and Cincinnati, big cities, 14,487 casualties, 3,073 deaths. Massachusetts, with Boston and a couple other big cities, 11,455 total casualties, 2,253 deaths. Michigan, with Detroit, 9,000. New Jersey, a small highly urbanized state, 8,776 casualties. There is a pattern.

The pattern is the same in World War II. The casualties went up a great deal. New York, 89,656 total casualties, 27,659 deaths in combat from New York State. Why? Because they were braver than anybody else? Maybe. I do not know. The important thing is that is because that is where the people are. Larger numbers came from New York, because that is where the people are, first of all, and probably that is where the poorest people are who were drafted in larger numbers, and they went off and fought and died for their country.

Why do we treat that class of people with great contempt now? Pennsylvania, 81,000 casualties, 24,000 died in combat. Illinois, where Chicago is located, 54,000 casualties, 17,000 died in combat. Ohio, 49,000 casualties, 15,000 died in combat. They came out of the big cities where the people lived. California in World War II, more urbanized, 47,000 total casualties, 17,000 died in combat.

Korea, New York had 8,780 casualties, 2,249 combat deaths. Pennsylvania, again, second, Illinois, third, Ohio, same pattern.

Vietnam, the same pattern: New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, California. Simple arithmetic.

The point is, the people who die, who pay the supreme price for their country, come out of the big states and the big cities. Therefore, we have every right to treat them with great respect. We should honor the dead from these areas by making certain that the living always are given the fullest possible benefits the government can offer.

Why are we abandoning the big city school systems when so many ancestors of the present children in those systems paid such a high price to create and maintain the America that we have now? Think about it. Think about it.

The people who died, who paid the highest price to keep our Nation going, deserve to be respected at all times, not the present attitude, the wrongheadedness, the unyielding stubbornness toward poor people and working families that has taken hold among decisionmakers, not among the voters.

The voters say we want education to be the number one priority of the government. The decisionmakers in Washington say all right, we will play games with you and pretend it is number one, but if you look at the appropriations process, we are not appropriating that kind of money for education.

We had a bill last year which authorized $218 billion for highways and transportation, $218 billion. There was money for mass transit in there. That is part of what is being appropriated this year. They are having a big debate about taking away some of the mass transit funds from New York where the riders live. Where the people are, for some reason, our hearts and our appropriations do not go.

There is some flaw maybe in our whole system. The grand compromise that our forefathers made when they established the Nation, that they had to make because the states existed before the Nation, the grand compromise of giving two representatives to every state created a powerful body which represents a minority, and that body has over the last 20 to 25 years essentially been anti-urban, anti the population centers of the Nation, anti-policies that would benefit the great masses. So we have a reversion kind of thing going here in our great democracy, and our great democracy, one-man, one-vote, is being diluted and distorted in a way which results in policies and power which hurts the great majority. The places where the people live are getting the worst attention or the least attention in terms of their needs.

Education is a clear area of great need. In Kosovo we have had zero casualties, so far have zero casualties, but if ground troops had been needed they would have come from the same places that they always come from, in large quantities they would come out of the big cities.

Go and look at the Vietnam Wall. I love the Vietnam Wall as a monument because it broke the pattern. No more ever will we have tombs of unknown soldiers. Tombs of unknown soldiers mask the great tragedy of war. The fact that the Vietnam memorial lists the names one by one, they are all written there, they are all honored for what they have done in terms of paying the supreme price for their country, they stand out as individuals. I have seen many people cry at that wall because it comes home personally. That is the way war ought to be depicted. It is a very personal kind of set of tragedies.

''Saving Private Ryan'', Spielberg's great movie, starts out and is based on the premise that a whole family has contributed a certain number of sons and the last son ought to be saved. I think that in the beginning of the movie when they drive out to the house to meet the mother, it is a very poor family, relatively speaking, a poor family that has given those sons. That is a pattern of World War I, of World War II. Why do we have contempt in our policies for the people that we expect to die for America?

Madam Speaker, I will submit a little summary that I made called Big State, Big City Casualties, which lists some of the things that I have just said about where the casualties are, in which states, and the statistics are by state, and also indicates the cities located in those states.

I have, of course, a bigger record that is more complicated. It lists all the states. In the case of the war in Vietnam they even list the casualties by race. You find that the black casualties there are greater than the proportion of blacks in the population. In Vietnam certainly, when they kept statistics by race, some of the same people were treated with great contempt as we abandon our school systems and abandon our safety net, health care services, welfare. Those same people paid the supreme price for our country in large numbers. Let us stop and think about the pattern of exploitation, negative, abandonment of working families in America.

We need a tax plan which addresses itself to the needs of working families. Not only are we in a situation where the only targets for cuts, for taking away benefits that have existed for years, are programs that benefit working families and poor families, the poor who do not work, the elderly, the disabled, a lot of people who are not working who benefit from these programs, we are not only targeting the cuts for them, we are targeting the benefits of government policy to the rich.

We have got tax proposals that are going to be brought out and put on the table between now and the end of this appropriations process, and, of course, they will be pursued again next year in the final showdown that takes place in this Congress, this two year span. There are going to be tax cuts on the table and a bargaining process, and we are probably going to end up with some kind of tax cut.

All those people who are benefiting from the great increase in wealth, the jump from $3 trillion to $13 trillion, a large amount of that is what you call unearned income. Unearned income is a term I did not invent, but it is all the money you make that does not come from wages directly.

Wage earners provide the principal support for the Federal Government. Almost two-thirds of Federal revenue comes from income and Social Security taxes that are paid by workers, people who earn wages. They are the ones that provide the taxes. It is taxes on earned income.

By contrast, income taxes on unearned income, stocks and bonds and that kind of thing, produce only about

12 percent of the total Federal revenue. I propose, and I think that the working families platform that ought to be adopted by working families and organizations that are supposed to represent them, I propose a massive shift in the burden of the taxes from the earned income of working people to the unearned income of those who are getting the greatest increases in wealth.

Ten years ago, the early 1989, as I said, the value of all U.S. stocks was about $3 trillion. Now it is about $13 trillion, a $10 trillion increase. That is the opportunity. You can get new revenue from that increase and the people who are continuing to earn without any pain being caused.

The great political position that we need a tax cut is not related to pain and the reduction of pain; it is related to a wrong-headed, unyielding, stubborn policy which defines ''them'' and ''us'' and disregards the fact that there is a place, there ought to be a place, for working families to share the great wealth of America.

I introduced on March 11 of this year H.R. 1090, which I call the Social Security Protection and Tax Relief Act of 1999. It cuts the Social Security tax rate from 7.65 percent to 6.4 percent.

□ 2130

This will give a tax cut of $15 for every $10,000 of earned income to all working families and to the rich as well as the poor, if the rich are working and earning wages, and whether or not they pay income tax, of course, they will benefit through the various devices in place in the Tax Code.

So cuts of the social security tax, payroll taxes, where the biggest increases have taken place over the last 20 years, and where the people on the bottom are taxed at the same rate as the people on the top, those cuts would be a great benefit for working families.

My H.R. 1099 imposes a new 12 percent social security tax on all taxable unearned income to offset what you would lose from reducing the taxes on people at the lowest levels. We propose social security taxes on all taxable unearned income.

I also on April 12 introduced another bill, H.R. 1390, the Income Tax Fairness Act of 1999. That cuts all income tax brackets by 3 percentage points, all income tax brackets, from the highest to the lowest. The present rates in the 5 brackets are 15 percent, 28 percent, 31 percent, 36 percent, and 39.6 percent. The new rates would be 12 percent, 25 percent, 28 percent, 33 percent, and 36.6 percent.

I am not on the Committee on Ways and Means, and I know most people would consider it inappropriate that I should be here talking about taxes and changes in the tax policy.

The Committee on Ways and Means is an exclusive committee. For the benefit of people who are not close to Washington, we have a caste system in the Congress. There are exclusive committees and there are other committees for the peasants. I am not on an exclusive committee. The Committee on Appropriations is exclusive, the Committee on Ways and Means is exclusive, the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Energy are exclusive.

Some of the wrongheadedness and anti-democratic attitudes that are generated come out of the structure itself. It is all wrong to say that education is a lesser committee. The Committee on Education and the Work Force is not an exclusive committee. However, what is more important to the Nation at this point than the education system which brought us to where we are and will take us into the future?

At any rate, I am not on the Committee on Ways and Means, but I think every Member of Congress has a right to speak out and offer the best wisdom that they can offer to stimulate the discussion. Hopefully we will develop a platform which all the people who consider themselves advocates for the average American, the average taxpayer out there, the working families, will also get involved in the debate.

Steve Forbes and the various other conservatives should not be the only ones who are concerned about tax reform. There ought to be a tax reform program that comes from working families and their advocates.

H.R. 1390 cuts deductible depreciation on nonresidential buildings from 2.6 percent per year, and it is based on an estimated useful life of 39 years, et cetera, et cetera, some other details that I think we need not go into.

The estimate is that this tax program that I offer will be either revenue-neutral or a revenue-plus. Total Federal revenue, income and social security taxes, will be reduced by between $190 to $200 billion per year and increased by the same amount or more, $200 to $250 billion a year by the mechanisms in these bills.

I am also convinced that the great social security problem we all talk about, and we have good reason to worry about, the great social security problem could be dealt with if we were to place a social security tax on all unearned income. In addition to the tax on earned income, let us put it on all unearned income. That is the area of greatest growth. That is the area where the ratio of people in the workplace does not determine what goes into the social security coffers.

Let us have a social security tax on unearned income for the first time, and that will save the social security system for at least two generations, and I suspect will go even beyond that and solve the problem once and for all.

In other words, I think working families deserve a platform, a program of their own. I hope the candidates, certainly the candidates in the Democratic Party for president, will break out of the mold, will break out of the conventional wisdom, and move forward and talk in more direct and affirmative terms about programs which benefit the great masses in America.

Finally, I want to conclude on the program that I think benefits the most people, and all of us, but certainly working families in dire need of the public education system that is able to deliver the kind of education that is needed as we go into the new millennium.

As we go into the 21st century, we need the best schools in the world. We are not going to be able to maintain our lead economically if we do not have the best educated populace in the world. We are not going to be able to maintain our strong military if we don't have the best educated populace in the world.

Already we have great shortages in the Navy. I understand the last great super aircraft carrier that was launched was short of personnel by 300 people. They could not find 300 people to staff it. There are other shortages throughout the Navy and other services, shortages of appropriate personnel.

Are there shortages of bodies in a Nation with more than 250 million residents? There is never a shortage of bodies. They are talking about a shortage of people who have the capacity and the prerequisite training to be able to deal with a high-tech military. The Navy needs people who have some kind of education which prepares them to learn how to operate high-tech weapons. The Air Force needs the same kind of people. The Army needs the same kind of people.

Even in the military, we need the best security effort that we can launch, which would be a better educated population through a revamped public education system, everywhere we go, economics, foreign policy, globalization, military, and even social security.

If we are worried about social security, what is the great worry about social security? The number of people who are going to be on social security as we progress into the 21st century, the ratio of people who are earning or drawing money from social security will be far greater than the number of people who are in the work force paying into social security. That is a simple understanding that is correct. We are going to have fewer people paying into social security than are getting benefits from social security. Then we have a situation where if we do not find new sources of revenue, it is going to run out of money.

I have just indicated part of the solution may be to look for other revenue sources for social security. But even if we stay with the primary revenue source of wage-earners paying into the

social security fund, if we have an education system which guarantees that the jobs that are created in this Nation will be there and the people who are in the Nation can qualify for them and earn wages and pay into the social security system, we are helping social security.

So education helps to keep us strong militarily, it helps to keep us strong economically. Education is the best investment we can make in social security.

The problem now is that because already we have not been able to fill many of the jobs in the high-tech industries, corporations are contracting out to other nations. Bangalore, India, is called the computer capital of the world because in Bangalore, India, they have numerous contractors from this Nation who are contracting with firms in Bangalore to provide computing services. And because of our high-tech communications facilities, we can do that kind of thing.

In addition to large numbers of corporations contracting to firms located in Bangalore, and the people in Bangalore, of course, pay their social security into the Indian system, not the American system, we have also large numbers who come to this country as foreign workers and improve their skills because they are hired in the jobs that cannot be filled by our corporations. They go back and make the computer and other high-tech industries of their Nation even more efficient and effective as competitors. So wherever we look, we find the need for greater investment in education.

There are many ways we can invest in education. We have talked about a lot of them. I do not think that I would rank reducing the classroom size over construction or construction over reducing the size of the elementary classes, but I would like to say that a school construction initiative which is meaningful would send a message to the whole Nation and the whole public education system.

If we believe in a religion, then the first visible commitment of that religion is manifested in the kind of church they build or temple they have or synagogue they have. The physical facility is not at the heart of what the religion is all about, but the physical facility is a visible manifestation of a commitment.

If we abandon the public schools of this Nation, and we have a situation similar to the one we have now, where we are spending only 23 cents per child on physical infrastructure in the elementary and secondary schools, the Federal commitment, the Federal portion of the commitment to the physical infrastructure right now is about 23 cents per child. We have 53 million children in school. When we look at the amount of money the Federal Government is spending, it is about 23 cents per child.

I propose a bill, H.R. 1820, which I have already introduced and am seeking cosponsors, where we would spend $417 per year per child instead of 23 cents per year per child. For $417 per year per child, we could deal with the crumbling, dilapidated schools, schools that endanger the health of youngsters because they have coal-burning furnaces, lead pipes, some have serious problems in terms of the roof. No matter how many times you repair it, the water seeps into the walls at the top and it keeps coming down. Lead paint, lead is in the paint. There are all kinds of dangers.

Many buildings are just so old. We have a lot of buildings in New York City that are 75 years or older, many that are 50 years old. This is not unique to New York City. All of the big cities have the same problem. Many rural areas, of course, have even worse problems. They never had sound buildings. We need a construction effort.

I conclude by saying that investment in the public education system is one of many of the steps we need to take to end the oppression of working families and provide benefits, and have them share in the wealth, instead of being objects of our contempt.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information on World War II:

BIG STATE, BIG CITY CASUALTIES

State	Total casualties	Combat deaths	Three big cities
		World War I	
New York	35,100	7,307	New York, Buffalo, Albany
Pennsylvania	29,576	5,996	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg
Illinois	15,984	3,016	Chicago, Springfield, Peoria
Ohio	14,487	3,073	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton
Massachusetts	11,455	2,153	Boston, Amherst, Burlington
Michigan	9,702	2,213	Detroit, Ann Arbor, Lansing
New Jersey	8,766	1,761	Newark, Jersey City, Hoboken
California	6,153	1,352	San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles
		World War II	
New York	89,656	27,659	New York, Buffalo, Albany
Pennsylvania	81,917	24,302	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg
Illinois	54,686	17,338	Chicago, Springfield, Peoria
Ohio	49,989	15,636	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton
Massachusetts	31,910	9,991	Boston, Amherst, Burlington
New Jersey	31,544	9,742	Newark, Jersey City, Hoboken
California	47,073	17,048	San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles
		Korean Conflict	
New York	8,780	2,249	New York, Buffalo, Albany
Pennsylvania	8,251	2,327	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg
Illinois	6,435	1,744	Chicago, Springfield, Peoria
Ohio	6,614	1,777	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton
Michigan	5,181	1,447	Detroit, Ann Arbor, Lansing
		Vietnam	
New York	N/A	4,108	New York, Buffalo, Albany
Pennsylvania	N/A	3,133	Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg
Illinois	N/A	2,926	Chicago, Springfield, Peoria
Ohio	N/A	3,082	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton
Massachusetts	N/A	1,317	Boston, Amherst, Burlington
Michigan	N/A	2,641	Detroit, Ann Arbor, Lansing
California	N/A	5,563	San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mrs. MYRICK (during the Special Order of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–175) on the resolution (H. Res. 200) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE COX REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to continue to provide for our colleagues in the House and for the constituents that they represent across the country information relative to the Cox report and the way this report is being spun by this administration.

Madam Speaker, I had wanted to go into much of the information I am going to share tonight in more detail yesterday, but because I had to leave after 30 minutes, I could not go into detail last evening. I will do so tonight.

Madam Speaker, I want to start off this evening, as I did last night, by saying it is not my normal course to spend every evening over a given period of time on the floor of this House discussing the same issue. But like eight of my colleagues, I spent almost the last year of my life focusing on the investigation that we were asked to perform by the leadership in both parties in this body on potential security harm done to our country by our policies relative to China and other nations that might benefit from technology developed here in America.

We worked tirelessly behind closed doors, cooperating fully with the FBI and the CIA, and with the full support of George Tenet, who heads the CIA, in trying to determine whether or not there were damages done to our national security, and if so, what was the extent of that damage.

We deliberately made a decision when we began the process last summer that we would not go into the specifics of campaign finance activity or what other motives would have driven policymakers to lower the thresholds for exports, or perhaps the reasons why influence would be allowed by Chinese nationals and others, both at the White House and to other Federal agencies, to

allow those key players to gain access to the key decisionmakers that would benefit them in acquiring technology.

□ 2145

The nine Members that were a part of the Cox committee represent a broad basis of views in this Congress, four Democrats and five Republicans, very serious Members; and our goal was and the result was a totally nonpartisan effort.

We looked at every aspect of technology that may in fact pose problems for us down the road: whether or not that technology had in fact been transferred; if so, to what extent, how it was transferred, and what the implications were for our long-term security.

The almost 1,000-page document that we completed is, I think, very detailed and certainly would be required reading for any American. The problem is, most American citizens, like most Members of Congress, do not have the time to sift through almost 1,000 pages of detailed explanations and stories relative to various technologies that had been transferred out of the U.S. over the past several decades.

Therefore, because much of this is contained within the thousand-or-so-page report, even though 30 percent of that remained classified because the administration would not declassify the entire document, the media, to a large extent, have chosen not to focus on the substance of what is in the Cox committee report.

Unfortunately, the bulk of the American media, and I say the bulk because there are a few exceptions, people like Jeff Girth with the New York Times, who has been doing tireless work in this area before our report was even issued; people like Carl Cameron at Fox News, who continues to do extensive work in this area; people like 60 Minutes, who are right now doing research in these areas, and other network affiliates, they are the exception. The bulk of the mainstream media have chosen to accept the spin that has been given by this White House to the work that we did.

What I am trying to do, Madam Speaker, is to present information to our colleagues, which they could, in turn, provide to their constituents, of a factual basis that compliments the work that was done by the Cox committee.

Now, the public at large can receive copies of the Cox committee report. It is available on the newsstand, or they can get it on the Web site that has been established by the Cox committee itself. Many libraries now have copies of the Cox committee three-volume series.

Last evening, I mentioned the fact that I have now established a Web site on the Cox report that goes beyond the information that is covered in the Cox report and provides the visual explanation of the overview of the problem that we dealt with in the Cox committee.

So our colleagues, Madam Speaker, and all of their constituents can now turn to the Internet where they can access the material I am going to show this evening, and they can download the actual charts that I am going to provide. In addition, smaller versions of these larger charts have been made available to every Member of this body. All they have to do is contact my office, send a staffer over; and be they Republican or Democrat, they can get the charts and all the related information that goes with the charts so they can share this information in a factual way with their constituents.

The Web site where our colleagues and the American people across this country can access this information is www.house.gov/curtweldon. Any American represented by any one of our colleagues can access this information through that Web site.

In fact, last evening, we had a number of contacts from throughout the country from people who want to get additional factual information in an investigational form, in a condensed form about what actually the Cox report focused on.

As I have said in a series of speeches that I have been giving both here and around the country, Madam Speaker, the focus of the Cox committee was not just on our laboratories. Now, if my colleagues listen to Bill Richardson, the Secretary of Energy and the point person that has been asked by the administration to provide the spin for the Cox committee report, my colleagues would think that our report only focused on our laboratories, Los Alamos, Sandia, and Lawrence Livermore in particular. Nothing could be further from the truth, Madam Speaker.

While it is true, the laboratory security was one part of what we looked at, it is only one small part of the bigger picture of the way that we loosened the controls over our technology for the past 7 years.

The American people need to understand that this effort was well beyond our laboratories. But as I did last night, I want to highlight four specific actions that rebut what Secretary Richardson has been saying around the country as the point person for this administration as he has tried to spin the Cox committee report as though it is only concerned with lab security.

Now, Madam Speaker, our colleagues know full well, because they have read the text of Mr. Richardson's speeches, that his focus has been something along the lines of this: This administration was the administration who uncovered the Chinese espionage in 1995 that happened in previous administrations that were run by Republicans, and we took aggressive action in this administration to correct those problems.

Secretary Richardson would have the American people believe and would have our colleagues believe that this administration had no responsibility whatsoever in technology being transferred to China and that the only thing they did was that they uncovered the fact that, in 1995, they learned that China had stolen the designs for our warhead capabilities, the W–88 and the W–87, that occurred in previous administrations. That has been the extent of Secretary Richardson's comments.

He has also gone on to say, now, look, we have taken steps to correct all of this, and today we have corrected the bulk of the problems.

Well, I am here to rebut that, Madam Speaker. I would like to do it in a forum where I could stand directly across from Secretary Richardson, or even the President, and have a chance to go at it verbally and exchange information, but it looks like that is not going to be possible.

The national media outlets will put Secretary Richardson on the Sunday morning talk shows to give the White House spin, but they have yet to give full consideration to the factual rebuttal to what Secretary Richardson has been saying. So I am going to attempt to do that here again on the public record tonight.

First of all, we must remind the American people that contrary to what Secretary Richardson has been saying, it was this administration, under the leadership of then-Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary in 1993 that ended the policy of color coding laboratory security credentials at our laboratories. My understanding is that she thought having color coded badges was to some extent discriminatory and they were not necessary. So under her administration, acting on behalf of Bill Clinton, we did away with that process in 1993.

Now what did that mean? That meant, Madam Speaker, that all of those employees at our labs that we used to be able to tell by the color of the identifying ID system that they had on them no longer could be done, or no longer could be checked, because we did away with that color coding, making it much more difficult to determine where employees could or could not work or be in a particular classified laboratory setting.

So under Secretary Hazel O'Leary, this administration ended the practice of visually being able to identify what people at our labs could or could not have access to key areas. Now, obviously that made it much easier for unauthorized people to go into areas where they did not have appropriate clearance.

Now, if this policy were so acceptable and defensive, my question is, why did this administration 2 weeks ago reinstate the policy as it existed under President Reagan, President Bush, and even President Carter and before that?

If this policy change, which Secretary O'Leary made on behalf of Bill Clinton in 1993 and 1994, was so critically important and logical, why 2 weeks ago did they go back to the policy as it was under Republican Presidents?

Was perhaps there some new revelation that this relaxation that occurred by the Clinton administration in 1993 and 1994 led to security problems in our laboratories? Bill Richardson has yet to answer that question.

Second point, Madam Speaker, we have not heard Bill Richardson talk about the fact that it was under Secretary Hazel O'Leary, acting on behalf of President Clinton, that FBI background checks of people who worked at our labs and visited our labs were put on hold.

Now, why do we have FBI background checks? They were there to discourage people who should not have access to our country's secrets to get into places where those secrets were kept. That was not done prior to 1993, Madam Speaker. That was done by this administration as a major change in policy that opened the floodgates for people to go to our labs, who in previous years would not have been allowed access to those facilities.

Bill Richardson has not dealt with that issue, because as he said, this administration only inherited problems and did everything to correct them.

Third point. There was an incident involving a retired employee from Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in the 1993 to 1995 time frame, where that employee, former employee, was accused by the Department of Energy of having released sensitive classified information to unauthorized people. The Department of Energy investigated that employee. The Oakland office of the Department of Energy saw fit, based on the factual evidence to remove that former employee's classified status so that he no longer, as a retiree, had access to classified information.

The employee appealed that decision to the Secretary of Energy's office. Hazel O'Leary herself overturned the decision of the Oakland Department of Energy office and allowed that retiree to retain his classified status. When that occurred, Madam Speaker, employees all across DOE involved in sensitive security areas got the feeling that this administration felt that giving away classified secrets was no big deal.

We lowered the threshold for the security clearance process. We stopped the FBI background checks. Then we even had an employee who was accused by the Department of Energy itself, and found guilty of giving classified information. The Secretary herself overturned the Department of Energy decision to take away his security clearance.

Now, those people that I have talked to in the Department of Energy who worked under Hazel O'Leary, way more than one or two people, have said that under her leadership, there were wholesale actions to declassify massive amounts of information, in some cases boxes and cartons of records that no one had gone through, simply declassified, made available for people to read in a spirit that I guess was considered openness, even though these were, in many cases, the most important technical secrets that this country had.

Let me give my colleagues one particular example, Madam Speaker. Secretary Richardson has gone around the country, and he has made the case that when this administration found the evidence in 1995 that China had stolen or received the design for our most capable nuclear warheads, the W–88 and the W–87, that this administration immediately corrected those problems so they would never occur again. Even though Janet Reno cannot properly explain why the Justice Department turned down requests for four wiretaps, for efforts by one of our employees at one of our labs that we thought was a spy, Secretary Richardson has said they took aggressive action.

Now, that is what he said publicly. I wish he would answer this question, because that same year, in 1995, U.S. News and World Report published a special report entitled ''Shockwave.'' ''Shockwave'' was printed on July the 31, 1995, distributed all across the country and around the world. I am sure a number of these copies were sold in China.

□ 2200

Because when I traveled to Beijing I saw copies of U.S. News and World Report on the shelves that people could buy. The same thing in Russia. These copies were available in North Korea, in Iran or Iraq. This edition of U.S. News and World Report's Special Supplement were sold wherever people would pay the price of whatever this document cost, $3.50. What was in this special report on the last page, which I showed last evening, was startling.

On July 31, 1995, this administration, not the Reagan administration, not the Bush administration, not the Carter administration, this administration leaked the design for our W–87 warhead to U.S. News and World Report. Not just the Chinese, the North Koreans, the Iraqis and Iranians, anyone who would buy U.S. News and World Report on July 31, 1995 got a documented diagram of the W–87, which up until that point in time was classified.

Here is the color version of what the Department of Energy released to U.S. News and World Report. This design shows in some detail the way our most capable nuclear warhead works. It shows and explains the process, it shows and locates the technology, the fuel, the process, the activity, the physics of the way America's most capable warhead would work. This was not secretly stolen by the Chinese, that this administration maintains they found in 1995. This diagram was given to U.S. News and World Report by this administration in 1995, and reproduced in U.S. News and World Report.

As I said last evening, Madam Speaker, I have been told, and I am tracking this down right now, that there was an internal investigation within the Department of Energy to find out who leaked this diagram, this sensitive diagram to U.S. News and World Report. Because I have been told, Madam Speaker, that that individual and group were told to stop the investigation. Why? Because the assumption was that this diagram came from Hazel O'Leary's office herself.

Why are we not hearing Secretary Richardson talk about this, Madam Speaker? Why is he not talking about in 1995, in July, when this diagram for the W–87 was reproduced and sold on newsstands all over the world to anyone who would pay the price? This was not some secret espionage capability of the Chinese. This was the Department of Energy, following Hazel O'Leary's desire to open up to the people of the world our most secret information about technologies important to our country.

There is one additional factor that needs to be investigated, Madam Speaker. There was an individual, or is an individual employed at the Department of Energy who has currently been placed on what I call political administrative leave. His name is Edward J. McCallum. He was the one who briefed Members of Congress and their staffs about problems with one of our nuclear facilities, Rocky Flats. When it was found out that he had done the outrageous thing of informing Congress about security concerns at one of our nuclear sites, what was the response of this administration? They put him on administrative leave. Secretary Richardson has announced that he is going to fire Mr. McCallum because he claims he gave out classified information.

Madam Speaker, I cannot believe this is happening in America, but there is some added irony here. Madam Speaker, I am providing for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a document dated May 3, 1999, prepared by Mr. McCallum which outlines the problems at Rocky Flats and what steps he took to correct them.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. MCCALLUM

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak with the committee today on the Department of Energy's Safeguards and Security Program. Over the past nine years, I have served as the Director of DOE's Office of Safeguards and Security. In this capacity, I have been responsible for the development and promulgation of policy that governs the protection of the national security assets entrusted to the department, to include those assets that are part of the nation's nuclear

weapons program. I am also responsible for providing training and specialized technical advice and assistance to DOE field sites when requested. My office is also charged with conducting special inquiries into incidents of security concern to include, but not limited to, those incidents involving the unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

As you may know the Department of Energy has placed me on Administrative Leave since April 19, 1999. DOE officials allege that I committed a security infraction by claiming that I disclosed classified information during a conversation with a whistleblower from the Rocky Flats site. Based on the Department's own classification procedures and guidelines (CG–SS–3, Chap 10, Dispersal of Radioactive Material), I firmly believe that these allegations are completely unfounded. I have been an authorized classifier in the DOE and it's predecessor organizations for over 25 years and helped develop the first classification guide in this area in 1975. Further DOE also failed to follow its own procedures in investigating these issues before placing me on Administrative Leave. I believe this action to be an obvious act of retaliation against the individual and the office that has tried to bring an increasingly distressing message of lax security at the DOE Laboratories forward since 1995.

Prior to joining the Office of Safeguards and Security I held several high level positions within the department's safeguards and security program areas. From 1988–1989 I served as Director, Office of Security Evaluations. In 1978 I joined the DOE at the Chicago Operations Office and in 1979 became the Director of the Safeguards and Security Division. Prior to joining DOE I served as an officer in the U.S. Army. Active military service included a number of Military Intelligence and Special Forces assignments in Europe and Southeast Asia. I culminated my military duty after over thirty years of active and reserve service.

In fulfilling my responsibilities as the Director, Office of Safeguards and Security, I have attempted to provide senior DOE management with the most sound, professional judgment possible concerning the status of security within the department, along with recommendations as to how best to rectify shortcomings. As you are no doubt aware, much of what I have offered over recent years has not been altogether positive, nor well received. The steady decline in resources available to the DOE safeguards and security program as well as a lack of priority have allowed the department's protection posture to deteriorate to a point where a program that long operated in a defense in depth mode, where no single point failure permitted the system to fail, can no longer afford such a strategy.

The information presented in this statement is not new. It has been repeated consistently over the last decade in Departmental reports such as the Annual Reports to the Secretary in 1995, 1996 and 1997 by the Office of Safeguards and Security. External reviews such as the Report to the Secretary in 1991, by General James Freeze, and the Nuclear Command and Control Staff Report on Oversight in the DOE in 1998 cite similar concerns. There have also been a large number of General Accounting Office Reports on these areas. However, for numerous reasons the department has not been able to resolve these serious and longstanding problems.

COMPUTER SECURITY

One of the primary interests expressed by the Committee, and indeed widely covered by the media recently, is the loss of classified information from the computer systems at the National Laboratories. Indeed, we may be sitting at the center of the worst spy scandal in our Nation's history.

The DOE Computer Security Program suffers from a variety of problems. One of the primary concerns is the protection of unclassified sensitive information processed by the Department and the relationship of these systems to the classified architecture. Relatively little guidance has been issued on how to protect sensitive but unclassified information. System administrators are charged with the responsibility for designing their own protective measures. Unfortunately, many of them do not have the computer security background or knowledge required to implement a sound computer security program. Attempts to issue comprehensive guidance by my office and the Chief Information Officer as early as 1995 met with significant Laboratory resistance. Several Laboratories complained that providing protection such as firewalls and passwords were unnecessarily expensive and a hindrance to operations. Implementation of the proposed Computer Security Manual in 1996 would have prevented many of the problems being reported today.

Another area of great concern is the migration of classified information from systems approved for processing classified data to less secure unclassified processing systems. My office has noted a number of problems in this area to include: Failure to conduct classification reviews before placing information onto an unclassified processing system, intentionally creating unclassified data that is very close to classified data to ease processing, and using personal computers at home to process classified information.

A variety of computer security tools and techniques, such as encryption devices, firewalls, and disconnect features, are available and their use is required; however, these protective measures are not always used. In some cases, this is due to lack of knowledge by system administrators. In other cases, it is due to lack of funding or priority for the required equipment.

PROTECTIVE FORCES

While much of the attention of late has been directed toward the area of foreign visitors and the protection of classified information, equally serious cause for concern exists in other areas as well. For instance, since 1992, the number of protective forces at DOE sites nationwide has decreased by almost 40% (from 5,640 to the current number of approximately 3,500) while the inventory of nuclear material has increased by more than 30%. The number of Protective Force Officers has declined to the point where it is questionable at some facilities whether the DOE Protective Force could defeat an adversary. By 1996 several facilities were no longer capable of recapturing a nuclear asset or facility if it were lost to an adversary. Indeed, a number of sites stopped even training for this mission because resources had been reduced below the minimum level necessary to expect success. We have had some success in increasing these numbers of recent years so that at this time all sites report they can meet this minimum capability. Several sites are using performance tests to verify that their Protective Force can defeat the adversary; however, many of these tests are not realistic. For example, performance tests sometimes are not consistent in providing the adversary with the weaponry or explosive breaching devices used by terrorist groups. At times artificial ''safety constrains'' are imposed on exercise adversary teams that effectively neutralize their ability to operate. This results in ''winning'' the performance test, in a less than realistic scenario.

There have been several other consequences of the reduction in the number of Protective Force Officers. First is a relatively older Protective Force (the average Protective Force Officer is now in his/her early 40s). Second, DOE sites are relying on local law enforcement agencies to handle serious security threats. Their ability in nuclear terrorist situations is questionable. Third, sites have difficulty increasing the tempo of security operations during high threat periods. Fourth, Protective Force personnel are displaying lower morale due to reduced training and job stagnation. Finally, an average annual overtime rate in our nuclear weapons facilities of approximately 25% has detrimental effects on safety, training, and response capabilities.

EXERCISES

A centrally funded and well-integrated National-level security exercise program is critical to meet the safeguards and protection needs of DOE and the nation. Exercises that address site response and management of security crisis are required by regulation to be held annually at critical DOE facilities. However, participation by State and local law enforcement, regional offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and other Federal agencies is inconsistent and varies considerably across the complex. Under Presidential Decision Directives 39 and 62, the Secretary of Energy is directed to conduct exercises to ensure the safety and security of its nuclear facilities from terrorism. DOE is also tasked to support the FBI in its lead as the Federal agency responsible for managing all domestic incidents involving terrorist threat or use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In addition, the recent creation of the Department of Justice National Domestic Preparedness Office, the FBI Critical Incident Response Group (CIRG), and other National crisis response assets, requires that DOE plan and practice a new and expanded role in supporting a security crisis response beyond the local site and internal Department level.

Currently, the present DOE organizational structure separates exercise responsibility between Program offices and Safeguards and Security; this hampers the integration of sequential training objectives that can be monitored and tracked and creates confusion at the site level. More importantly, the majority of the funding resides at the site level where expenditures must vie with other program needs each fiscal year, often to their detriment.

PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS

Another area of concern involves aging and deteriorating security systems throughout the DOE complex. Physical security systems are critical to ensure the adequate protection of Special Nuclear Material (SNM). Many facilities have systems ranging in age from 14 to 21 years, and are based on mid-70's to early-80's technology. Because of the obsolescence of these systems, replacement parts and services are increasingly expensive and hard to obtain. Expensive compensatory measures (i.e., protective force response) are required to ensure needed confidence levels of adequate protection. Older systems are also increasingly vulnerable to defeat by advanced technologies that are now readily and cheaply available to potential adversaries.

Continual reductions, delays or cancellations in line-item construction funding increases the vulnerability risks to sites protection capability. Also, DOE is not realizing significant savings available through advancements in technology that have increased detection, assessment, and delay capabilities.

Some sites are using a variety of nonstandard security alarm and access control systems that have not been fully tested to determine if they contain vulnerabilities, or if they meet Departmental requirements without compensatory measures. Such systems may have back doors or viruses, that allow the insider adversary to cripple the entire site protection system, thus leaving the site vulnerable. Some sites do not have qualified personnel to conduct these vulnerability tests and are generally unwilling to conduct any type of attack on the system to determine if such vulnerabilities can be accomplished.

COUNTERTERRORISM MEASURES

PDD–39, The United States Policy on Counterterrorism, requires all governmental agencies to implement security measures to defend against Weapons of Mass Destruction, including chemical and biological weapons. The Office of Safeguards and Security has developed the necessary policies and requirements for implementing PDD–39. Field Elements, however, have been slow to purchase and install explosive detection systems, with only a limited number of sites having done so. Program Offices claim that there is no funding for such equipment.

PERSONNEL SECURITY

I fear that a recent decision by the department to have program offices fund the cost of clearances for field contractor personnel will have severe repercussions. Since implementing this new approach at the beginning of FY 1999, we have already begun to see a dramatic increase in the backlog of background investigations. As with other security areas, program offices must decide upon competing interests when determining those areas to be funded. Unfortunately, security activities are relegated to a lower tier in terms of importance by some program offices and selected field sites. This appears to be the case with the funding of security background investigations. As the first line of defense against the ''insider'' threat, the adequate funding and timely conduct of reinvestigations is critical to ensuring the department maintains a protection posture commensurate with the level of threat.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Operating beneath the surface of these major challenges are some fundamental issues that, if properly addressed, could provide the impetus to effect real progress. These challenges, for the most part, are not new, nor are their solutions.

Organizational Structure: In all of the reviews of the safeguards and security program conducted during the last decade, there is a recurring theme. Simply, the Department's organizational structure of the Safeguards and Security Program is such that programmatic authority and responsibility are not properly aligned. The Safeguards and Security Program in its current structure has one organization developing policy, training and providing technical field assistance (NN), another organization providing funding and ''implementing guidance'' (Headquarters Program Offices), a third organization (Field Site) is responsible for implementation of policy, while a fourth (EH) is responsible for oversight. A fundamental change in both the organizational structure and funding of the Safeguards and Security Program is absolutely necessary before the Department can begin to systematically address the major challenges previously addressed. These organizations must be consolidated with policy, guidance and implementation in one location, with an appropriate budget to participate in the Department decision making.

Safeguards and Security Program Funding: This is the central, driving issue. Budget cutbacks have adversely affected all of DOE. As previously alluded to, however, when Program Offices face funding shortfalls, there is a tendency to cut security programs on a pro rata basis without the benefit of assessing the impact these cuts would have on the department's protection posture. The implementation of virtually every security program, from the Information Security Program to the Protective Force Program, has suffered significantly as a result. I believe many of these cuts are shortsighted and ill advised as they eventually lead to security lapses. Nevertheless, my office has no authority to force the Program Offices to implement departmental security policies and requirements. Similarly, my office has no funds to provide to Program Offices or Field Elements to help pay for appropriate security measures. Without an adequate budget there is simply no authority.

Security Policy and Requirements Formulation. DOE security policies and requirements are based upon current threat data and requirements identified by outside intelligence organizations. DOE, the Department of Defense, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Central Intelligence Agency meet every two years to evaluate current threat data and formulate an agreed upon threat statement that governs security programs throughout the U.S. Government. In addition, the Department of Energy internally reviews this threat statement annually. In DOE parlance, the resulting document is known as the Design Basis Threat. Program Offices are required to use the Design Basis Threat as the baseline for planning security measures. Security requirements are also levied upon the Department by the Office of the President, Congress, and the General Services Administration. For example, Presidential Decision Directive 39 directed all Executive Branch agencies to protect against terrorist attacks. This resulted in an increased need for explosive detection equipment, more frequent security patrols, and hardening of structures. In some cases, Program Offices have directed their field elements not to implement departmental security requirements. This is due to 2 main reasons: The program offices can't afford the new directive, or they simply don't agree with it. In other cases, they have issued interpretive guidance that changes the security policy or undermines the effectiveness of that policy. Again, the Office of Safeguards and Security has no authority to demand compliance with departmental security policies and requirements.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

I would be less than forthcoming if I failed to mention some positive aspects of the department's safeguards and security program. Let me start by saying that the program is staffed by hard working dedicated men and women throughout the country who are firmly committed to protecting the critical national security assets entrusted to their care. The responsibilities of these individuals are most demanding, even dangerous in some respects. Yet despite the dwindling resources made available to them, these individuals continue to perform in outstanding fashion. Where this department has failed is in providing these professionals the necessary resources to allow them to perform their responsibilities appropriately. The Department has also failed to provide protection so that individuals will bring forward problems and deficiencies without fearing retaliation.

Progress has been made in some of the areas I previously addressed. In the area of physical security, the Department is working to correct identified weaknesses. Specifically, the Department augmented security at some field sites by deploying new technologies to safeguard special nuclear materials and weapons; worked with other agencies to train departmental protective forces; identified and developed more sophisticated detection and deterrent systems; and hired additional security personnel. New explosive detection systems are being installed at selected nuclear facilities and some sites are upgrading access control systems.

In the area of information security, the Secretary recently directed the shut down of classified computer operations at three national laboratories until such time as he was assured that information processed on the systems is being done so securely. From a longer-term perspective, the department is requesting a dramatic increase in budget for information security. The additional funding will be used to help further secure the department's classified and unclassified computer networks. The improvements will help strengthen fire walls, develop better intrusion detection devices, and fund rapid response teams to work with the FBI to detect and track cyber intruders.

In the area of the control, measurement and accountability of special nuclear materials, the Department has established the Fissile Materials Assurance Working Group (FMAWG) to assess needed areas of improvement and make recommendations. In this regard, the FMAWG identified unmeasured materials and initiated actions to resolve discrepancies. They further identified issues regarding the safeguarding of irradiated material and are promulgating policy for implementation. The Department is developing new technologies for tamper indicating devices and proposing pilot projects for field implementation.

A PATH FORWARD

All of these positive steps are good, necessary actions to ensure the adequacy of our protection posture. More is needed, however. As previously addressed, organizational realignment of safeguards and security activities is sorely needed. I understand that this is now under review by the department. While addressing the problems inherent in the current organizational structure of the Department will not in itself solve all of the issues contained in this report, it will establish the necessary framework to allow resolution in a more effective and lasting manner. Simple organizational realignment, however, by itself, will not result in the fundamental change in approach that is required. The Department should work closely with Congress to establish a budget line item for safeguards and security. Doing so will enable a more accurate accounting and control of safeguards and security expenditures. It will also improve the likelihood that policy will be issued in conjunction with the necessary resources to implement that policy.

It should be apparent that attempts to have effective internal oversight of the DOE safeguards and security program have failed

over a twenty-year period. While there have been high points and periods when oversight has been effective, organizational and budget pressures have played too central a theme for this function to remain within DOE. An organization like the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board should be established to independently review Security at DOE and the Laboratories. Further a direct reporting mechanism should be established to one or more of the Congressional Committees.

Perhaps the biggest challenge facing the department today as we strive to meet our protection responsibilities is the attitude throughout the complex toward security. There are some that believe that safeguards and security is an overhead expense. I disagree, strongly. Safeguards & security is a mission-critical element. Without it, why bother creating new national defense technologies, if present or future foes can have ready access to it? To treat it as a mission-critical element requires a greater sense of accountability than seen to date. Secretary Richardson has committed to establishing and maintaining a sound safeguards and security program. It will take the commitment not only of the Secretary, however, but of each and every program official throughout the department if this mission essential element is to be fulfilled. It is incumbent upon senior departmental management to make safeguards and security a priority. It is too important to be relegated to a secondary status where its operations are viewed as ancillary. Both Congress and the public rightfully expect our best effort in executing this vital program. We should demand no less from ourselves.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Germantown, MD, January 27, 1997.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION LIST

From: Edward J. McCallum, Director, Office of Safeguards and Security.

Subject: Status of Safeguards and Security.

This report provides a comprehensive review of Safeguards and Security activities throughout the Department of Energy complex during 1996 and provides a candid look at the future of the Program. The report is structured to present a Departmental perspective of the Safeguards and Security Program to senior management and all safeguards and security professionals. For the first time the report also contains a section which summarizes safeguards and security participation in National Nuclear Command and Control activities.

During the past year disturbing trends continued that resulted in additional budget reductions, further diminishing technical resources, reducing mission training and undermining our ability to protect nuclear weapons, special nuclear materials and other critical assets. This is occurring at a time of increased responsibilities resulting from the international transfer of nuclear materials and dismantling of U.S. nuclear weapons. Although traditional and time proven protection principles are still emphasized, it is becoming increasingly difficult to adequately protect our nation's nuclear stockpile in the face of inadequate resources, obsolescent systems, aging protection forces and funding uncertainties. This has increasingly resulted in a ''hollow-force'' that goes below the ''bottom line'' and makes it more difficult to fulfill National Security mandates. It is imperative that the Safeguards and Security downward resource spiral be immediately halted. Further, nuclear materials must be consolidated to reduce costs or additional resources must be found for protection. Adequate investment is essential to sustain a vital Safeguards and Security Program that continues to support the nation's security, the public health, safety and our environment.

I am confident that the report will be a valuable tool to stimulate open conversation, provide constructive feedback and assist in addressing the continued viability of the Department's Safeguards and Security Program. Collectively, we must continue to strive to maximize the use of our resources necessary to ensure requisite security for the Nation's and the Department's most vital assets.

Attachment.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, March 16, 1999.

Dr. ERNEST MONIZ,
Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy, Washington, DC

DEAR DR. MONIZ: As the Central Intelligence Agency's representative to the Department of Energy (DOE) Security Management Board, I would like to convey some important perspectives concerning on-going discussions to reorganize the Department's security element. Of concern is consideration that is being given to further decentralize DOE's security management apparatus and assignment of security expenses to indirect costs (i.e., overhead) at the individual sites and Laboratories. In my judgment, and based on our experience at CIA, DOE should undertake such reorganizational and budgetary alignments advisedly.

Using CIA's experience as an example, reorganization through division can be highly ineffective and inefficient. Shortcomings to CIA's 1994 decision to divide the Office of Security were quickly exposed, including: expensive duplication of security activities, deteriorated management focus over a tangential security program, elimination of a coherent security career service, and dilution of CIA's leadership role in the Community. Adding to the difficulties, security managers under this arrangement had limited control over their fiscal fate, having been placed alongside and beneath numerous budgetary layers.

Director Tenet recognized these inefficiencies immediately, and placed me in charge of consolidating CIA's program in 1997. In addition, he has provided security with a stronger voice in its fiscal future. The process to reconstitute our security apparatus has been challenging; but, its benefits have already become apparent through a stronger, more viable security program.

The lessons learned after CIA decentralized its security organization have also been experienced by other agencies, several of which have chosen to reconsolidate their activities. With such stark examples of the shortcomings of decentralization in security apparatuses, I urge you to give strong consideration to the implications of such reorganization of DOE.

Furthermore, in today's world of sophisticated technological threats, and given the developing review at one of the National Laboratories so widely publicized, I would further caution against leading the charge toward field autonomy, and anticipated the Department looking toward reinforcing centralized security expertise.

When appointed to the Security Management Board a year ago I expected that the Department wanted the input of the representatives from other Agencies in security issues of this nature. In fact, I believed that obtaining such outside counsel on issues of this nature was the purpose for which the Board was created. Unfortunately, my experience with the Board indicates that it is a feckless exercise with no accomplishments almost fifteen months after it was established. I would welcome the opportunity to further discuss my views with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND A. MISLOCK, Jr.,
Associate Deputy Director
For Administration for Security.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 3, 1999]

CONGRESS BRINGS NEW INQUIRES INTO WEAPONS SECURITY FAILURES

(By John J. Fialka)

WASHINGTON.—House and Senate investigators are launching new inquires into the Energy Department's $800 million security program and how it failed to stop the apparent compromise of many of the nation's most valuable nuclear-weapons secrets.

Rep. John D. Dingell, the Michigan Democrat who led several of the House Commerce Committee's previous investigations in the 1980s and early 1990s, charged that the department runs a system of ''inverse reward and punishment.'' People who have identified lax security at the nation's defense labs have been punished and those who somehow finesse, ignore or abuse the program have been rewarded, he said.

The panel will hold hearings this week on the latest example of this seeming paradox: Edward McCallum, the Energy Department's top internal critic of security deficiencies, has been put on leave and is being investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigations for allegedly leaking secret information. At the same time, Wen Ho Lee, the former Los Alamos nuclear-weapons scientists who allegedly transferred many of the nation's most sensitive nuclear-weapons codes to an unprotected computer between 1983 and 1995, is described by the FBI as being ''unprosecutable.''

There is no evidence that China obtained any of the codes, although Mr. Lee met with China's weapons experts on two occasions during the 1980s and Chinese scientists were among the most frequent visitors to the lab.

The Commerce Committee has threatened to subpoena 13 Energy Department officials who know about the investigation of Mr. McCallum, a 25-year department veteran who, among other things, has complained about difficulties in trying to protect the secret computer system at Los Alamos. The network of 2,000 computers is used to store digital models of nuclear tests that show, moment-to-moment, how nuclear weapons work.

Committee members have invited Mr. McCallum to testify along with another department veteran, Glenn Podonsky, who runs internal inspections for the agency. While Republicans are leading the charge in the various congressional investigations, the two witnesses and others are expected to tell of foul-ups and budget shortfalls that date to the Carter administration.

Energy Department reports show that Mr. Podonsky, as early as 1994, had identified the problem that researchers could transfer data from the secured computer system to the unprotected one.

Over the weekend, Department of Energy officials said that a classified report prepared by U.S. intelligence agencies in November showed that there had been numerous efforts to penetrate the weapons laboratories' unclassified computer system. The secret report also noted that China was among

a number of nations the laboratories should regard as a threat. Still, investigators didn't examine Mr. Lee's computer until March and didn't close down the classified system until last month. The report's findings were first published in the New York Times.

Brooke Anderson, a spokeswoman for Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, said the secretary ''is extremely concerned that the hearing may bring potential disclosures of classified information and his priority is to protect the national security.'' Mr. Richardson, a former member of the Commerce Committee, irritated its leaders after a security hearing last week, accusing the panel of ''exhuming the past.''

David Tripp, Mr. McCallum's lawyer, said the information involved in the allegations against Mr. McCallum wasn't classified and that he is being punished for being ''a pain in the neck'' about exposing security problems. Rose Gottemoeller, the assistant energy secretary who removed Mr. McCallum from his job, denied that was the reason, calling Mr. McCallum ''a valued security professional'' who has made ''major improvements.''

Despite substantial spending on ''gates, guards and guns,'' one problem that had received relatively little scrutiny is the so-called insider threat. As the Cold War has faded, the threat has grown because many Americans now shun careers in engineering, physics and mathematics—skills in demand at the weapons labs. The shortage forced the labs to turn to foreign-born experts who had become naturalized U.S. citizens, such as Mr. Lee, Taiwanese whose skills included modeling nuclear-weapons explosions on supercomputers.

[From the TelePort of: Ed McCallum, May 7, 1999]

To: Al Santoli.

Memo: This is draft and has not been given to DOE except verbally. It clearly shows there was no classified unless DOE wants to change the published rules./Ed

DRAFT

HERNDON, VA, *May 6, 1999.*

Subject: Classification Analysis of Rocky Flats Transcripts

Mr. JOSEPH MAHALEY,

Director, Office of Security Affairs, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOE: Since I have not been given the opportunity to present my technical analysis of the classification decisions that I made during the subject discussions with the DOE contractor whistleblower, Mr. Jeff Peters, I will do so now. The presentation being made in this letter should have been part of the first step of the inquiry process described in DOE Manual 471.2–1B, 7a.(1), and should have been completed before proceeding with any inquiry. If both sides of a technical discussion had been laid on the table before the Department's classification authority, I firmly believe a determination would have been made at that time that the tape conversation and subsequently released transcripts were unclassified.

To date, six authorized classifiers have assessed the transcripts. Two areas of the conversation have been identified for further review. First, reference is made to ''20 percentile'' and ''80 percentile'', but no further context is provided by either speaker. Even if the reader can speculate the discussion relates to protective force computer modeling, no specific scenario is developed, no specific facility (e.g. building or vault, as stated in Topic 610 of CG–SS–3) is identified, and no specific attack developed.

DOE Classification Guide, CG–SS–3, Chapter 6, ''Vulnerabilities'', D. states clearly that information must, ''meaningfully aid a terrorist or other malefactor in targeting DOE facilities or bypassing security measures . . .''.

Vulnerability is defined in Appendix A, Definitions of CG–SS–3, as ''an exploitable capability or an exploitable security weakness. . . . If the vulnerability were detected and exploited by an adversary, then it would reasonably be expected to result in a successful attack . . .''. Clearly, no exploitable vulnerability is discussed within the meaning and intent of this classification guide that has been used by DOE for over 25 years.

The second area of conversation identified for review is the statement ''Put some HE on top of it and boost it up—you don't need to take it in the middle of Denver, it's going in the middle of Denver anyway.'' This portion of the conversation refers to a radiological dispersal device. CG–SS–3, Chapter 3, ''Malevolent Dispersal of Radioactive Material'', provides detailed guidance for classification in this area:

Paragraph C, states that for information to be classified it must be,'' . . . detailed, specific information that, if not controlled, would significantly enhance the probability of such a dispersal''. Further elements of the same paragraph require elements such as ''Details of specialized access procedures to areas or equipment . . .''. ''Detailed scenarios (combining details of radioactive source type, size and form; container design; dispersal mechanism design) . . .''

Topic 1101.1 states specifically ''Trivial or generally known methodology'' is *Unclassified*.

Topic 1030, ''Design of credible Radiation Dispersion Device (RDD), states a design is ''Unclassified for unsophisticated designs.''

Topic 1052 cites ''Generic description of methods that could be used to disperse radioactive material (e.g., fire, *explosives*)'' as Unclassified.

Special nuclear materials discussed in the conversations have been publicly associated with the nuclear weapons program and included in Section 51 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. They are defined as ''Pure Products'' and as ''High-Grade Materials'' in unclassified DOE Regulations and in CG–SS–3.

Further, information concerning radioactive source term and scenarios of worst case dispersal with consequence estimates are contained in great detail in Safety Analysis Reports for each site. These reports contain worst case scenarios for radiological releases. They are unclassified, published and available in DOE Public Reading Rooms and periodically on the internet.

I know of no other issues that have been reviewed or could be considered even close to classified information. Further, I was given a 30-minute briefing on Defense Programs weapons design program(s) in the past. Nothing I have seen or heard of these programs would void or invalidate the published guidance in CG–SS–3.

I firmly believe that I have not disclosed classified information and have not crossed any boundaries, real or imagined. In no case were details or specifics provided any reader. Speculation might cause a reader to draw conclusions that are completely external to these illegally recorded conversations. The transcripts have been reviewed by a number of authorized classifiers and all have reached the conclusion that the conversation does not contain classified information and in no way crossed any prohibited boundaries.

I believe I have seen a rush to judgment on this classification issue and subsequent actions that violate the procedures published in DOE classification guidance and DOE Manuals relative to the investigation of a potential compromise. If the basic elements of ''due process'' had been followed this would have only been a technical discussion with possible clarified technical guidance provided by one side or the other. In closing, if Defense Programs believes these elements are so sensitive, then why weren't adequate physical protections immediately put in place to allay their concerns?

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,

Germantown, MD, February 3, 1999.

Memorandum for Joseph S. Mahaley, Director, Office of Security Affairs

From: Edward J. McCallum, Director, Office of Safeguards and Security

Subject: Hagengruber Study.

I have completed my initial review of the subject document and offer the following impressions. These thoughts are not intended to be all inclusive, nor do they address all of the facts that I find questionable. In this regard, I have directed the Office of Safeguards and Security (OSS) Program staff to conduct a thorough review of the entire report with respect to its factual accuracy. Upon completion of this review, detailed comments regarding factual inaccuracies will be forwarded. Beyond the factual accuracy of some of the items found in the report, however, it is evident that this study not only misses the mark of the task assigned, but if left unchallenged could serve to damage the Department's standing in the security and intelligence community at large.

In reading the report, I am struck by the elementary understanding it portrays of the Safeguards and Security (S&S) Program, specifically as it relates to the national level directives that provide much of the foundation for many of the areas called into question. There is no mention of the Presidential Decision Directives (PDD) or the requirements contained therein governing federal agencies and their policies toward counterterrorism, explosives detection, radiological sabotage, and chemical/biological weapons defense. In fact the assertions offered are in direct contradiction to President Clinton's policy on Counterterrorism promulgated in PDD–39. For a study that spent the better part of a year examining the Department's S&S Program, I find this glaring omission of national policies to be alarming. Furthermore, it conveys a lack of understanding of the environment in which the Department operates that consequently diminishes the value of any findings or recommendations.

Beyond the lack of depth of understanding of S&S Program requirements, however, I find the team failed to answer the only question that was posed to them. Specifically, whether current—DOE practices ensure that Special Nuclear Material (SNM) and Nuclear Weapons are adequately protected against Raidological Dispersal Device (RDD) and Improvised Nuclear Device (IND) threats. The short statements in the report that we need to change policies to require a higher standard of protection of SNM is gratuitous and provides no new information. The single graphic depicting greater quantities of explosives relative to SNM types was recognized long ago when the Atomic Energy Commission began this program, and again in 1988 when the graded safeguards table for SNM protection was established. I was disappointed to find that the validation of specific time lines of existing guidelines currently in the Secretary's office awaiting

completion of this study were completely avoided.

Equally disappointing is the amount of effort and detail directed at the management and organizational issues that have been previously reported in numerous studies to include your Report to the Secretary of October 1997 and the OSS Annual Report to the Secretary of January 1997. That the fragmented and divisive S&S structure is difficult to manage is well acknowledged and has been addressed repeatedly by DOE through reorganization and restructuring (e.g., SAI 26). There is no new information here, and the recommendations offered are confusing and inconsistent with one another. The solution as I understand it would further decentralize authority and responsibility to field sites thereby recreating the exact same environment as existed in Counterintelligence prior to the issuance of PDD 61.

The report wades through a plethora of symptoms and offers the often repeated Laboratory rhetoric to limit Headquarters involvement and trust the contractor to carry out the government's mission. Trust is not the question, execution is. As you know, cost is an essential element of risk management. The House of Representatives, Committee on Commerce, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee challenged the DOE on the oversight of its contractor's S&S programs throughout the 1980's and early 1990's. Senator Glenn asked the same questions in Senate, Government Affairs Committee hearings. These facts are either unknown or ignored by the report team. I have yet to hear an allegation that DOE provides too much oversight of our contractors except from the Labs. Consequently, the suggestion that S&S should be funded through a site's overhead budget is simply irresponsible. It is unclear to me how this would be the preferred method of funding. Such a move would further remove the Department's control over this critical area. It is precisely this approach to safeguards and security as an ''overhead'' function that has led to many of our difficulties. It further underscores the lack of understanding of the mission essential element of safeguards and security as it relates to the Department's overall mission. It is precisely this type of thinking that Admiral Crowe's January 1999 report on the embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar Es Salaam warns against. In his cover letter to Secretary Albright he expresses concern about the ''. . . relative low priority accorded security concerns throughout the US government—by the Department, other agencies in general, and on the part of many employees both in Washington and in the field.'' Admiral Crowe goes on to advise that, ''Saving lives and adequately addressing our security vulnerabilities on a sustained basis must be given higher priority by all those involved if we are to prevent such tragedies in the future.''

Again, this lack of understanding leads to another distrubing assertion found in the report. Specifically that: ''Safeguards and security is not a mission of DOE. Rather, safeguards and security is the responsibility of the DOE and contractor management at individual sites.'' Such a statement is contrary to Department of Energy's Strategic Plan of September 1997. Under the Strategic Plan's National Security Strategic Goal is the objective to ''ensure the vitality of DOE's national security enterprise.'' In support of this objective is a strategy to ''ensure the protection of nuclear materials, sensitive information and facilities.'' The fact that safeguards and security is found in the Strategic Plan as well as in the Secretary's Performance Agreement with the President clearly raises its level of import to more than ''a requirement of operation.''

A final point worthy of note is the complete lack of understanding of the Department's Design Basis Threat (DBT) process. The FBI, CIA, DOE, and the military services as well as the Nuclear Command and Control Staff have developed the existing Design Basis Threat over a number of years. It has been extensively reviewed and supporting studies issued by the DIA. Sandia, as well as our other Labs, have been asked to comment and participate in the development process. To describe the process and approach as flawed further underscores the superficial nature and questionable analysis found in the report.

Perhaps most distressing is the lack of balance in its approach to the critical safeguards and security issues facing the Department. Rather, what is provided is a very parochial Defense Programs/Laboratory view that ignores not only the external drivers found in national level policies, but a total lack of understanding of specific procedures implementing these policies. Suffice to say, I am strongly opposed to the continued funding of Phases II and III of this effort. If Phase I is any indication of the quality of effort that might be expected, any further funding in this regard would be imprudent at best. Nonetheless, if the program is continued, I strongly suggest we manage the direction and quality of the next phase.

As stated in this and other studies, successful resolution of the issues facing this Department relative to safeguards and security will require a concentrated effort on the part of all interested parties to include the Office of Defense Programs and the National Laboratories. What concerns me is that critical information concerning these issues is missing from this study. While such an omission may serve certain short term interests, it is not in the best interest of the Department or the nation. As an agency, we must endorse and implement two significant objectives concerning our protection strategy: (1) to protect our nation's critical assets from those who would cause our nation harm, and (2) to protect the forces that secure our facilities from unnecessary vulnerability. To do any less is to undermine our national security responsibility, which is without question, a core mission of this Department.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, Mr. McCallum has been punished and has been placed on administrative leave and may lose his job. Guess who now sits on the corporate board of directors, being paid, overseeing the operation of that same facility? You guessed it, Madam Speaker. Hazel O'Leary. Hazel O'Leary now sits on the board of directors of the company that oversees the Rocky Flats facility that Mr. McCallum attempted to bring to the attention of the Congress was being protected in a woefully inadequate way. What is the response of this administration? To make him the scapegoat.

It is a shame that he did not precede Notra Trulock, because as many of my colleagues know, it was Notra Trulock who began to blow the whistle on this administration for not paying attention in 1995 to security breaches that were occurring in the Department of Energy. But Notra Trulock lucked out. Because when the administration realized that what Notra Trulock was saying was true, they could not go after him. They gave Notra Trulock a $10,000 bonus and now Notra Trulock is on national media programs and talks about how the administration has gotten its act together.

It is a shame that Mr. McCallum did not precede Notra Trulock. Perhaps he would have gotten the $10,000 raise for being the whistle-blower. I can tell my colleagues, Madam Speaker, I am not going to sit by, and neither are a number of our colleagues, and see an innocent individual doing his job professionally be railroaded out of his position because this administration is embarrassed over the policies of their lack of control and decontrol in security measures involving our national laboratories, our Department of Energy facilities, our defense installations, and our military and other technology.

The American people, Madam Speaker, can now read the statement of Mr. McCallum for themselves in tomorrow's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The American people also now, Madam Speaker, can read information I provided last evening giving the big picture of the China connection. I want to review that again today in some more detail.

As a member of the Cox committee, I had the opportunity, over the 7 months that we worked aggressively on this project, to meet a number of senior and very capable intelligence officers and people within our intelligence establishment who are absolutely frustrated by what they see occurring in this administration on security issues. When we completed the Cox Commission report, I knew that the American people would not sit through and read, for the most part, a document that is almost a thousand pages in length. Very difficult to understand.

So working with this group of people, and I would add for the record, who are today currently employees of this administration, so I cannot name them because they will be given the same treatment as Mr. McCallum has been given, these people have given me the information that I am providing to our colleagues and to the American people.

This chart, Madam Speaker, for the first time, even though it looks like a hodgepodge of blocks, it can be pulled down on the Internet site, as I have said earlier, and this site is www.house.gov/curtweldon. This document gives the full pictorial representation of what we think China had planned to acquire western technology.

Now, should we fault China for establishing this network? Probably, yes. But as many have said, what country does not spy or look to acquire technology from other countries? I would

say we are the fools if we are stupid enough to allow China to access information that we should be controlling. And that is why I think the bulk of the responsibility here, Madam Speaker, lies with our own government. It was our government that failed the American people.

This chart outlines the Central Military Commission of the People's Liberation Army of China. The red boxes on this chart, which are too difficult to read without having the chart directly in front of you, are the various military commands and entities that are a part of the Central Military Commission that we know have been involved in engaging and in acquiring technology for China. Now, some of that acquisition has been legal, and there is nothing wrong with that. If they can buy it, how can we fault China for buying things we are legally willing to sell them or other countries will sell them? Some of it was not legal. By and large, though, much of what they got, they got through legal manipulation that we allowed to occur.

The green boxes are those entities and banks and financial institutions here, in Hong Kong and Macao, as well as in Europe and Asia, that were designed to fund the acquisition of these technologies. Now, because they could not buy them directly, front companies were established, and they are the blue boxes. We estimate there were hundreds and hundreds of front companies established by the Chinese to acquire technologies, paid for by these entities, to go to the arms of the People's Liberation Army, because that is a desire they had for these specific technologies.

A very elaborate scheme, but very simple. The financing through the entities to buy it go back to those entities that wanted to improve their missile systems, their nuclear programs, their computing capabilities, the design of their fighter aircraft, whatever the need might be. Again, if we are stupid enough to sell sensitive technology, how can we just blame China for buying it in the open market? This was the network.

Now, we can see that what we did not look at in the Cox committee is what influenced these people to allow this technology to flow. Was it money, was it influence, was it a desire to increase economic activity for American companies? What was the motivation? We did not look at that in our China committee effort. We thought that should be a follow-on once we determined that there was security harm done to our country. That is why I prepared this document and the document I am going to follow up with.

There are some connections here, Madam Speaker, that the American people need to look at, because some of these green boxes have attached to them campaign donations. Ted Sioeng, $200,000 to $400,000 to the Democratic National Committee. Or John Huang and James Riady, and all of these people who contributed millions of dollars to the Democratic National Committee. Or the temple that gave, through Maria Hsia, $50,000 at a fundraiser at a temple of impoverished religious leaders. Those connections need to be pursued.

This information, Madam Speaker, has been investigated much more thoroughly by the FBI and the CIA than I have. Now, I have seen some of the classified versions of this, which are far more elaborate, which I obviously cannot show publicly. What I have shown here is an unclassified version of the connections between these agencies that have been publicly identified. And in response to a question by a Member of Congress at a public hearing, Louie Freeh, the director of the FBI, was asked: ''How much of the information that we are aware about in public form, like this, compares to what you know in the FBI and the CIA about what happened in this entire series of transactions?'' This was the response of FBI director Louie Freeh. ''The public knows about 1 percent.'' One percent of what went on that we have in the FBI and the CIA in terms of these connections. One percent, Madam Speaker, which means that 99 percent beyond this our intelligence and our law enforcement agencies know about but we do not.

□ 2215

Madam Speaker, the individual that Louis Freeh assigned to investigate this, Charles LaBella, when he got through all of this evidence, well beyond what I have, wrote a memorandum to Louis Freeh that I have been told is almost 100 pages in length. That then resulted in Louis Freeh sending a memo to Janet Reno saying there is enough evidence here that you better impanel a special investigative effort, an independent counsel, because of what may be here. Janet Reno refused Louis Freeh and refused Mr. LaBella. That document has never been released to the Members of Congress nor the American public. In fact, I am not aware of any Member of Congress that has read that memo. But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, every Member of this body and every citizen in America should demand of this President one thing, and, that is, to release the LaBella memorandum. If this President and Vice President GORE have nothing to hide, if there are no connections, if there is no scandal, if there is no grand scheme, if there are no implicating factors, it can all go away very quickly by releasing the LaBella memorandum. That document has been subpoenaed by the Congress and it has been refused by Janet Reno to be turned over to us so that we have not had the opportunity to see what Charles LaBella said was there in that 99 percent of information that we do not know about. What I have given to the American people is the unclassified information that they can read, and it in itself is revealing. In fact, Madam Speaker, you will notice there are lines connecting many of these boxes. The solid lines indicate direct working relationships between the PLA entities, the financing entities, and the front companies. So they are directly linked. The dotted lines, which are fewer in number, are those where there is a loosely connected relationship but not a direct relationship. Now, the logical question is, ''Well, hold it, Congressman, you can't just draw lines. You've got to provide some documentation.'' Well, we did. Again working with existing employees of this government who have been frustrated by what they have seen occurring have helped me identify 26 documents that are available on the public record that are not classified, that include newspaper articles, research documents, business reports, company annual reports where you can connect the lines. Each of the numbers on this chart which corresponds with a line gives you a specific document that you can read which I have outlined and identified in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday which you can get off of my web site which gives you the public information that supports the linkage between these various entities. It is public information. Now, that is not all. And the media when I brought this out last week said, ''Well, wait a minute, you haven't established a direct relationship.'' I cannot show classified information here. That is a violation of our Federal laws. I have given unclassified documentation which without a doubt shows the connections between the major players in the effort to allow China to acquire technology that they have been wanting to buy.

Now, the administration would have us believe that this is really all concocted by China and that we should make China the evil empire. I am not doing that, Madam Speaker. I cannot blame China if decisions made by this administration allowed technology to flow legally, and that is what occurred in most cases. The influence that was peddled by these financial people ended up lowering the controls over our regulation of technology being sold abroad. The influence exercised by these people and their money influenced key decisionmakers in this administration. In my opinion, that lies in terms of fault at the feet of this administration itself. And as much as we would like to totally blame China, I blame our own government.

Now, are there instances where China went too far? Absolutely. And I would say this again on the record. If we can document that there is direct espionage that took place at our labs or at other facilities, we should use the full

force of our law to prosecute those people who in fact spied on America, much like we have done in the past. But we cannot blame a country if we willingly sold them the bulk of this technology because of influence they were able to get by putting some money around or by currying favor with certain people.

Let me go to the second chart, Madam Speaker. The second chart, which was also prepared with the help of existing employees that work for this government who are in sensitive positions, gives the time line, the time line of liberalized and decontrolled technologies to the People's Republic of China. But I want you to know, it was not just China that benefited from these policies. Many of these policy decisions benefited a number of countries who were able to legally buy our technology.

Now, I am not against our companies selling technology abroad. In fact, I am an advocate of our companies being able to sell and compete in the world marketplace. But, Madam Speaker, that is not what occurred here. What occurred here was the elimination in a wholesale way of a legitimate process that was in place under previous administrations to monitor technology and to do it with our allies. As I mentioned last night, the reason I started this chart in 1993 was not because that is when Bill Clinton took office, it was because in 1993 this President ended a process called COCOM. COCOM was an organized group of our allied nations and Japan that met on a regular basis to monitor sensitive technology that was produced in any one of the allied countries. There was an agreement that none of those COCOM nations would sell sensitive technology to countries that we thought might use it against us, so that none of our companies were hurt because all the countries that have this technology were working together so that no one could benefit.

It was this administration in 1993 that unilaterally decided to end COCOM, did away with it. Without even consulting with our allies, we said, ''We're doing away with this process.'' From 1993 on, the floodgates opened. Because now you had companies in Great Britain and France and Japan who said, ''Wait a minute, there's no more COCOM, we're not going to let the U.S. sell this technology abroad, we're going to sell competing technology.'' So now you had a mad scramble, you had American companies trying to keep up with German, French, Italian, British and Japanese firms who now saw American companies selling technologies that under COCOM they could not sell. So the European countries and Japan said, ''Wait a minute, we're going to sell that technology as well,'' and you had a mad scramble to sell technology in a totally uncontrolled fashion. That began in 1993 under this administration. The Commerce Department will tell you it was good for business. Some business leaders will tell you it was good for business. We on the Cox Committee will tell you it was bad for America. Other allied nations will tell you it was bad for international security. Proliferation has never been worse than it has been for the past 6 years. Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea, India, Pakistan, all have cutting-edge technologies that up until 1993 were tightly controlled by COCOM, all of that ended by this administration. That is the focus of the Cox report.

The chronology of this chart takes each technology separately: warhead design, machine tools, low observable technologies, telecommunications, propulsion systems, high-powered computers, encryption technology, space launch technology, and analyses when key decisions were made by this administration and gives you the month and the date that allowed technologies to flow that up until these dates were controlled. And you can see by the number of red dots here that during this time frame, the floodgates opened. We said, ''We'll sell anything and everything and we won't consult with our allies.'' So you have had a mad competition among companies in countries that up until 1993 worked together to make sure that no one could unfairly have a larger share of the market with sensitive technologies. After 1993, the demise of COCOM, the floodgates opened. Everything and anything was for sale. Our companies got their way, they got to sell whatever they wanted, foreign countries and companies the same thing, and China took advantage of it.

Now, there are some interesting other factors about this chart, Madam Speaker. You will notice a gray area in the center of this chart, starting in 1995, ending in 1997. Why did I make that gray? Because in 1995, we have been told by Bill Richardson that this administration found out that China was acquiring our most sensitive technology. And if you listened to Secretary Richardson, this is what he said: ''Boy, when we found that out, we took aggressive action. We said, 'We're not going to let China steal our technology.'''

Well, that is what he said. The color in the blue, Madam Speaker, and all the red dots you see here, just under Space Launch alone, 15 separate actions after this administration knew that China had stolen our design technologies that they took in 3 years to give more technology to countries like China. And that is across the board, Madam Speaker. So the blue indicates where this administration knew that China was trying to acquire this technology and doing it illegally, opened the floodgates even further for more technology.

There is one more factor here, Madam Speaker. All of us in America know when the elections were held. It is kind of interesting when you look at this chart from a distance that the bulk of the clustering of these dots are in and around the time frame of 1996. I wonder what was happening in that year, Madam Speaker? Might that have been the year when the presidential elections were being held? Could there be some coincidence that many of these key decisions in terms of policy changes were being done because elections were being held and maybe people were interested and from the standpoint of corporate America in having policymakers make determinations to allow more products to be sold overseas, could that be a reason? That is what the LaBella memorandum referred to, Madam Speaker, that this country needs to see for itself, the reasons why these decisions were made. Why did we change our policy so much? Why did we allow access? Why did we totally decontrol technologies in a way that was not being aware and cognizant of our own security concerns?

But it goes beyond these issues, Madam Speaker. Let us move down to this next item here. PRC Nationals to U.S. High Tech Companies. It was in 1994, in fact it was in March, that Chinese nationals to our U.S. labs and our U.S. high tech companies was allowed. The COMEX review of foreign nationals was abandoned, by this administration. That was in 1994. I am sure that was done because the companies wanted less hassle of foreign nationals going into our high tech companies. And over here in 1997, we revised our deemed exports policy to allow foreign nationals to work at U.S. high tech companies. Now, that was in 1997. These were decisions made that allowed more Chinese nationals to work in our high tech companies in America. And how about the high tech furnace approval for weapons of mass destruction? That approval was given in 1998, Madam Speaker, a technology that gives China capability for the production of weapons of mass destruction. Even though this administration said when they found out about the theft of nuclear secrets, they took aggressive action to control it.

Let us go down further, Madam Speaker. During this same period of time, China and Russia were both violating international arms control agreements. The Missile Technology Control Regime, the control of exports. We caught them on a number of occasions. In fact, in last night's special order, and again the American people can read this through my web site or get a copy of it through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last evening—and I did not do the work, the Congressional Research did the work—we documented the arms control violations that we caught Russia and China involved in

over 6-year time period. Here is that chronology as documented by the Congressional Research Service.

□ 2230

The dates, the type of transfer, who the transfer went to are all documented. This was not done by some partisan group; it was done by the Congressional Research Service, a part of the Library of Congress.

These violations of arms control agreements by China, were they sent technology? Where did they send the technology to? Let us look at the chart.

Well, they sent technology to Pakistan, Iran; Iran? North Korea. Syria. They sent solid propellant production technology to Libya, Iran, Egypt. They sent missile accelerometers and gyroscopes to Iran, Syria, Libya, Egypt and Pakistan. They sent antiship missiles to Iran. They sent more material to Pakistan; chemical weapons technology to Iran again.

All of these transfers done by China.

What was the response of this administration? Nothing.

On, yes, two times out of about 17 or 21, I forget which it is, they did impose temporary sanctions; but they eventually waived them.

So not only are we getting Chinese access in a way they never had access before, not only were we helping to expedite and grease the skids for the financing of the purchase of technologies, but we were ignoring violations of arms control agreements that China was required to abide by. We did not call them on these violations.

And at the bottom of the chart, Madam Speaker, even though I could not complete it, I was only able to do this up through 1996, I list a number of times that the major players in the Chinese financing scams visit at the White House, not visited Members of Congress, but were in private visits in the White House itself.

In the case of John Huang, in the one year of 1993 alone, we know of 12 times he was in the White House. In 1994, twice; in 1995, let us see, one, two, three times; or 1994, three times; 1995, three times. These are people that are involved in that elaborate scheme of organizations and financing entities that were given direct access to our White House, to our top policy maker to our commander in chief, to our key leaders who were then being pressured to relax our policies relative to technology being sold abroad.

Madam Speaker, these two charts represent the pictorial view of the Cox committee report. They represent what needs to be explored further.

I am not here as a partisan, Madam Speaker. Both times I ran for mayor of my hometown I was the nominee of the Republican Party and the Democrat Party both times I ran. I work with many Democrats in this body and frequently get up on the floor of this House and praise our Democrat colleagues for their leadership role on defense and security issues. I have joined with members of the Democrats on a number of key issues involving social policy, family medical leave, environmental policies, protection for our workers, and I have supported the President and the administration in some of those issues which my party has not been supportive of. But, Madam Speaker, when it comes to national security, we have a big problem here. This needs to be looked at beyond the Cox committee.

To me, I know why in my mind Janet Reno turned down the recommendation of Louis Freeh based on the memos sent by Charles LaBella to appoint an independent counsel. I am convinced, Madam Speaker, the evidence is there. I am convinced that 99 percent that we have been told we have not seen yet has far more than many people in this country want to become public.

I am also convinced, Madam Speaker, that we had better pay attention here. This is not some story about a dress, this is not some intern in the White House. This is not some story about a travel office. This is not even about Republicans or Democrats. Madam Speaker, this is about the very core of what our country is about. No one, no party official in either party, no elected leader, has the right to allow a wholesale technology faucet to open that we are going to have to pay the price for.

Now, if I am overreaching, Madam Speaker, I do not think I am because, a member of the Cox committee having sat through as many of those meetings as any one of my colleagues, with perhaps the exception of Chairman Cox himself, I know what evidence the FBI and the CIA has, and I have only seen a small fraction of what is not on this chart. I know there is much more.

If there is nothing there, Madam Speaker, the President can clear this entire issue up in a heartbeat. All he has to do is release the entire unabridged version of the Charles LaBella memo to Louis Freeh. If there is nothing to hide, if there is nothing to these connections, if there is no story, I will be happy.

I do not think that is the case, Madam Speaker. I think the reason why Janet Reno did not accept Louis Freeh's recommendation, based on LaBella's memo, is because she knew what is there. That document that LaBella prepared, which I understand is quite voluminous, goes into extensive detail and actually points to individual people.

Madam Speaker, this country, this democracy, needs the American people and its elected officials to see the overview of the evidence that LaBella gave to Freeh that now remains closed and confidential. If there is nothing there, then there is no problem with the memo; if there is no evidence, if there is no story, if there is no substance, the whole thing will go away, and the China story will end, and we will make the necessary corrections to our own policies.

Madam Speaker, I would encourage every one of our colleagues and every constituent in every district of a Member of this body and the other body to demand that this administration do one thing: release the full text, the uncensored text, of the Charles LaBella memorandum to Louis Freeh. Let us see what evidence they thought may be there in terms of a greater scheme for the Chinese to acquire technology by facilitating and greasing the skids of certain key people and certain key agencies that ended up with America's security being harmed. That was the unanimous vote of all nine members of the Cox committee, that America's national security has been harmed by the actions that we investigated in the Cox committee work.

We cannot just stop with this document, and we cannot rely on the mainstream media because with the exception of a few people like those that I have mentioned and some others, the mainstream media is too stinking lazy to go through the investigative details necessary to uncover what is here. We need to have this administration come clean, give us the uncensored text of what Charles LaBella said to Louis Freeh which only went to Janet Reno. When that happens, we will then know the true extent of the China connection and its impact with this administration.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from making personal references towards the President.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO DENY COMMUNIST CHINA NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). We have worked together over these last 10 years while I have been a Member of Congress on many, many occasions, and I find Congressman WELDON to be a patriot, a man of integrity, a man of courage, and I think when all of this is said and done, when we find out the jeopardy that our country has been put in and take the measures that are necessary to correct this situation and to

make our country safe again, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) will be on the list of real American heroes that came about to save the day, and I am just proud to serve with him.

Madam Speaker, tonight it is fortuitous that I will be speaking after the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) because my remarks are in parallel with what Mr. WELDON has been talking about. It goes into a slightly different subject. Tonight I will be talking about Most Favored Nation status and our economic, as well as military and diplomatic, relations with China. But of course everything that Mr. WELDON has said today amplifies the need that I will be demonstrating for us to reexamine American policy towards Communist China.

In fact, let me state right at the beginning that when it comes to Communist China, we have been treating a hostile power, the world's worst human rights abuser, as a strategic partner, that is what this administration has insisted on us calling Communist China, and I believe that Americans will pay a woeful price for this irrational, amoral and greed-driven policy if we do not change it, and that is what we need to do to change that policy that has been in place to some degree or another for 2 decades, but especially in these last 6 years.

Yesterday I introduced legislation to do just that, to change that policy. It is a bill of disapproval of extending so-called ''normal trade relations,'' which was previously known as Most Favored Nation status, with Communist China. So what my proposal is is that we deny Communist China normal trade relations status with the United States, formerly called Most Favored Nation status.

The time, Madam Speaker, is long since past when the United States should reexamine its fundamental policies toward the Communist dictatorship that now rules the mainland of China. Our commercial policies, as well as our diplomatic and military policies, for the past decade have worked against the interests of our own people and have not, as we had hoped, increased the level of freedom enjoyed by the Chinese people. In fact, some of the initial progress that we saw in China has now gone in the opposite direction, especially since the end of the Reagan administration and the tragic national reversal in China in 1989 at Tiananmen Square when they had the massacre at Tiananmen Square.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), one of our Republican leaders here in the House, defines ''insanity'' as doing more of the same, but expecting the results to be different. Well, for 10 years the cause of freedom in China has been in decline. Things are getting worse. So much for the engagement theory, the strategy of engagement, and what we hear from those people advocating normal trade relations and to continuing our relations with China is doing more of the same, but expecting that China is going to be different, that there will be different results now.

Well, that makes no sense. It is the unreasonable and perhaps irrational optimism of some people to assume that continuing our fundamental policies toward China will bring about different results than the retrogression that we have seen in the past decade.

In the past 10 years, the genocide, for example, has continued in Tibet. The Chinese democracy movement has been wiped out, and there has been increasing belligerence by the clique that runs China. The Beijing regime is modernizing and expanding its military power while threatening the United States and bullying its neighbors, especially in Taiwan and the Philippines.

Big business falsely claims that China is a country that is liberalizing through commercial engagement. There is no evidence for that claim. So every time you hear it: Well, we have got to engage them, that is what will make them better; just be aware that there is every evidence to show just the opposite. In fact, the empirical evidence shows that China is going in the opposite direction, that engagement is not making things better, is not causing a freer China, but instead for the last 10 years has resulted in more repression, more militarization.

Furthermore, the trade relationship is working against the people of the United States. So here we are in an economic engagement that is not helping us bring about a freer China, thus, less belligerent, thus a China that will be more peaceful. It is not doing that, but it is also not even helping us economically.

□ 2245

The Chinese are using their $60 billion annual trade surplus with us to modernize their Armed Forces, including building nuclear missiles aimed at the United States, and they are continuing to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. For example, Communist China is reported to be the power behind North Korea's space program. Get into that.

North Korea has a space program. This is a country that has people who are starving by the thousands, that we are giving millions of dollars worth of food aid to, but they have a space program? You got it. Communist China is helping the North Korean regime with a so-called space program. In other words, they are helping them build rockets that, when tested, end up flying right over Japan and land close to Alaska.

North Korea, of course, is not the only looney country Communist China is helping along with deadly weapons technology. You have got Iran, Libya, Pakistan, all have benefitted from Beijing's helping hand. Of course, some of the technology now being handed over is technology based on things that they have stolen, on ideas and engineering techniques that they have stolen from the United States of America.

On April 15 the Washington Post cited a Pentagon study that verified China is continuing to ship weapons of mass destruction technology to the Middle East and South Asia, despite repeated promises to end such activity.

A separate U.S. intelligence report found that China has recently provided North Korea with specialty steel used in the building of missile frames. However, the State Department officials, including Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, have repeatedly avoided answering questions before the House Committee on International Relations hearings when asked about China's ongoing proliferation activities.

When Secretary Albright was in China last summer with the President, China conducted its first successful test of a motor for its new DF–31 ballistic missile that can strike the United States from the Chinese mainland. So here was the President of the United States, so eloquent in his presentation, there he was representing us, along with Secretary of State Albright, supposedly representing our interests. They were aware that this new missile engine was being tested, a missile engine that could threaten the people of the United States. They were also aware that weapons technology had been stolen from the United States that would permit Communist China to build warheads, nuclear warheads, that would be on the top of those new rockets, and these rockets could strike the United States.

Yet there was no record of the Secretary of State or President Clinton raising this issue with their Chinese hosts. Instead, they continued on that visit to praise the increasingly, I would say increasingly brazen communist leaders, as being strategic partners, strategic partners, and the type of people that we can do business with.

This is very sad. It is more than sad, it is frightening. The recent Pentagon report describes how Chinese Government owned companies are selling weapons technology and knowhow and providing training to countries such as Iran and Pakistan. An American military official familiar with the report said that the Chinese are skirting nonproliferation treaties with the United States.

So they have agreed not to proliferate. This was the President's great accomplishment, supposedly, with Communist China. We were going to give them all sorts of things in trade benefits so they would not proliferate, yet we know now they are proliferating and developing weapons of their own and giving them to these hostile and

somewhat crazy states, states that are lacking in positive and responsible leadership. But Communist China is shipping them these weapons of mass destruction technology anyway, even though they have made these agreements.

The Chinese are shipping these rogue nations missile components, some of which, of course, are American products as well as American knowhow, and they are shipping the components rather than shipping the whole missile. That way they are saying they are not really proliferating missiles to these other countries.

But they are. They are proliferating on a routine basis, of course, without technically breaking the agreements with the United States, by just sending the parts to the missile. This nefarious behavior could be, we might call it the Mandarin version of a famous Arkansas homily, ''smoke, but don't inhale.''

After reading the Cox report, one is struck by the mind-boggling loss of our country's most deadly secrets. When you hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) explain the magnitude of the loss that we have seen, it takes your breath away and makes you wonder how our children will live, what type of lives they will live, whether or not America could be incinerated by a Chinese dictatorship that feels it can afford to lose hundreds of millions of people if it means wiping out its enemy, 100 or 200 million Americans.

The theft of U.S. nuclear secrets by Communist China is surpassed only by the complete abandonment of security precautions at our Department of Energy under the Clinton Administration, as well as a brazen attempt by the Clinton Administration to keep the knowledge of this catastrophic transfer of weapons technology, to keep the news of this from the Congress and the American people.

On May 30, the New York Times reported the utter cynicism and duplicity of the Clinton administration concerning our nuclear weapons programs. After the Cox committee released its report on Chinese espionage at our nuclear labs, Bill Clinton called protecting atomic secrets ''a solemn obligation.'' That is what President Clinton called it.

However, in private, administration officials told reporters, and this is reported by the New York Times, that openness, a euphemism for giving away our nuclear secrets, has its advantages, despite the risks, and has been a potent force for international good.

Hazel O'Leary, who the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has also quoted and talked about some of her policies, in fact Mr. WELDON was right on target and this will even add to what Mr. WELDON was saying, Hazel O'Leary, President Clinton's Secretary of Energy from 1993 to 1997, was the grand poobah of nuclear openness, as we have seen by what Mr. WELDON told us this evening. In fact, she massively declassified secrets and put them on the Energy Department's web site, including the diagrams of some advanced nuclear weapons which we saw tonight in Mr. WELDON'S presentation.

When asked about that recently, Mrs. O'Leary said, ''we pulled off an impossible feat,'' and she recently boasted this while defending her action. She went on, ''To say that all of our efforts were negative is not to understand the benefits, not to see what we did in terms of building international trust.''

See, the idea is if everybody had all this information, information about deadly weapons technology that we had spent hundreds of billions of dollars developing, that if everyone had it, well then, it might be a more peaceful world. This is worse than the Rosenbergs. This is looney tunes. This is someone who has a fanatical anti-American altitude in a position to hand over to our worst enemies secrets that put our young people and our country in jeopardy.

Needless to say, most defense experts obviously disagree with Mrs. O'Leary's bizarre, and I would say strange, logic. It takes more than a postgraduate degree from an ivy league school to have logic like this. However, O'Leary could not have undertaken this massive giveaway of a decade of brilliant and costly weapons research that permitted the United States to be the arsenal of democracy, she could not have done this without at least the tacit support of the Commander in Chief.

The New York Times surmised that the new age defense policy emanating from the White House explains why Mrs. O'Leary did this. It explains also the administration's slow response when confronted with very real evidence of Chinese spying and the loss of blueprints for frighteningly powerful weapons.

In 1993, O'Leary told a news conference at the start of the openness process, ''The United States must stand as a leader. We are declassifying the largest amount of information in the history of our department.'' O'Leary also did away with a counter-intelligence effort, security badges and effective security clearances. She eliminated all of these, as Mr. Weldon alluded to a few moments ago.

Remember the promise to reinvent government? Remember that promise? Well, this is it. This administration reinvented our government policy towards its labs. You might say they turned our nuclear labs into a high-tech K-Mart, I guess in Arkansas you might say Wal-Mart, in terms of the giving away or making available to international missile technicians and spies information that we invested billions of dollars to develop.

This was not a going-out-of-business sale on the part of the United States Government; this was a going-out-of-sanity sale on the part of the United States Government. Those who benefitted the most were the minions of the People's Republic of China, the Communist Chinese, our erstwhile constructive strategic partners.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California and our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) who preceded us in the well of the House. If there have been two among the 435 honored to serve in this chamber, it has been the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California who, together, have sounded the clarion call to the extent of the threat which affects our national security.

Madam Speaker, I was honored earlier today to bring to this floor a measure that deals with the educational security of rural America, and it is worth noting that there was not a single member of this House present who voted against the legislation for the New Education Land Grant Act.

Madam Speaker, I said at that time, this is an issue that affects us not as Republicans or as Democrats, but as Americans. Madam Speaker, the full House assembled worked its will in bipartisan fashion.

How sad it is, Madam Speaker, to see what transpires in this town via smoke and mirrors and spin, when we are dealing with a problem that threatens the security of every American; to read in the Little Rock Democrat Gazette from one columnist that this is some form of red scare, to have those hurl verbal brickbats at a clear and present danger to the United States.

As my colleague from California no doubt experienced during the district work period, Madam Speaker, I heard from countless constituents, from those who had borne the brunt of battle, from those who had worn the uniform of our country in peacetime and in war, from those who were concerned citizens, asking, what is this Chinese connection? What is this notion of a strategic partnership that would involve illegal political donations to those who would occupy our highest offices in the executive branch, what would possess business leaders to so jeopardize American security to grant technological prowess to the Communist China, and why would there be those within the administration who would turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to the theft of our most precious secrets?

□ 2300

As my colleague from California pointed out, why would there be cabinet officials who had a curious notion of utopia who would open our national labs, expose our national secrets, create an environment in which an employee at Los Alamos could put on an

unsecured computer our legacy codes, the width and breadth of American nuclear knowledge and technological knowhow to fall into the hands of any foreign power, but especially the Communist Chinese?

And how, Madam Speaker, could we have an Attorney General, given the number of wiretaps for national security that were authorized, fail to authorize the two wiretaps involving one Wen Ho Lee, the accused assailant who would surrender our nuclear secrets to the Communist Chinese?

Again, Madam Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from California, as our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, so eloquently pointed out, this is not a matter of being Republican or Democrat, this is not a matter of preening and posturing for the latest spin cycle.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, this goes to the core of our national security and the security of every American family and our place in the world, and those who would oppose us and use our technology against us. That is what we deal with.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, perhaps the most disturbing part of this whole controversy is the response that we have had from people who are trying to protect the administration from being held accountable for certain things dealing with this controversy.

For example, I heard in a committee hearing, those of us who were complaining about this were accused of vulgar partisanship, as if in bringing this up we were doing this out of partisan concerns.

I certainly explained at that point that the only thing vulgar and the only vulgar partisanship going on was that certain people on the other side felt compelled to have to try to block those of us who were trying to investigate this, trying to hold those who have committed this sin against the American people accountable, claiming that we were being partisan in doing so.

Even today we hear people who are apologists for this, and this has to be labeled a national security catastrophe of a magnitude that we have yet to experience. Even the Rosenberg catastrophe, where Josef Stalin got his hands on the first nuclear weapon, that was horrible, that was a bad thing. That affected the entire Cold War. It probably led to the war in Korea. But that probably was not as bad for our long-term national security as what has happened here.

But we are told even now by these people who are trying to say that, well, it is not really that bad, and how many times will we hear someone say, we spy, our allies spy, everybody spies, so how can we blame China? Yes, in a way, how can we blame China? We have to blame the incompetence or culpability of people in our government to let this happen.

But let me point out, it is not the same when Great Britain or Belgium or Italy or a democratic country spies on us. If Great Britain were to receive these benefits of all of this research that we have had into these terrible weapons systems, no one would worry. It would not be a big problem. We would not like it, but it is a democratic country. Great Britain is not aiming its weapons at the United States. We cannot perceive and conceive of a situation where they will.

But what we are talking about when someone says that, well, we spy, they spy, everybody spies, what they are talking about is a moral equivalency argument. This is the same moral equivalency argument that says there is nothing, no difference between a democracy and a vicious dictatorship.

What this leads to is this, this leads to the type of actions that were taken by Mrs. O'Leary there at the beginning of the administration and probably consistent with the President's world theory that you can just shovel all this information out so every country can have it, regardless if they are a dictatorship or a democracy, and it will not make any difference.

It is more likely, and this is the motive here if you have a moral equivalency argument, we can then let all of this information out and we can build a world authority, and perhaps that was the goal.

Two things we should know about, moral equivalency and globalism. Moral equivalency and globalism, that is a formula for tyranny. It is a formula for the destruction of the United States of America. There is nothing morally equivalent about a democratic country that protects the rights of its people, permits people to worship as they see fit. And yes, we are not perfect, but we have freedom of speech, and where we have imperfections, we can work together and we can try to make things better. But when there is a corrupt official, those who complain are not shot, like they are in Communist China. They are not thrown into a Lao Gai prison system.

There is no moral equivalency between dictatorship and a democratic government, especially the United States of America. It is this leftist concept that probably led Ms. O'Leary, Secretary O'Leary, to give this information out. Now it is being used right in front of our eyes to say, well, spies here, spies there, everybody spies. That is a fallacious argument.

A country that is a dictatorship, unlike a country that is a democracy, cannot be a trusted partner of the United States and a friend of the United States. If we do so, if we put our faith in dictators and gangsters and people who commit these types of heinous abuses against their people, we will pay an awful price. We are paying that price today.

Our administration continues to call it a strategic partner. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and then I will give some reasons why China cannot be a strategic partner of the United States.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I would thank my colleague from California, who eloquently establishes the dynamic and the challenge which we confront as a Nation. Thank God that we are a constitutional republic with rights guaranteed by the first amendment.

To those who would abridge those rights, to those who would turn a jaundiced eye to the abuses of others abroad, to those who would dare describe repressions, totalitarian regimes as strategic partners, it is time for a little straight talk.

I know my colleague is familiar with the work of Bill Gertz, the Washington Times national security reporter who has authored a comprehensive evaluation of the extent to which our secrets have been stolen and leaked to hostile Nations. The name of the book is entitled ''Betrayal.''

I would say not only does Communist China present a problem, but North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, those nations with whom the Communist Chinese have shared the nuclear technology reaffirms the fact that even in this alleged post-Cold War era, the world remains a dangerous place.

One other note I would point out to my colleague from California, Madam Speaker. When we assemble here in early January of the odd-numbered year every 2 years to take our oath of office, we take our oath of office to the Constitution of the United States. We heard the President and Vice President take a similar oath, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States; not the U.N. charter, not the NATO charter, not a utopian notion of a strategic partnership, but our allegiance is to our Constitution, to our sovereignty and to our legitimate national interest.

How tragic it is that it appears those national security interests have been bartered away for campaign contributions, or naively given away for global considerations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I would like to go through a few reasons of why China is not our strategic partner. People have to understand, there is a lot of rhetoric about China being the worst human rights abuser. People do not understand the specifics of what we are talking about.

What we have here is the world's largest dictatorship. According to Amnesty International, there are thousands of political prisoners who remain even today in the Lao Gai forced labor camps, which are a prison system where you have basically slave labor. Sometimes these are just, as we say, thousands of political prisoners who

are making some of these low-cost items, and this suit did not come from China.

□ 2310

But perhaps the suit worn by someone who is reading this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listening tonight is made in China. One must remember that that suit might have been made by someone who simply was a religious believer who was thrown into a prison system and forced for decades to work as a slave laborer because of his or her faith.

There are at least 2,000 persons in prison for so-called counterrevolutionary crimes. Some 200 Tiananmen Square protesters, after 10 years, are still in prison for peacefully participating in pro democracy protests.

During the past 2 months, the Chinese Communist government has issued new laws, this is just the last 2 months, that strengthen the Communist party and further restrict freedom of speech and the formation of political parties.

Genocide continues in Tibet where hundreds of thousands have perished since the invasion of 1950. China's own statistics show that, during the 1959 freedom uprising in Tibet 87,000 Tibetans were ''eliminated.'' Today the Tibet Information Center in London cites at least 183 political prisoners at the end of 1998, including 246 women. The Physicians of Human Rights have reported the brutal torture of Tibetan political prisoners by their Chinese jailers, and this torture by their Chinese jailers is rampant.

The Chinese Government has recently issued a new law in Tibet eliminating religion in and promoting Marxism. This is the Chinese Government in Beijing that has kidnapped this young religious leader who would then take the seat of the Dalai Lama someday if he is still alive. What monstrous regime would take a little child who is nothing more than a pacifist religious loader, a figure of pacifism and a religion of Buddhism, and take him away and perhaps murder him.

On May 29, the South China Morning Post Newspaper reported that, since March, Beijing has deployed extra troops to tighten control over Tibet. In addition, they have recruited former People's Liberation Army troops from China to migrate to Tibet to act as sort of a civil guard to assure China's control of Tibet by force.

So here we are, here we are fighting and spending tens of billions of dollars to try to thwart ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, but we are calling the Communist Chinese regime our strategic partners when they are engaged in ethnic cleansing every bit as brutal and every bit as tyrannical as what is going on in Kosovo.

When some people claim that China is not a threat to its neighbors, they conveniently forget that when Mao Tse Tung conquered China in 1950, Tibet was a sovereign country with its own language, its own religion, and its own culture. There is no difference, as I say, between China's occupation and the genocide of Tibet than Japan's brutal occupation and the ethnic cleansing of Manchuria in the 1930s.

The United States tried to pretend at that time in the 1930s that the Japanese were not committing an aggression. They had hoped that by trade and finance that the Japanese would be able to be turned, that the presence of Japanese students at our colleagues and universities, that dancing the Charleston would help the Japanese turn a different way, that Japan would be our friend with this type of engagement.

In 1941, these delusions lead to the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. Given the lethal power of today's weapons of mass destruction, we would not have the luxury of months to build up our Navy and our military and our Air Force to respond to a devastating surprise attack by China's so-called asymmetrical warfare plans.

In the Xinjiang region, in the far regions known as East Turkestan, that is Xinjiang, the suppression of religion, and that is the Muslim religion and political arrests and executions parallel the systematic brutality in Tibet.

In 1999, Amnesty International documented 190 executions of political prisoners in that province after unfair and summary trials. The report also cites 200 political prisoners known to be detained at this time with arbitrary arrests continuing.

Whether it is Tibet or in East Turkestan, while the local populations continue to decline, part through forced abortion, part through sterilization, ethnic Chinese, as I have stated, the ethnic Chinese are moving in. Hordes of them are coming in and establishing these areas as colonies, as resource-rich territories.

China is making major military moves, not only on the continent of Asia, but is moving towards places like the Spratley Islands, bullying our regional democratic allies, such as the Philippines and Indonesia, and threatening the vital sea lanes of the South China Sea.

There are some people who claim that it is wrong to compare the Communist Chinese to Hitler and the Natzis. I agree maybe that that comparison is not right. But I do believe that there is a more accurate comparison; and that is, the Communist Chinese should be compared to the militaristic regimes in the Japanese era of the 1920s, perhaps the regimes of Tojo and Yamamoto.

What was the goal of the Japanese in the 1920s? They believed themselves to be racially superior. They believed they had a right to dominate Asia and to conquer the Pacific. It is ironic that, in less than 10 years before the attack in Pearl Harbor, that Admiral Yamamoto attended graduate school in the United States at Harvard University and as a student in the United States was made aware of many American military strategies.

The Spratley Islands lie close to the coast of the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia. China is now building fortifications on these atolls and reefs while it builds up a blue water navy and a submarine force.

Ironically, there has been no militarization of these islands, the Spratley Islands, since the Japanese used them as stationery aircraft carriers during the early stages of World War II. The Spratleys were turned in at that time, they were turned into military bases in preparation to invade the Philippines.

It was incredibly eerie last December, on the eve of Pearl Harbor Day, when my special assistance Al Santoli and my good friend Jeff Baxter toured the battlefield and the tunnels of Corrigedor right outside of Manila. And on this pleasant tropical mountainous island, American military men and women held out as their ammunition ran out and they held out against overwhelming Japanese occupation force. In fact, my wife's Uncle Lou was captured by the Japanese in the Philippines. He was part of the Bataan Death March where he saw innocent civilians being bayoneted and horrible human rights abuses and abuses and horrible things that happened to those American prisoners.

That was what happened because of our policy in the 1920s, ignoring what was going on in Japan. That was our policy of engagement with the Japanese, just as our policy is now to the Communist Chinese; and they have the same dream the Japanese had, dominating Asia and the Pacific basin.

Two days later after my visit to Corrigedor, my friends and I, including Filipino Congressman Roy Golez, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy flew over the Spratley Islands in an antiquated Philippine air force C–130, which is around 150 miles from the Philippines over to the South China Sea.

We dropped out of a thick monsoon cloud cover to about 500 feet over the Spratleys over an outcropping called Mischief Reef. In that lagoon at Mischief Reef, within this oval-shaped reef, there were three large Chinese warships. I witnessed hundreds of Chinese construction workers with sparks flying off their welding torches, building permanent military structures on that reef 150 miles off the coast of the Philippines, and bracketing the South China Sea and all of the routes, the trading routes that go through there. Half or three-quarters of the Japanese trade goes through those areas, that trading route, that waterway.

Within 2 months after that flight, Congressman Golez sent me new photos showing me a three-story Chinese concrete command and control building on the very site that we overflew. This grab of territory and this bullying of the Philippines is a warning we ignore at our own peril.

Again, it is time to fundamentally change our policies toward the Communist Chinese government that controls the mainland of China. We are not talking about isolating China. Those claiming that we are trying to isolate China are setting up a false dichotomy. We are talking about a rational policy towards a hostile dictatorship, not an isolationist policy of ignoring overseas threats.

In fact, those of us who are advocating to have a strong and forceful policy toward China, we are exactly the opposite of those who want to overlook Communist Chinese aggressions.

□ 2320

Those are the ones who are more akin to the isolationists of the past. In fact, they are relying on wishful thinking instead of making the tough decisions that are necessary to avert war. We are the realists. We are not isolationists. We are the ones who are asking for a policy that makes sense when confronting a dictatorship. And dictators do not respect weakness. They respect strength, they respect purpose, they respect people who watch out for their own interests.

I introduced a resolution, as my colleague is aware. I introduced this resolution yesterday and it is a resolution of disapproving the annual extension of normal trade relations, formerly Most Favored Nation status, and we would disapprove that. That is what my resolution states. And this is not intended to isolate China. Instead, it sends Beijing a direct message that the United States will not stand by and let them bully their neighbors and we will stand, instead, for our own Democratic principles, and we will protect the economic as well as the military interests of our country.

And when we talk about our country, we are not just talking about a small business elite, a clique of billionaires who make a short-term profit at a time when the economic policies are hurting us economically and the military consequences are overwhelming.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. OSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and I am particularly pleased to be here with my good friend in the Speaker's chair. I do not speak often on the floor, and I welcome the chance to come down today.

I, in particular, was sitting in my office listening this evening to the discussion on the floor and I thought of the Cox report that I have been reading, traveling back and forth to my district, and in volume I, on page XXIV, it talks about the basis from the Reagan years for the reaching out to China; that having been a decision on our part here in the United States to use our relationship with the People's Republic of China as a strategic offset in the Cold War with the Soviet Union and also to buttress our ability to launch space-based vehicles.

The determination of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and as noted here in the Cox report, again on page XXIV in volume I, is that that decision, contrary to what people might hear bandied about by many of our colleagues, no longer is applicable; that the consequence or the necessity of having Red China as an offset to the Soviet Union no longer exists because the Soviet Union no longer exists. So the strategic underpinning of our commercial interaction with China has evaporated.

The reason I bring that up, is that in that same document, on XVIII, it talks about two companies in particular who have engaged in significant commercial interaction with the PRC, having to do with their missile defense and development programs, those being Hughes and Loral, and I just wanted to read to my colleagues some of the verbiage that was agreed upon by the bipartisan China commission that the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) chaired, for the record, having to do with multiple independent reentry vehicles; having to do with accident investigation techniques; having to do with testing, modeling and simulation, hardware design and manufacture of these ballistic missiles.

I quote. ''In both 1993 and '95, Hughes failed to apply for or obtain the required Department of State licenses for its activities, because Hughes knew that the Department of State would be unlikely to grant the license and that the licensing process would in any case be lengthy.''

It goes on to say, and keep in mind this is a bipartisan unanimous report, ''Hughes also engaged in deliberate efforts to circumvent the Department of State licensing requirement.''

Now, this is the part that I almost went myself ballistic on the airplane over. ''To this end, Hughes sought the approval of a Department of Commerce official for its 1995 activities and claims to have sought the approval of a Department of Defense monitor for some of its 1993 activities, although Hughes knew that neither official was legally authorized to issue the required license.'' They knew.

This goes on. And it is not just Hughes, it was also Loral. Same page, page XIX, volume I of the Cox report, and these are not my words, this is a bipartisan unanimous writing of the report, ''Loral and Hughes deliberately acted without the legally required license and violated U.S. export control laws.'' This has to do with our most sensitive equipment, dealing with intercontinental ballistic missiles, targeted potentially on the United States.

Where does this lead? Where does this lead? Where is the administration? Again, this is not put out with any singularity. This is a bipartisan report, a unanimously accepted report of the Cox commission.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time for a moment, Madam Speaker, the first point the gentleman made, one would understand that. During the Cold War, when we were in a contest with the Soviet Union, we used the China card. We played the China card. And, yes, just like during World War II, when we allied ourselves with Joseph Stalin in order to defeat Adolf Hitler, which was the major threat to peace and freedom at that time, that was a moral thing to do. We were allying ourselves with one bad group in order to defeat a greater threat. It was okay to defeat Adolf Hitler by working with the communists, but after Adolf Hitler was off the scene and defeated, it was no longer the right thing to do working with the communists. That is number one.

When Ronald Reagan was President of the United States and continued to have this policy of working with China, because the Soviet Union was still our enemy, even then we were supporting a democracy movement in China. We were supporting those people who were struggling to build a free China. That is why there was a great surge of democracy at the end of the Reagan administration. And at Tiananmen Square, which, of course, happened right after Reagan left office, there was this great upsurge of democracy in China, and within a few months they were massacred. They were massacred at Tiananmen Square, which was just 10 years ago.

But let me go to this point about the companies that my colleague from California is talking about. I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science, and it was the activities of several of these American aerospace companies that first led me several years ago to investigate this issue.

I spent 6 months of my life investigating that American companies were upgrading communist Chinese rockets. Perhaps my friend from Arizona remembers me stopping on the floor and saying something terrible is going on here and I am looking into it. I went around telling people, ''I investigated this. I went to the contractors and subcontractors.'' And, finally, I got enough information to prove exactly what the Cox report has verified and there was an official investigation launched by the Cox report.

But what is significant here is these companies are part of an engagement

strategy. My colleagues have to remember we have set down the rules for these companies to go into China. The idea is that engagement will make China more liberal and will then pose less of a threat to the United States. But what are we reading? What is the gentleman telling us? What that report verifies is this policy has had the opposite impact. In a horrible way it has made us vulnerable like we never dreamed we would be vulnerable. Our children now are in jeopardy to be incinerated by these high-tech weapon systems we spent billions of dollars to develop. We could not have imagined that in our worst nightmare. It has been a wrong policy. We have to go back and reexamine it. We have to change that policy.

And what has it done? It has made us less safe over here. It has not been good for us economically. Our companies are setting up factories over there to put our own people out of work. It is corrupting our own political process.

□ 2330

Those same companies and other companies are lobbying us. They are not over in China lobbying for democracy. They are lobbying us. They are giving us contributions in order to protect their slave trade and their blood money.

I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleagues from California. I thank our new Member of the Congress for his perceptive abilities to go right to the bipartisan report and get to the heart of the matter. And as my more senior colleague from California points out, as I sit and hear my two friends reflect on this obscenity committed against our constitutional republic, I cannot help as a student of history step back and realize how prophetic were the words of our 34th President, Dwight David Eisenhower, in his farewell address when he told us to be mindful of the military-industrial complex, of those whose allegiance to our Nation could be subverted. And we have seen it in the case of Hughes and Loral, in the case of Loral, Bernard Schwartz, the top contributor to the Democratic National Committee, and it is tragic that this transpired. But facts are stubborn things. And to look beyond that, to the words of the bipartisan report, that these companies willfully circumvented American law and, Madam Speaker, this points out an affliction, a cancer that is infecting the body politic, when we have those who have sworn to uphold and execute our laws who refuse to enforce the law and apparently have broken those laws.

My colleague from California, in the candor for which he is renowned, pointed a portion of the culpability at the Congress. But the inescapable fact remains that at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, there are those who willfully, willingly sought the contributions of a foreign power, of those who are not citizens of the United States, of those who are not eligible to participate in our political system to gain political victory.

At this point, Madam Speaker, we must ask, what price political victory? The betrayal of our most sensitive technologies to put in harm's way the very children the President of the United States spoke of at this podium in his State of the Union address 2 years ago when he came here and bragged to the Congress of the United States that no American child lived or went to sleep that night under the threat of Russian missiles? What price victory, Madam Speaker? What price victory? When those who swear to uphold and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and provide for the common defense would allow such a perversion of priorities today to the point where we have not only the Communist Chinese but the outlaw nation that is North Korea and the extremist states of Iraq and Iran and the others who now possess nuclear technology and have within their grasp the ability to harm virtually every American family.

These are questions that cause great unease. There is no partisan glee to this. But the strength of our constitutional republic throughout our history has been that we heed the call and understand the threats and understand the dangers. And we stand again, Madam Speaker, at that very juncture. How tragic the circumstance. But how compelling the call to action for this Congress and for the American people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time for a moment, let me just state that the fight on this issue will be over normal trade relations. If we again renew normal trade relations with Communist China, this body is going to send the signal to not only Communist China but to the world that we are backing away, that we do not have the will to protect our interests, we do not have the will to be the world's leader, we do not have the will to even protect our own national interests and our own national security. All those who are listening, all those people, American people who are out in the hinterland wondering what can I do, what can we do, there are policies that we have to make. The Cox report outlined things that we have to do. First and foremost, we have to quit treating Communist China as if it is a friend, as if it is like Great Britain or a democratic society. First and foremost, we have to quit calling it our strategic partner, quit acting like it is our friend and we have to recognize that it is a hostile power. As a hostile power, we do not have their scientists combing through our laboratories, we do not have exchange programs with their military which I found out they were having exchange programs with our military. We were inviting them here, have been having them here to see how our military conducts its business and to train their own military in logistics and how to run military operations. We have got to quit treating them that way. We have to build a missile defense system. We have got to do it. We have now given them the ability to incinerate our people. Our only hope is to make sure that we rush ahead with technology development to protect them now that that genie is out of the bottle. We have got to make sure that the United States of America ends the trading relationship that gives the Communist Chinese $60 billion in hard currency.

The Communist Chinese, these people who run Beijing, they understand what is going on. At the end of the year, they have $60 billion in hard currency to do with what they want, to modernize their weapons, to make alliances with dictators and gangsters and drug lords all over the world, $60 billion in hard currency to destroy us. We have got to end the rules of the game that gives them that $60 billion. By the way, it is not a free trade situation. The Chinese have high tariffs against any American products that we want to sell there. And we have permitted them to have those high tariffs while their goods flood into the United States at low tariffs. Is this good for American working people? No. In fact, what is happening when you hear about we have about $14 billion where they say, ''They bought $14 billion worth of goods from us.'' But if you look at what those goods are, those are mainly technologies and manufacturing units, so that we are building up their capabilities, their military capabilities and their manufacturing capabilities with that $14 billion, while they flood into our market with about $80 billion worth of goods and services which they sell to us with almost no tariff. So, in other words, when they talk about, ''We can't isolate China, we have to trade with them,'' they are not selling our products over there, they are building factories over there and they are doing it by closing factories here. And here is the real stinger, which I mentioned earlier. Most-favored-nation status or normal trade relations, as they say, what does that really mean in terms of government policy? The real impact of it is, because even if we do not pass it, people can still sell things, we are not saying you cannot sell things to China, all it means is if someone is going to set up a factory in China, he has to do so at his own risk. When he takes his money over there, he does not get a subsidized loan from the Export-Import Bank, or the IMF or the Asian Pacific Bank or any of these other multitude of financial institutions that receive U.S. taxpayer funds. All we are talking about is cutting off

these big businessmen from having their investments guaranteed by the taxpayers and these very same taxpayers are having their jobs taken away because they are setting up factories in China to export back to the United States.

Now, who has it been good for? Who has this economic policy been good for? It has not been good for our security, we have already shown that. My colleague from California demonstrated that these companies ended up doing, what, doing something that strategically national security-wise is a nightmare, so it is not good for our national security. It is not good for us economically. They say, ''Oh, look at our big economic boom.'' Well, our good, big economic boom, yes, why do these Americans have to be investing overseas in Communist China for us to have a boom? They could invest in a democratic country like the Philippines, for example, they need investment there. No, they are investing in Communist China because they can cut one deal with a gangster and they think they are going to get a quick profit.

So who has it been good for? It has not been good for our country, for our economy, for the working people. It has been good for a few billionaires. I call them Bill's billionaire buddies. That is who this China policy has been good for. We have got to have the courage to sever ourselves from the policies of the past and fundamentally reexamine those policies and strategies, not for isolation, not for isolation. We want engagement, yes, just the way we would engage Adolf Hitler or Tojo or someone like that. We engaged them in a way that showed them courage and determination and engaged them only in a way that would benefit the people of the United States and the security of the United States, not in a way that would make them think that we were whimpering cowards.

□ 2340

At the end of the day, when the President of the United States goes to Beijing and says, or Madeleine Albright goes to Beijing and mouths some cliche about human rights or talks about, oh, you have got to have a better trade barrier, lower those trade barriers, you got to do this, you got to quit persecuting Christians, you got to quit doing these things that get our Congressmen mad at you; the Chinese dictators, these gangsters, take that as a sign that we do not believe in a darned thing. They take that as a sign that even our President and even our leaders care more about these billionaires than they do about the American people and the national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has expired.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given the time until the top of the hour when we have to, by the rules of the House, adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) for the remainder of the time until the top of the hour.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois in the Chair, and I thank her for the adroit manner in which she is administering the rules of the House this evening, and I thank her for the indulgence to continue this conversation with my two colleagues from California until the top of the hour, which will be 9 p.m. in the Western States from whence we hail.

But, Madam Speaker, it is worth noting that our words and observations tonight carry to the American people not a paranoia, not a panic, but a clear, strong resolve that at long last those of us who are given the constitutional authority to provide for the common defense understand the clear and present danger that confronts our constitutional Republic.

We take no glee in it, we wish it were not so. But as former President Reagan said, facts are stubborn things, and as my junior colleague from California points out and the bipartisan words of the Cox committee report, there are disturbing conclusions drawn that force us to reassess our national security, that force us to reassess our trade policy, that force us to reassess the affairs of state that ofttimes come under the heading of foreign policy.

The challenges are real. No amount of spin, no amount of economic prosperity, no amount of lip-biting and empathy can obscure them from any quarter. And again we offer this because, as I was taught again during our district work period when I had the chance to stand alongside veterans in Flagstaff, Arizona, when more than 200 residents of that city came together to commemorate the sacrifices of our war dead, I was reminded that the words of our Constitution are more than verbiage strewn on parchment. They are a living, breathing part of us as a people, and we dare not, we dare not ignore our duties and our responsibilities. And citizen after citizen came to me expressing their real concerns.

Oh, we do not hear about them from the 24-hour news networks, we do not hear about them except in scant effort by the three major news network anchors, but the American people understand that Abraham Lincoln, whom history predestined would preside over the most divisive bloody conflict in our history, understood full well that the American people, once fully informed, would make the correct decision; and our role is to fully inform and to answer this threat and this cause.

And I am so pleased that our colleague from California joins us in his first term that he brings this report; and I would note, Madam Speaker, that those who may hear these words can gain access to the Cox committee report via my office Web site, and I think my colleague from California has more he would like to share from that report and other observations.

I would yield to him at this time.

Mr. OSE. Madam Speaker, it is ironic that we find ourselves here talking about rocket scientists, because under no circumstances do I pretend to be a rocket scientist. However I think, like so many things we are involved in, whether it be running our families with our spouses or raising our children or running our businesses, the devil of doing anything is in the details that are involved. And I want to run through a few things that are in the Cox report in particular related to what used to be the United States' quantitative and qualitative edge in technology and what damage has occurred as a result of the loss of these secrets.

As many people know, the United States has continually improved its ability to deliver intercontinental ballistic missiles, whether it be telemetry or design or payloads or what have you; year after year after year, compared to the situations in other countries where the technology available, for instance to the People's Republic of China or others, was either based on 1950s design or was wholly unavailable, period. And the reason these things are so important and particularly related to the most current news we hear about the loss of secrets from Los Alamos and other laboratories is that the design warheads and the manner in which they are delivered are significantly improved, both in terms of payload and efficiency, by virtue of having one country steal from us that technology that we have created by virtue of investment over tens of years and billions of dollars.

For instance, what used to be our technology in the 1950s could deliver arguably a relatively small payload accurately. Over the years we have been able to create technology and implement technology that allows us to shrink the size of our warheads, improve the delivery system on a ballistic missile basis and put multiple warheads in a single delivery system as opposed to one warhead per delivery.

The tragedy of the theft of these secrets is that our ostensible trading partners now possess the same ability, as compared to as few as 10 years ago, in the late 1980s, when they were totally incapable, incapable of delivering that kind of a weapon on the United States. And the reason that is important is that, as we go forward, as the House wishes and has adopted with its national ballistic missile defense plan, as we go forward, putting that in place, if we have a missile come to our shores

with multiple, independent reentry vehicles, the difficulty of preventing those weapons from detonating are multiplied logarithmically. It is not arithmetic, it is not geometric, it is logarithmic because our ostensible trading partners, instead of having again one warhead per missile have shrunk the size of their warheads and loaded multiple warheads onto the missile, and as they come back into the atmosphere, will release them on target.

This is something that affects every single one of us. It has nothing to do with economic trade in my opinion. This is a national security issue, and it is of great concern to me on this issue, as it has been, as you both know and as many of the others know here as to our intervention in Yugoslavia, that we, number one, are ignoring the national security interests in the case of these ballistic missiles and the information that has been stolen relative to technology and the like in one case, and we are unable to identify a national security interest in another case, that being Yugoslavia.

□ 2350

So the gentleman from Arizona's comment is well made about how to get access to this. I am sure that the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has it on his web site. I would encourage every American to at least read the forward summary in volume 1. It is frightening information. It is emblematic of the difficulty that we face and the dangers we face in the real world today.

Mr. HAYWORTH. In fact, I thank my colleague for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I would invite every member of this House, with the technological capabilities we all enjoy, to post this unanimous bipartisan report on their individual web sites so that, Madam Speaker, those in this country who are citizens, who are concerned, can have access to this information, full and unfettered, so that they understand the extent to which our national security has been jeopardized.

I yield to my more senior colleague from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think we have certainly outlined tonight the magnitude of the problem, and my colleague from California has demonstrated that what we are talking about is the survival or the incineration of millions of Americans. I mean, again, it is worse than our worst nightmare could possibly have been 10 and 20 years ago. No one could ever have imagined that this would come about.

But I worked for a guy in the White House who always said that what is important is not just to focus on the problem, but to make sure you always offer a solution, and then look towards the opportunities that you have. So I would just like for a couple of minutes talk about the options that we have and just say, what are they?

Number one, first and foremost, we have to start off with a missile defense system. We have to move forward with missile defense. As my colleague from California just mentioned, it is going to be a lot harder now, because they not only have a missile with one warhead, and a missile that was pretty unreliable, but, thanks to some American companies using technology that we paid for, we paid for it, taxpayers developed that technology to protect us during the Cold War, now it has been given away and stolen and actually sold by our major corporate leaders, some of these major corporate leaders. So we have to go forward with missile defense, do it seriously, and do it as if the lives of our children depend upon it.

Number two, we have to work closely and reestablish close ties and a trusting relationship with the democracies of the Pacific and Asia and the Philippines, Japan, Korea and Thailand, which no longer trust in the word of the United States, which see us kowtowing before this communist dictatorship in Beijing. The democratic peoples of the world have to know they can count on the United States, and especially in that area in Asia and the Pacific region.

Again, we must go back to Communist China and we must alter our fundamental relationship, quit treating them as a friend and begin treating them as a hostile power, which means no more military exchanges, no more scientific exchanges, and especially no more subsidies for our businessmen going over there to invest and building up their economy and their capabilities technologically to build these weapons you are talking about. It is one thing to have the blueprints. It is another thing to have the machine tools and the computer technology in order to accomplish that.

We can start, first of all, doing this by eliminating their ability to have an unfair trade relationship with us, by supporting my resolution of disapproval of normal trade relations in the next couple of weeks, which is going to come before the body.

The American people, all of the veterans you saw and that I saw and you saw in your Memorial Day services, veterans from around the United States, should be here pounding on doors, demanding, demanding that we eliminate most-favored-nation status, that normal trade status with China be denied.

This should be a goal of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Patriotic organizations around the United States in the next two weeks should mobilize behind this and knock on every Congressman's door, and they will listen if the American people speak. Money talks maybe in these campaign contributions, but in a democracy the voice of the people talk louder, and we can be glad we live in a country where the people's will will be heard. We must invest in democracies and invest in democracy.

What that means is this: How did Ronald Reagan win the Cold War without having to fight with the Soviet Union? We faced the same type of incineration, by the way, you are talking about, with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had MIRVed warheads too, did they not? They were a horrible threat to our well-being. For decades we lived under that threat.

Ronald Reagan ended it in a number of ways. He rebuilt our military strength, which is something we need to do, not only missile defense. But what he did, most importantly, was support those people who believe in democracy around the world, whether it was in Nicaragua, where eventually the Nicaraguan freedom fighters, who people on the other side of the aisle did everything they could to prevent us from helping those people they called the Contras, and eventually there was a free election in Nicaragua, and those communists, the Sandinistas, were booted out, even though our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said they represent the real will of the Nicaraguan people.

If we support democracy around the world, and that means especially in China, we should be financing and working just like we did with Lech Walesa in Poland and freedom movements, what Ronald Reagan did all over the world. We should focus on China as if our very national survival depended on us reaching out to the decent freedom-loving people of China. If any message goes out tonight, it should be Communist China, Communist China, may be our enemy. That regime of gangsters may be our enemy.

But our greatest ally, our greatest ally, is the people of China. The Chinese people are our friends. They are wonderful people. They long for the same type of human dignity and freedom and liberty and justice and opportunity for their families that we long for for our families. They do not hate the United States. They are not our enemies. We have to do everything to work for the freedom-loving people and build up that democracy movement that was wiped out by the Communist Chinese once Ronald Reagan left office.

Let us work with them and build Radio Free Asia. Let us support the freedom movement. It is what is true to our principles. Do not let anybody say we are anti-Asian, anti-Chinese. We are not. We are pro-freedom, and we believe that freedom is the right of every person of every color of every religion and every ethnic background. That is our strength.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, one can almost anticipate the reflexes action of those who man the spin cycles elsewhere in the sectors of this

capital city, those cacophony of critics that we are certain to hear.

A couple of notes should be acknowledged as we conclude this time on the House floor. I thank both of my colleagues.

Number one, it is not enough to say everybody does this, for, if that were the case, we would blame Lyndon Johnson for the John Walker Navy espionage spy ring that began operation in the late 1960s.

No, the analogy may be somewhat quaint, but I think it is appropriate. It is one thing to lock your windows and doors and set an alarm and go on vacation and have folks cut that alarm off, somehow circumvent that system, come into what you thought was your secured home and steal your secrets.

It is quite another thing for your neighbor next door to meet the truck of the would-be burglars, to let them in the House, to help them find your most valuable possessions, and then to disavow any knowledge of that action. And that is just how simple and just how sad the current dilemma we face in fact presents itself.

A couple of final notes. It is sad that this administration has worked at cross-purposes. It has, on the one hand, deployed American forces to more locations than any other administration in the post World War II era, and, at the same time, it has denied the efforts of this common-sense conservative Congress to provide for our national defense, to provide the weapons systems, to provide the manpower and material. So you have a situation where there is work at cross purposes.

Worse still, the actions of this Congress to provide a missile defense system at long last after the news of the Chinese theft, those on the left joined us in bipartisan fashion, and yet this President in subsequent correspondence has, pointed out by our majority leader, sought to reassure the Chinese that we would not mount a missile defense system.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve better. It should be the mission of this Congress to make sure we provide for the common defense.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 5 p.m. On Tuesday, June 8, 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. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OSE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLETCHER, for 5 minutes, on June 10.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on June 15.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1379. An act to amend the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, to make a technical correction relating to international narcotics control assistance.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 midnight), the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 9, 1999, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 106th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable DAVID VITTER, First Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2529. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increase in Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99–989–2 FIR] received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2530. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Funding Operations; Investment Management (RIN: 3052–AB76) received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2531. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his requests for FY 2000 budget amendments for the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, State, and Transportation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 106—81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2532. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program (RIN: 1840–AC57) received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2533. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Managment Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule— Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 92F–0368] received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2534. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a program of grants to children's hospitals to support graduate medical education; to the Committee on Commerce.

2535. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to establish a working capital fund for the United States Agency for International Development; to the Committee on International Relations.

2536. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to address various management concerns of the Department regarding its security cooperation programs; to the Committee on International Relations.

2537. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule —Rules and Procedures for Funds Transfers (RIN: 1510–AA38) received April 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2538. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule —Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1510–AA39) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2539. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for appropriate targeting of early retirement offers by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2540. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Trails System Act to create a third category of long-distance trails to be known as National Discovery Trails and to authorize the American Discovery Trail as the first trail in that category; to the Committee on Resources.

2541. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans, to authorize payment of these benefits at full rates for certain Filipinos who reside in the United States, to make improvements in veterans home loan guaranty programs, to make permanent certain temporary authorities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2542. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—New Canadian Province Import Code for Territory of Nunavut [Docket No. 990416099–9099–01] (RIN: 0607–AA32) received May 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2543. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Service's final rule—Child Support Enforcement Program; Grants to States for Access and Visitation Programs: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (RIN: 0970–AB72) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2544. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election to Claim Education Tax Credit [Notice 99–32] received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2545. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation that addresses various management concerns of the Department of Defense; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Small Business, and Government Reform.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of June 7, 1999]

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 91. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a clinic to be conducted by the United States Luge Association (Rept. 106–171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 105. Resolution authorizing the Law Enforcement Torch Run for the 1999 Special Olympics World Games to be run through the Capitol Grounds (Rept. 106–172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 898. A bill designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness'' (Rept. 106–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 8, 1999]

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–175). 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:

[Omitted From the Record of June 7, 1999]

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2005. A bill to establish a statute of repose for durable goods used in a trade or business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2006. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require persons who are plan administrators of employee pension benefit plans or provide administrative services to such plans, and who also provide automobile insurance coverage or provide persons offering such coverage identifying information relating to plan participants or beneficiaries, to submit to the Federal Trade Commission certain information relating to such automobile insurance coverage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2007. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate gun safety, to ban the transfer of a firearm to, or the possession of a firearm by, a person who has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor, and to ban the importation or manufacture of handguns which do not have certain safety features, and to ban the transfer of a firearm to, or the possession of a firearm by, a person who has been twice convicted of drunk driving; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

H.R. 2008. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to regulate gun safety, and to ban the importation or manufacture of handguns which do not have certain safety features; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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.

H.R. 2009. A bill to apply the same quality and safety standards to domestically manufactured handguns that are currently applied to imported handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2010. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Firearm Injury Reporting System, and for grants to States for the collection of information on fatal injuries caused by firearms; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 2011. A bill to establish the District Court of the Virgin Islands as a court under article III of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTSCH (for himself and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 2012. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under the Medicare 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. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2013. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to provide for the appointment of the Inspector General of certain Federal agencies by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2014. A bill to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory commuter tax on nonresidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension for the work opportunity credit and the welfare-to-work credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the provision of law requiring termination of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans as of December 31, 1999; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself and Mr. POMBO):

H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to enable Federal agencies responsible for the preservation of threatened species and endangered species to rescue and relocate members of any of those species that would be taken in the course of certain reconstruction, maintenance, or repair of Federal or non-Federal manmade flood control levees; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States business operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. THURMAN,

Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 2019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the unearned income of children attributable to personal injury awards shall not be taxed at the marginal rate of the parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BASS, Mr. HORN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. QUINN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OSE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide marriage penalty relief, incentives to encourage health coverage, and increased child care assistance, to extend certain expiring tax provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers to provide coverage for human leukocyte antigen testing; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINTOSH (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 2022. A bill to prohibit compliance by the executive branch with the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the 1997 mutilateral Memorandum of Understanding related to that treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MCINTOSH (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2023. A bill to provide a schedule for production of elements for a national missile defense system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2024. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carriers to conduct safety audits of foreign air carriers as a condition of approval of certain cooperative arrangements between the carriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2025. A bill to ban the manufacture of handguns that cannot be personalized, to provide for a report to the Congress on the commercial feasibility of personalizing firearms, and to provide for grants to improve firearms safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2026. A bill to enforce the guarantees of the first, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States by prohibiting certain devices used to deny the right to participate in certain elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2027. A bill to require that candidates who receive campaign financing from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund agree not to participate in multicandidate forums that exclude candidates who have broad-based public support; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2028. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for infant and child health programs under chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2029. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require that Federal agencies consult with State agencies and county and local governments on environmental impact statements; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 2030. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the process by which the Secretary of Health and Human Services makes coverage determinations for items and services furnished under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; 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. SCARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2031. A bill to provide for injunctive relief in Federal district court to enforce State laws relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2032. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to establish a Nuclear Security Administration and an Office of Under Secretary for National Security in the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Science, 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. WALDEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2033. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the lowest unit rate for campaign advertising shall not be available for communications in which a candidate attacks an opponent of the candidate unless the candidate does so in person; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. WILSON:

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide for the establishment of a School Security Technology Center and to authorize grants for local school security programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution recognizing Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of the development and use of firearms personalization technology; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution to honor the ExploraVision Awards Program and to encourage more students to participate in this innovative national student science competition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 199. A resolution to commend the signing of a cease-fire agreement and to urge a swift solution to the crisis in Sierra Leone; to the Committee on International Relations.

[Submitted June 8, 1999]

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 2035. A bill to correct errors in the authorizations of certain programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Administration; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 2036. A bill to protect children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 2037. A bill to combat youth violence and to protect children from violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend section 468A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to deductions for decommissioning costs of nuclear powerplants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2039. A bill to restore actuarial balance to the Social Security trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 2040. A bill to provide for a comprehensive assessment of veterans' cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. WILSON, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 2041. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans access to obstetric and gynecological care; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 2042. A bill to establish a Commission on health policy for employer-sponsored health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2043. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans access to unrestricted medical advice; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHERWOOD:

H.R. 2044. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans access to pediatric care; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

H.R. 2045. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide to participants and beneficiaries of group health plans access to emergency medical care; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H.R. 2046. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure access by participants and beneficiaries of group health plans to information regarding plan coverage, managed care procedures, health care providers, and quality of medical care; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 2047. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2048. A bill to amend section 922(x) of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transfer to and possession of handguns, semiautomatic assault weapons, and large capacity ammunicition feeding devices by individuals who are less than 21 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2049. A bill to rename Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts as ''Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts''; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LARGENT (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2050. A bill to provide consumers with a reliable source of electricity and a choice of electric providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Resources, 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to investigate and hold public hearings in response to petitions claiming unreasonably high air fares or inadequate air carrier competition at airports; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 2052. A bill to provide the State of Oregon with a role in decisions made on environmental restoration and waste management at the Department of Energy's Hanford Reservation; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 2053. A bill to allow taxpayers to designate contributions to charity on their return of tax and to establish the Checkoff for Charity Commission to ensure that such contributions are paid to the designated charities; 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. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. OSE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida):

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce for individuals the maximum rate of tax on unrecaptured section 1250 gain from 25 percent to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety of imported food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2056. A bill to establish United States Government policy regarding the necessity of requiring the full withdrawal of all Syrian military, security, intelligence and proxy forces from Lebanon and the restoration of Lebanon's independence; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 2057. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to eliminate the chilling effect on the constitutionally protected expression of religion by State and local officials that results from the threat that potential litigants may seek damages and attorney's fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 2058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for estate tax purposes equal to the value of the decedent's individual retirement plans, section 401(k) plans, and certain other retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility dates for financial assistance for higher education for spouses and dependant children of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 2060. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make revenues from excise taxes imposed on fuel used in trains available for projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LUCAS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2061. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reduce the amount of funds to a State that does not have in effect certain provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 2062. A bill to amend the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 with respect to financial exploitation of older or disabled individuals; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2063. A bill to provide for a study of marketing practices of the firearms industry; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2064. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on instant print film; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2065. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on instant print film; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the annual enrollment of land in the wetlands reserve program, to extend the program through 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2067. A bill to require that, for purposes of the 2000 census, members of the armed forces on active duty be allocated to their home of record, and overseas military dependents be allocated to their last United States residence or, alternatively, to the same place as the member of the armed forces; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2068. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the sunset and numerical limitation on Medicare participation in Medicare+Choice medical savings account (MSA) plans; 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. STARK:

H.R. 2069. A bill to permit Secretary of Health and Human Services to adjust Medicare payments to reflect deviations from generally accepted practice in overserving or underserving Medicare beneficiaries; 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.

H.R. 2070. A bill to provide for development and implementation of a single, unified prospective payment system for post-care hospital services; 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. TALENT:

H.R. 2071. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the textile industry and in water treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2072. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the paper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2073. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in water treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2074. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in water treatment and beauty care products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2075. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in photography products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2076. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in peroxide stabilizer and compounding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2077. A bill to establish a National Forest Preserve consisting of certain Federal lands in the Sequoia National Forest in the State of California to protect and preserve remaining Giant Sequoia ecosystems and to provide increased recreational opportunities in connection with such ecosystems; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TALENT:

H.R. 2078. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain chemical used in the textile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE:

H.R. 2079. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to transport maximum security prisoners across State lines to prisons that are not classified to handle maximum security prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MOORE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WU, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 2081. A bill to provide for the appointment of an Assistant United States Attorney for each judicial district for the purpose of prosecuting firearms offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore pension limits to equitable levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Rosa Parks; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WEINER):

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the treatment of religious minorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and particularly the recent arrests of members of that country's Jewish community; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H. Res. 201. A resolution recognizing the importance for families to pledge to each other to be organ and tissue donors; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. REYES, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. SANDERS):

H. Res. 202. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the artwork displayed in the Capitol and in the office buildings of the House of Representatives should represent the contributions of women to American society; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 203. A resolution acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the men and women who have lost their lives while serving as firefighters; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of June 7, 1999]

H.R. 8: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 14: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 21: Mr. KING, Mr. BERMAN, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 25: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 48: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 49: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 72: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 116: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 175: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KIND, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 194: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 206: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 219: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 242: Mr. TERRY and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 316: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 324: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 353: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 354: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 363: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 383: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 417: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 443: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 483: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 486: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 500: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 518: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 561: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 614: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 625: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 673: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 688: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 708: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 710: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 749: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 785: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 798: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 832: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 835: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 845: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 859: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 860: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 906: Mr. ENGLE.

H.R. 965: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1037: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1053: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1071: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1082: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1083: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1093: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 1095: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1108: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1111: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1149: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1193: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. COSTELLO

H.R. 1196: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1229: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1247: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KING, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1289: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1300: Mr. COSTELLO and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1304: Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. WU, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1313: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1315: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1317: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1324: Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FARR of California, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1326: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COOKSEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1336: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1349: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1355: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1382: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1387: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1388: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KING, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MICA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1399: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1414: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1423: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1424: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1456: Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1459: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1463: Mr. HYDE and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1484: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1485: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1491: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1495: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1496: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1520: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1546: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 1567: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1579: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1584: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1585: Mr. INSLEE and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1586: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1592: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KING, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1603: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1621: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 1631: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1665: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1670: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1691: Mr. WELLER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1710: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1714: Mr. DREIER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 1731: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1734: Mr. ESHOO.

H.R. 1776: Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. MYRICK, MR. BALDACCI, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. DANNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1824: Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1839: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1857: Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1858: Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1862: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1932: Mr. REGULA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KLINK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HORN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1937: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. LARGENT.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. OSE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. QUINN.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. REGULA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. FOLEY.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FARR of California, and Ms. RIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. HOLT and Mr. SHOWS.

H. Con. Res. 124: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. COOK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 16: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H. Res. 41: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Res. 80: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

[Submitted June 8, 1999]

H.R. 7: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 17: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 36: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 44: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 65: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 82: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 121: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 155: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 179: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 184: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 205: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 212: Mr. NEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 218: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 232: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 239: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 248: Mr. PAUL and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 271: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAZIO, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 274: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. OSE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. POMBO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WELLER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 303: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 315: Mr. BECERRA and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 347: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 353: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 354: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 358: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 360: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 382: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 405: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 413: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 417: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 425: Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 486: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 489: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACKSON Illinois, Mr. MEEDS of New York, and Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 515: Mr. WU, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 531: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 534: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. DAVID of Virginia.
H.R. 558: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 576: Mrs. NORTHUP.
H.R. 595: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 629: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 655: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 664: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 679: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 680: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 690: Mr. FILNER and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 693: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 716: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 721: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 724: Mr. WEINER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 732: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 750: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 756: Mrs. NORTHUP and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 765: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 776: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 783: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WELLER and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 784: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BUYER, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 792: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 797: Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 798: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 803: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 804: Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 809: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 815: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 817: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 827: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 828: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 842: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 846: Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 850: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 854: Mr. OLVER and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 860: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 869: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 890: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 895: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 919: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 920: Mr. WEINER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 922: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 941: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 957: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 959: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 979: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. LAZIO.
H.R. 996: Mr. JOHN, Mr. KIND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 997: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 1001: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 1020: Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. REYES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SMITH of WASHINGTON, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1032: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1044: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 1046: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 1063: Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 1070: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 1071: Mr. FARR of California and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1102: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. EWING, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 1106: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 1111: Mr. WEYGAND and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1112: Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1115: Mr. COOK, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1130: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1154: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1159: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1180: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1194: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1217: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1221: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. COOK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1227: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1228: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1254: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1256: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1264: Mr. BAKER and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 1265: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1272: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1273: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1287: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. EWING.
H.R. 1291: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. STUMP, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. METCALF.
H.R. 1292: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 1294: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 1300: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1326: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1331: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1337: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1344: Mr. OLVER and Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 1347: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1352: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1355: Mr. NADLER and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1372: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1380: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1436: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1437: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1438: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1439: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1445: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1469: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1495: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1497: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1505: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1507: Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASTOR, and Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 1511: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1515: Mr. WALSH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KIND, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CARSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1530: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1543: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1578: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1593: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1621: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1625: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1631: Mr. WATERS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1634: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1671: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 1690: Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 1704: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1706: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1710: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1736: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1760: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1773: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1777: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1788: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FROST, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1791: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1795: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1798: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1804: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1819: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1827: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1832: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 1837: Mr. WALSH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1838: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1841: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1842: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr.

MCHUGH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1847: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1848: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1849: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1850: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1871: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1885: Mr. WEINER and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1899: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WU, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. QUINN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1913: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1917: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. COOK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1921: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1929: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1939: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1941: Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1975: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1977: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1979: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1980: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 1993: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1994: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1998: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1999: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 2003: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2004: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DICKS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2013: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. POMBO and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 46: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KING, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. GRAHAM.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. PHELPS.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. FROST and Mr. ENGLISH.

H. Con. Res. 120: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 19: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 89: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Res. 147: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 155: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H. Res. 169: Mr. PORTER and Mr. BROWN of California.

H. Res. 183: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of June 7, 1999]

H.R. 111: Mr. FARR of California.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of division A (page 326, after line 16), insert the following new title:

TITLE XIV—PROLIFERATION AND EXPORT CONTROL MATTERS

SEC. 1401. REPORT ON COMPLIANCE BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND OTHER COUNTRIES WITH THE MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than October 31, 1999, the President shall transmit to Congress a report on the compliance, or lack of compliance (both as to acquiring and transferring missile technology), by the People's Republic of China, with the Missile Technology Control Regime, and on any actual or suspected transfer by Russia or any other country of missile technology to the People's Republic of China in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. The report shall include a list specifying each actual or suspected violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime by the People's Republic of China, Russia, or other country and, for each such violation, a description of the remedial action (if any) taken by the United States or any other country.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall also include information concerning—

(1) actual or suspected use by the People's Republic of China of United States missile technology;

(2) actual or suspected missile proliferation activities by the People's Republic of China;

(3) actual or suspected transfer of missile technology by Russia or other countries to the People's Republic of China: and

(4) United States actions to enforce the Missile Technology Control Regime with respect to the People's Republic of China, including actions to prevent the transfer of missile technology from Russia and other countries to the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 1402. ANNUAL REPORT ON TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall transmit to Congress an annual report on transfers to the People's Republic of China by the United States and other countries of technology with potential military applications, during the 1-year period preceding the transmittal of the report.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report under this section shall be transmitted not later than October 31, 1999.

SEC. 1403. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSFER OF SATELLITE EXPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY.

Not later than August 31, 1999, the President shall transmit to Congress a report on the implementation of subsection (a) of section 1513 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2174; 22 U.S.C. 2778 note), transferring satellites and related items from the Commerce Control List of dual-use items to the United States Munitions List. The report shall update the information provided in the report under subsection (d) of that section.

SEC. 1404. SECURITY IN CONNECTION WITH SATELLITE EXPORT LICENSING.

(a) SECURITY AT FOREIGN LAUNCHES.—As a condition of the export license for any satellite to be launched outside the jurisdiction of the United States, the Secretary of State shall require the following:

(1) That the technology transfer control plan required by section 1514(a)(1) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2175; 22 U.S.C. 2778 note) be prepared by the Department of Defense, and agreed to by the licensee, and that the plan set forth the security arrangements for the launch of the satellite, both before and during launch operations, and include enhanced security measures if the launch site is within the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China or any other country that is subject to section 1514 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

(2) That each person providing security for the launch of that satellite—

(A) be employed by, or under a contract with, the Department of Defense;

(B) have received appropriate training in the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State known as the International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (hereafter in this section referred to as ''ITAR'');

(C) have significant experience and expertise with satellite launches; and

(D) have been investigated in a manner at least as comprehensive as the investigation required for the issuance of a security clearance at the level designated as ''Secret''.

(3) That the number of such persons providing security for the launch of the satellite shall be sufficient to maintain 24-hour security of the satellite and related launch vehicle and other sensitive technology.

(4) That the licensee agree to reimburse the Department of Defense for all costs associated with the provision of security for the launch of the satellite.

(b) DEFENSE DEPARTMENT MONITORS.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) ensure that persons assigned as space launch campaign monitors are provided sufficient training and have adequate experience in the ITAR and have significant experience and expertise with satellite technology, launch vehicle technology, and launch operations technology;

(2) ensure that adequate numbers of such monitors are assigned to space launch campaigns so that 24-hour, 7-day per week coverage is provided;

(3) take steps to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, the continuity of service by monitors for the entire space launch campaign period (from satellite marketing to launch and, if necessary, completion of a launch failure analysis); and

(4) adopt measures designed to make service as a space launch campaign monitor an attractive career opportunity.

SEC. 1405. REPORTING OF TECHNOLOGY PASSED TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND OF FOREIGN LAUNCH SECURITY VIOLATIONS.

(a) MONITORING OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall require that space launch monitors of the Department of Defense assigned to monitor launches in the People's Republic of China maintain records of all information authorized to be transmitted to the People's Republic of China, including copies of any documents authorized for such transmission, and reports on launch-related activities.

(b) TRANSMISSION TO OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that records under subsection (a) are transmitted on a current basis to appropriate elements of the Department of Defense and to the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

(c) RETENTION OF RECORDS.—Records described in subsection (a) shall be retained for at least the period of the statute of limitations for violations of the Arms Export Control Act.

(d) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe guidelines providing space launch monitors of the Department of Defense with the responsibility and the ability to report serious security violations, problems, or other issues at an overseas launch site directly to the headquarters office of the responsible Department of Defense component.

SEC. 1406. REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF EXPORTING HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTERS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, in consultation with other appropriate departments and agencies, shall conduct a comprehensive review of the national security implications of exporting high-performance computers to the People's Republic of China. As part of the review, the Secretary shall conduct empirical testing of the extent to which national security-related operations can be performed using clustered, massively-parallel processing or other combinations of computers.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the review under subsection (a). The report shall be submitted not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be updated not later than the end of each subsequent 1-year period.

SEC. 1407. END-USE VERIFICATION FOR USE BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTERS.

(a) REVISED HPC VERIFICATION SYSTEM.—The President shall seek to enter into an agreement with the People's Republic of China to revise the existing verification system with the People's Republic of China with respect to end-use verification for high-performance computers exported or to be exported to the People's Republic of China so as to provide for an open and transparent system providing for effective end-use verification for such computers and, at a minimum, providing for on-site inspection of the end-use and end-user of such computers, without notice, by United States nationals designated by the United States Government. The President shall transmit a copy of the agreement to Congress.

(b) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and section 1406, the term ''high performance computer'' means a computer which, by virtue of its composite theoretical performance level, would be subject to section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404 note).

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF COMPOSITE THEORETICAL PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR POST-SHIPMENT VERIFICATION.—Section 1213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ADJUSTMENT OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS.—Whenever a new composite theoretical performance level is established under section 1211(d), that level shall apply for purposes of subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the level set forth in that subsection.''.

SEC. 1408. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF EXPORT OF CONTROLLED TECHNOLOGIES AND ITEMS.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRIORITIZATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS.—The President shall submit to Congress the President's recommendations for the establishment of a mechanism to identify, on a continuing basis, those controlled technologies and items the export of which is of greatest national security concern relative to other controlled technologies and items.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT APPROVALS FOR EXPORTS OF GREATEST NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERN.—With respect to controlled technologies and items identified under subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress the President's recommendations for the establishment of a mechanism to identify procedures for export of such technologies and items so as to provide—

(1) that the period for review by an executive department or agency of a license application for any such export shall be extended to a period longer than that otherwise required when such longer period is considered necessary by the head of that department or agency for national security purposes; and

(2) that a license for such an export may be approved only with the agreement of each executive department or agency that reviewed the application for the license, subject to appeal procedures to be established by the President.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STREAMLINED LICENSING PROCEDURES FOR OTHER EXPORTS.—With respect to controlled technologies and items other than those identified under subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress the President's recommendations for modifications to licensing procedures for export of such technologies and items so as to streamline the licensing process and provide greater transparency, predictability, and certainty.

SEC. 1409. NOTICE OF FOREIGN ACQUISITION OF UNITED STATES FIRMS IN NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIES.

Section 721(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 2170(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The President'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Whenever a person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States is the subject of a merger, acquisition, or takeover described in paragraph (1), that person shall promptly notify the President, or the President's designee, of such planned merger, acquisition, or takeover. Whenever any executive department or agency becomes aware of any such planned merger, acquisition, or takeover, the head of that department or agency shall promptly notify the President, or the President's designee, of such planned merger, acquisition, or takeover.''.

SEC. 1410. FIVE-AGENCY INSPECTORS GENERAL EXAMINATION OF COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST ACQUISITION BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA OF MILITARILY SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGY.

Not later than January 1, 2000, the Inspectors General of the Departments of State, Defense, the Treasury, and Commerce and the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the adequacy of current export controls and counterintelligence measures to protect against the acquisition by the People's Republic of China of militarily sensitive United States technology. Such report shall include a description of measures taken to address any deficiencies found in such export controls and counterintelligence measures.

SEC. 1411. OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY SECURITY IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) ENHANCED MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROLS.—

(1) NEW INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS.—The President shall work (in the context of the scheduled 1999 review of the Wassenaar Arrangement and otherwise) to establish new binding international controls on technology transfers that threaten international peace and United States national security.

(2) IMPROVED SHARING OF INFORMATION.—The President shall take appropriate actions (in the context of the scheduled 1999 review of the Wassenaar Arrangement and otherwise) to improve the sharing of information by nations that are major exporters of technology so that the United States can track movements of technology and enforce technology controls and re-export requirements.

(b) OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY SECURITY.—(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense an Office of Technology Security. The Office shall support United States Government efforts to—

(1) establish new binding international controls on technology transfers that threaten international peace and United States national security; and

(2) improve the sharing of information by nations that are major exporters of technology so that the United States can track movements of technology and enforce technology controls and re-export requirements.

At the end of subtitle A of title XXXI (page 419, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3106. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CYBER SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) INCREASED FUNDS FOR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE CYBER SECURITY.—The amounts provided in section 3103 in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and in paragraph (3) are each hereby increased by $8,600,000, to be available for Counterintelligence Cyber Security programs.

(b) OFFSETTING REDUCTIONS DERIVED FROM CONTRACTOR TRAVEL.—(1) The amount provided in section 3101 in the matter preceding paragraph (1) (for weapons activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security) is hereby reduced by $4,700,000.

(2) The amount provided in section 3102 in the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (for environmental restoration and waste management in carrying out programs necessary for national security) is hereby reduced by $1,900,000.

(3) The amount provided in section 3103 in the matter preceding paragraph (1) is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

At the end of title XXXI (page 453, after line 15), insert the following new subtitle:

Subtitle F—Protection of National Security Information

SEC. 3181. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''National Security Information Protection Improvement Act''.

SEC. 3182. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT ON ESPIONAGE BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—The President shall transmit to Congress a report, not less often than every six months, on the steps being taken by the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and all other relevant executive departments and agencies to respond to espionage and other intelligence activities by the People's Republic of China, particularly with respect to the theft of sophisticated United States nuclear weapons design information and the targeting by the People's Republic of China of United States nuclear weapons codes and other national security information of strategic concern.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—The first report under this section shall be transmitted not later than January 1, 2000.

SEC. 3183. REPORT ON WHETHER DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SHOULD CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS RESPONSIBILITY.

Not later than January 1, 2000, the President shall transmit to Congress a report regarding the feasibility of alternatives to the current arrangements for controlling United States nuclear weapons development, testing, and maintenance within the Department of Energy, including the reestablishment of the Atomic Energy Commission as an independent nuclear agency. The report shall describe the benefits and shortcomings of each such alternative, as well as the current system, from the standpoint of protecting such weapons and related research and technology from theft and exploitation. The President shall include with such report the President's recommendation for the appropriate arrangements for controlling United States nuclear weapons development, testing, and maintenance outside the Department of Energy if it should be determined that the Department of Energy should no longer have that responsibility.

SEC. 3184. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE AND OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Energy Organization Act is amended by inserting after section 212 (42 U.S.C. 7143) the following new sections:

''OFFICE OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

''SEC. 213. (a) There shall be within the Department an Office of Foreign Intelligence, to be headed by a Director, who shall report directly to the Secretary.

''(b) The Director shall be responsible for the programs and activities of the Department relating to the analysis of intelligence with respect to nuclear weapons and materials, other nuclear matters, and energy security.

''(c) The Secretary may delegate to the Deputy Secretary of Energy the day-to-day supervision of the Director.

''OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

''SEC. 214. (a) There shall be within the Department an Office of Counterintelligence, to be headed by a Director, who shall report directly to the Secretary.

''(b) The Director shall carry out all counterintelligence activities in the Department relating to the defense activities of the Department.

''(c) The Secretary may delegate to the Deputy Secretary of Energy the day-to-day supervision of the Director.

''(d)(1) The Director shall keep the intelligence committees fully and currently informed of all significant security breaches at any of the national laboratories.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'intelligence committees' means the Permanent Select Committee of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of that Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 212 the following new items:

''Sec. 213. Office of Foreign Intelligence.
''Sec. 214. Office of Counterintelligence.''.

SEC. 3185. COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish and maintain at each national laboratory a counterintelligence program for the defense-related activities of the Department of Energy at such laboratory.

(b) HEAD OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall ensure that, for each national laboratory, the head of the counterintelligence program of that laboratory—

(1) has extensive experience in counterintelligence activities within the Federal Government; and

(2) with respect to the counterintelligence program, is responsible directly to, and is hired with the concurrence of, the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy and the director of the national laboratory.

SEC. 3186. COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES AT OTHER DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FACILITIES.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL.—(1) The Secretary of Energy shall assign to each Department of Energy facility, other than a national laboratory, at which Restricted Data is located an individual who shall assess security and counterintelligence matters at that facility.

(2) An individual assigned to a facility under this subsection shall be stationed at the facility.

(b) SUPERVISION.—Each individual assigned under subsection (a) shall report directly to the Director of the Office of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 3187. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy, shall carry out a counterintelligence polygraph program for the defense activities of the Department of Energy. The program shall consist of the administration on a regular basis of a polygraph examination to each covered person who has access to a program that the Director of Counterintelligence and the Assistant Secretary assigned the functions under section 203(a)(5) of the Department of Energy Organization Act determine requires special access restrictions.

(b) COVERED PERSONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), a covered person is any of the following:

(1) An officer or employee of the Department.

(2) An expert or consultant under contract to the Department.

(3) An officer or employee of any contractor of the Department.

(c) ADDITIONAL POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS.—In addition to the polygraph examinations administered under subsection (a), the Secretary, in carrying out the defense activities of the Department—

(1) may administer a polygraph examination to any employee of the Department or of any contractor of the Department, for counterintelligence purposes; and

(2) shall administer a polygraph examination to any such employee in connection with an investigation of such employee, if such employee requests the administration of a polygraph examination for exculpatory purposes.

(d) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include procedures, to be developed in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for identifying and addressing ''false positive'' results of polygraph examinations.

(2) Notwithstanding section 501 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7191) or any other provision of law, the Secretary may, in prescribing regulations under paragraph (1), waive any requirement for notice or comment if the Secretary determines that it is in the national security interest to expedite the implementation of such regulations.

(e) NO CHANGE IN OTHER POLYGRAPH AUTHORITY.—This section shall not be construed to affect the authority under any other provision of law of the Secretary to administer a polygraph examination.

SEC. 3188. CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE SAFEGUARDING AND SECURITY OF RESTRICTED DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 234A the following new section:

''SEC. 234B. CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REGULATIONS REGARDING SECURITY OF CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE INFORMATION OR DATA.—

''a. Any individual or entity that has entered into a contract or agreement with the Department of Energy, or a subcontract or subagreement thereto, and that commits a gross violation or a pattern of gross violations of any applicable rule, regulation, or order prescribed or otherwise issued by the Secretary pursuant to this subtitle relating to the safeguarding or security of Restricted Data or other classified or sensitive information shall be subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed $500,000 for each such violation.

''b. The Secretary shall include, in each contract entered into after the date of the enactment of this section with a contractor of the Department, provisions which provide an appropriate reduction in the fees or amounts paid to the contractor under the

contract in the event of a violation by the contractor or contractor employee of any rule, regulation, or order relating to the safeguarding or security of Restricted Data or other classified or sensitive information. The provisions shall specify various degrees of violations and the amount of the reduction attributable to each degree of violation.

''c. The powers and limitations applicable to the assessment of civil penalties under section 234A shall apply to the assessment of civil penalties under this section.''.

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—The section heading of section 234A of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2282a) is amended by inserting ''SAFETY'' before ''REGULATIONS''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in the first section of that Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 234 the following new items:

''234A. Civil Monetary Penalties for Violations of Department of Energy Safety Regulations.

''234B. Civil Monetary Penalties for Violations of Department of Energy Regulations Regarding Security of Classified or Sensitive Information or Data.''.

SEC. 3189. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR MISUSE OF RESTRICTED DATA.

(a) COMMUNICATION OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 224 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2274) is amended—

(1) in clause a., by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$400,000''; and

(2) in clause b., by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$200,000''.

(b) RECEIPT OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 225 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2275) is amended by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$400,000''.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 227 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2277) is amended by striking ''$2,500'' and inserting ''$50,000''.

SEC. 3190. RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO NATIONAL LABORATORIES BY FOREIGN VISITORS FROM SENSITIVE COUNTRIES.

(a) BACKGROUND REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy may not admit to any facility of a national laboratory any individual who is a citizen or agent of a nation that is named on the current sensitive countries list unless the Secretary first completes a background review with respect to that individual.

(b) MORATORIUM PENDING CERTIFICATION.—(1) During the period described in paragraph (2), the Secretary may not admit to any facility of a national laboratory any individual who is a citizen or agent of a nation that is named on the current sensitive countries list.

(2) The period referred to in paragraph (1) is the period beginning 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the later of the following:

(A) The date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) The date that is 45 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress a certification described in paragraph (3).

(3) A certification referred to in paragraph (2) is a certification by the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy, with the concurrence of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that all security measures are in place that are necessary and appropriate to prevent espionage or intelligence gathering by or for a sensitive country, including access by individuals referred to in paragraph (1) to classified information of the national laboratory.

(c) WAIVER OF MORATORIUM.—(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive the prohibition in subsection (b) on a case-by-case basis with respect to any specific individual or any specific delegation of individuals whose admission to a national laboratory is determined by the Secretary to be in the interest of the national security of the United States.

(2) Not later than the seventh day of the month following a month in which a waiver is made, the Secretary shall submit a report in writing providing notice of each waiver made in that month to the following:

(A) The Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(B) The Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(3) Each such report shall be in classified form and shall contain the identity of each individual or delegation for whom such a waiver was made and, with respect to each such individual or delegation, the following information:

(A) A detailed justification for the waiver.

(B) For each individual with respect to whom a background review was conducted, whether the background review determined that negative information exists with respect to that individual.

(C) The Secretary's certification that the admission of that individual or delegation to a national laboratory is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

(4) The authority of the Secretary under paragraph (1) may be delegated only to the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy.

(d) EXCEPTION TO MORATORIUM FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—The moratorium under subsection (b) shall not apply to any person who—

(1) is, on the date of the enactment of this Act, an employee or assignee of the Department of Energy, or of a contractor of the Department; and

(2) has undergone a background review in accordance with subsection (a).

(e) EXCEPTION TO MORATORIUM FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—In the case of a program undertaken pursuant to an international agreement between the United States and a foreign nation, the moratorium under subsection (b) shall not apply to the admittance to a facility that is important to that program of a citizen of that foreign nation whose admittance is important to that program.

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BACKGROUND REVIEWS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of Central Intelligence should ensure that background reviews carried out under this section are completed in not more than 15 days.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''background review'', commonly known as an indices check, means a review of information provided by the Director of Central Intelligence and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding personal background, including information relating to any history of criminal activity or to any evidence of espionage.

(2) The term ''sensitive countries list'' means the list prescribed by the Secretary of Energy known as the Department of Energy List of Sensitive Countries.

SEC. 3191. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ACCESS BY FOREIGN VISITORS AND EMPLOYEES TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FACILITIES ENGAGED IN DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

(a) SECURITY CLEARANCE REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy may not allow unescorted access to any classified area, or access to classified information, of any facility of the Department of Energy engaged in the defense activities of the Department to any individual who is a citizen of a foreign nation unless—

(1) the Secretary, acting through the Director of Counterintelligence, first completes a security clearance investigation with respect to that individual in a manner at least as comprehensive as the investigation required for the issuance of a security clearance at the level required for such access under the rules and regulations of the Department; or

(2) a foreign government first completes a security clearance investigation with respect to that individual in a manner that the Secretary of State, pursuant to an international agreement between the United States and that foreign government, determines is equivalent to the investigation required for the issuance of a security clearance at the level required for such access under the rules and regulations of the Department.

(b) EFFECT ON CURRENT EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary shall ensure that any individual who, on the date of the enactment of this Act, is a citizen of a foreign nation and an employee of the Department or of a contractor of the Department is not discharged from such employment as a result of this section before the completion of the security clearance investigation of such individual under subsection (a) unless the Director of Counterintelligence determines that such discharge is necessary for the national security of the United States.

SEC. 3192. ANNUAL REPORT ON SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE STANDARDS AT NATIONAL LABORATORIES AND OTHER DEFENSE FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

(a) REPORT ON SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE STANDARDS AT NATIONAL LABORATORIES AND OTHER DOE DEFENSE FACILITIES.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy, shall submit a report on the security and counterintelligence standards at the national laboratories, and other facilities of the Department of Energy engaged in the defense activities of the Department, to the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall be in classified form and shall contain, for each such national laboratory or facility, the following information:

(1) A description of all security measures that are in place to prevent access by unauthorized individuals to classified information of the national laboratory or facility.

(2) A certification by the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy as to whether—

(A) all security measures are in place to prevent access by unauthorized individuals to classified information of the national laboratory or facility; and

(B) such security measures comply with Presidential Decision Directives and other applicable Federal requirements relating to the safeguarding and security of classified information.

(3) For each admission of an individual under section 3190 not described in a previous report under this section, the identity of that individual, and whether the background

review required by that section determined that information relevant to security exists with respect to that individual.

SEC. 3193. REPORT ON SECURITY VULNERABILITIES OF NATIONAL LABORATORY COMPUTERS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the National Counterintelligence Policy Board shall prepare a report, in consultation with the Director of Counterintelligence of the Department of Energy, on the security vulnerabilities of the computers of the national laboratories.

(b) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—In preparing the report, the National Counterintelligence Policy Board shall establish a so-called ''red team'' of individuals to perform an operational evaluation of the security vulnerabilities of the computers of the national laboratories, including by direct experimentation. Such individuals shall be selected by the National Counterintelligence Policy Board from among employees of the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and of other agencies, and may be detailed to the National Counterintelligence Policy Board from such agencies without reimbursement and without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND TO FBI DIRECTOR.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the report shall be submitted in classified and unclassified form to the Secretary of Energy and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) FORWARDING TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Not later than 30 days after the report is submitted, the Secretary and the Director shall each separately forward that report, with the recommendations in classified and unclassified form of the Secretary or the Director, as applicable, in response to the findings of that report, to the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3194. GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE-RELATED COMPUTERS.

(a) PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy shall establish procedures to govern access to classified information on DOE defense-related computers. Those procedures shall, at a minimum, provide that each employee of the Department of Energy who requires access to classified information shall be required as a condition of such access to provide to the Secretary written consent which permits access by an authorized investigative agency to any DOE defense-related computer used in the performance of the defense-related duties of such employee during the period of that employee's access to classified information and for a period of three years thereafter.

(b) EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY IN DOE DEFENSE-RELATED COMPUTERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any provision of law enacted by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986), no user of a DOE defense-related computer shall have any expectation of privacy in the use of that computer.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term 'DOE defense-related computer'' means a computer of the Department of Energy or a Department of Energy contractor that is used, in whole or in part, for a Department of Energy defense-related activity.

(2) The term ''computer'' means an electronic, magnetic, optical, electrochemical, or other high-speed data processing device performing logical, arithmetic, or storage functions, and includes any data storage facility or communications facility directly related to, or operating in conjunction with, such device.

(3) The term ''authorized investigative agency'' means an agency authorized by law or regulation to conduct a counterintelligence investigation or investigations of persons who are proposed for access to classified information to ascertain whether such persons satisfy the criteria for obtaining and retaining access to such information.

(4) The term ''classified information'' means any information that has been determined pursuant to Executive Order No. 12356 of April 2, 1982, or successor orders, or the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to require protection against unauthorized disclosure and that is so designated.

(5) The term ''employee'' includes any person who receives a salary or compensation of any kind from the Department of Energy, is a contractor of the Department of Energy or an employee thereof, is an unpaid consultant of the Department of Energy, or otherwise acts for or on behalf of the Department of Energy.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to implement this section.

SEC. 3195. DEFINITION OF NATIONAL LABORATORY.

For purposes of this subtitle, the term ''national laboratory'' means any of the following:

(1) The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California.

(2) The Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

(3) The Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

(4) The Oak Ridge National Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNITED STATES-CHINA TRADE RELATIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Administration's toothless human rights policy towards China has failed miserably. In the five years since President Clinton de-linked China's MFN status from human rights considerations, there has been regression—not progress—within China. Even standing apart from new revelations of nuclear espionage and the skyrocketing U.S.-China trade deficit, this deteriorating situation justifies a fundamental reassessment of U.S.-China trade policy. A couple of examples may help flesh out the seriousness of the matter.

In 1992 the U.S. and Chinese Governments signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) prohibiting trade in slave-made goods, which was followed by a 1994 Statement of Cooperation. Notwithstanding those agreements and China's own laws against slave-made exports, Beijing is turning the Laogai—the Chinese Gulag—into a profit-making venture. Slave-made products—from office supplies to Christmas decorations—regularly make their way to the shelves of American stores. Even the State Department has been forced to admit that ''[f]orced labor is a problem'' and that China's cooperation with the MOU ''has been inadequate.'' Indeed, the Department reports that in every case where the United States asked to visit a suspect facility during 1998, ''the [Chinese] Ministry of Justice refused the request, ignored it, or simply denied the allegations made without further elaboration.'' In short, the MOU is not worth the paper it is written on.

Similarly, in October 1998, the Chinese regime signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Taking the bait, the Administration used China's promise to sign the ICCPR as a reason not to raise China's human rights violations at last year's meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission. The Administration heralded China's signature as an improvement—something that would lay the groundwork for future human rights accountability within China. Admittedly, the ICCPR contains many worthwhile guarantees, such as the right of political self-determination (Article 1), the basic rights of criminal defendants (Article 14), the right of free expression (Article 19), and the right to free elections (Article 25). But within two months after signing the ICCPR, the Chinese government violated each of those provisions in a brutal, systematic crackdown on democratic dissent that continues to this day. In fact, in the last month alone, Chinese officials have detained over 150 dissidents.

The slave labor MOU and the ICCPR signing are only two of many examples. But they illustrate a fundamental lesson that we ignore at our peril: When dealing with the Communist dictatorship of the People's Republic of China, the United States cannot settle for paper promises or deferred compliance. We must stop accepting pledges of future improvement in place of actual improvements. The Chinese dictatorship regularly tells bold-faced lies about the way it treats its own people, such as by asserting that no one died at Tiananmen Square, and that there is complete religious freedom in China. How, then, can we take its word when it comes to matters of mere commerce? We cannot. Reforms within China must precede the rewards of WTO membership, and should be a prerequisite for annual MFN status.

When I say ''reforms,'' I do not mean only economic reforms. We must also demand respect for the basic rights of the Chinese people. The Administration's policy of so-called ''constructive engagement'' on behalf of human rights has been a disaster, even according to the Administration's own benchmarks.

In quarterly reports, Amnesty International has been tracking the seven human rights policy goals that President Clinton publicly announced before his trip to Beijing in 1998. Those reports detail a complete lack of progress in all categories, and even some regression, during the past year: Release all prisoners of conscience and Tiananmen Square prisoners: ''Total failure, Regression''; review all ''Counter-Revolutionary'' Prison terms: ''Total failure, no Progress''; allow religious freedom: ''Total failure, no progress''; prevent coercive family planning and harvesting of organs: ''No progress''; fully implement pledges on human rights treaties; ''No progress''; review the ''Re-education through labor'' system: ''Total failure, no progress''; and end police and prison brutality: ''Total failure, no progress''.

The Communist government of the PRC continues to engage in systematic violations of basic human rights on a massive scale. It does not allow significant political dissent. It prohibits the free exercise of religion and imprisons religious leaders, ranging from the 10-year-old Panchen Lama to the elderly Catholic Bishop Su of Baoding Province. It summarily executes political prisoners in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. It harvests and sells the internal organs of executed prisoners. It forces women who have ''unauthorized'' pregnancies to abort their children and submit to sterilization. It continues to brutalize the indigenous peoples of Tibet and East Turkestan.

The failure of the Administration's current policy to effect any improvement should come as no surprise. While the rulers of the Chinese Communist Party may be ruthless and despotic, they are not stupid. If there are no costs associated with the brutality that keeps them in power, then they have no incentive to become less brutal.

Thus, when big business and the Clinton Administration really want to change Beijing's conduct—for instance, in the effort to get China to respect international copyright—what do they do? Do they decide that we should be patient, that we should constructively engage for a few years, and sooner or later Beijing will come around? No. They use economic sanctions—the very same sanctions they say would be counterproductive as a means of promoting political and religious freedom in China. I am aware of at least three occasions since 1991 when the U.S. Trade Representative threatened to impose billions of dollars in sanctions to vindicate U.S. intellectual property interests. In each of those cases, when faced with the sanctions, the Chinese government changed its behavior.

By their actions, big business and the Clinton administration show their faith in sanctions. By their reactions, Chinese leaders show the efficacy of sanctions. Thus, the question before us is not ''Can economic sanctions work?'' It is, ''Why do we use sanctions to protect software, but not human life; to protect musical recordings but not fundamental political and religious freedoms; to stop movie piracy, but not torture?'' In all the years I have been asking that question, I have not yet heard a good answer.

We have abandoned the American ideals of freedom and democracy for the sake of marginally cheaper consumer goods. We have squandered our patrimony of liberty for the profit of corporations who want access to China's inexpensive labor market. The people of the United States are waking up to this reality and, I believe, will no longer stand for it.

It is time to do an about face, to condition expanded trade relations upon respect for internationally recognized, fundamental human rights. American interests and American values demand no less.

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES ON DOCTORS NOT TO PROVIDE CARE: FEDERAL COURT EXPLAINS THE DANGERS: REASONS WHY WE SHOULD PASS H.R. 1375

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced H.R. 1375, a bill to limit the amount of financial pressure an HMO can place on a doctor to discourage referrals and testing. A recent Federal Appeals Court case provides new documentation on why we should pass such legislation.

Current regulations allow an HMO to withhold up to 25% of a doctor's compensation as a way to discourage ''unnecessary'' treatment.

The problem is, such "withholds" can discourage necessary as well as unnecessary treatments and tests. My bill would limit any HMO "withhold" to 10% and encourage the use of quality measures as the basis of payments to doctors.

On August 18, 1998, the US 7th Circuit issued a majority opinion in the case of Herdrich v. Pegram, Carle Clinic Association, and Health Alliance Medical Plans. Following are portions of that opinion—exhibit #1 for why we need a national policy limiting HMOs and medical plans for putting too much financial pressure on doctors.

On March 7, 1991, Pegram, Herdrich's doctor, discovered a six by eight centimeter "mass" (later determined to be her appendix) in Herdrich's abdomen. Although the mass was inflamed on March 7, Pegram delayed instituting an immediate treatment of Herdrich, and forced her to wait more than one week (eight days) to obtain the accepted diagnostic procedure (ultrasound) used to determine the nature, size and exact location of the mass. Ideally, Herdrich should have had the ultrasound administered with all speed after the inflamed mass was discovered in her abdomen in order that her condition could be diagnosed and treated before deteriorating as it did, but Carle's policy requires plan participants to receive medical care from Carle-staffed facilities in what they classify as "non-emergency" situations. Because Herdrich's treatment was considered to be "non-emergency," she was forced to wait the eight days before undergoing the ultrasound at a Carle facility in Urbana, Illinois. During this unnecessary waiting period, Herdrich's health problems were exacerbated and the situation rapidly turned into an "emergency"—her appendix ruptured, resulting in the onset of peritonitis. In an effort to defray the increased costs associated with the surgery required to drain and cleanse Herdrich's ruptured appendix, Carle insisted that she have the procedure performed at its own Urbana facility, necessitating that Herdrich travel more than fifty miles from her neighborhood hospital in Bloomington, Illinois. The "market forces" the dissent refers to hardly seem to have produced a positive result in this case—Herdrich suffered a life-threatening illness (peritonitis), which necessitated a longer hospital stay and more serious surgery at a greater cost to her and the Plan. And, as discussed below, we are far from alone in our belief that market forces are insufficient to cure the deleterious affects of managed care on the health care industry.

Across the country, health care critics and consumers are complaining that the quality of medical treatment in this nation is rapidly declining, leaving "a fear that the goal of managing care has been replaced by the goal of managing costs." (Jan Greene, Has Managed Care Lost Its Soul? Health Maintenance Organizations Focus More on Finances, Less on Care, Am. Hosp. Publishing Inc., May 20, 1997.)

An increasing number of Americans believe that dollars are more important than people in the evolving [HMO] system. Whether justified or not, this assumption needs to be taken seriously, according to keepers of the industry's conscience. University of Pennsylvania bioethicist Arthur Caplan argues that managed care should take a lesson from professional sports, which has alienated some fans because money and profits have eclipsed the reasons why fans are about the games: hero worship and the virtues of teamwork, loyalty and trust-worthiness. The same goes for doctors. "People go to their doctor not because he's a good businessman . . . but because he's a good advocate, someone we can admire," says Caplan. "If we have to struggle with him to get what we want, we will have no trust anymore."

To regain trust, HMOs need to be more sensitive to the doctor-patient relationship and remove the physician from direct financial interest in patient care, says Caplan. Instead, doctors should have a predetermined budget and be able to advocate for patients without direct personal gain or loss.

Another hot-button issue for HMO members is the fear that a lifesaving experimental procedure will be denied because of its cost. Caplan says the industry should follow the lead of the handful of HMOs that have established outside, independent panels to make final decisions.

Even care providers fear that they "have become somewhat preoccupied with [their] ownership status and consequently have not paid as much attention as [they] should have to improving [their] basic core competencies." (Id.) The specter of money concerns driving the health care system, says a group of Massachusetts physicians and nurses, "threatens to transform healing from a covenant into a business contract. Canons of commerce are displacing dictates of healing, trampling our professions' most sacred values. Market medicine treats patients as profit centers." (For Our Patients, Not for Profits: A Call to Action, JAMA, Dec. 3, 1997, at 1773.) As one professional stated, "It's too bad. We used to spend most of our time worrying about how to do a better job. Now we worry about doing a better job at a lower price." (Id.)

Thousands of American physicians and nurses, outraged by the increasingly "corporate" nature of American medicine, recently staged a reenactment of the Boston Tea Party by symbolically dumping $1 million each minute into Boston Harbor to dramatize the amount of health care money that is being wasted to pay for HMO marketing, profits, and administrative salaries. See Id.

The shift to profit-driven care is at a gallop. For nurses and physicians, the space for good work in a bad system rapidly narrows. For the public, who are mostly healthy and use little care, awareness of the degradation of medicine builds slowly; it is mainly those who are expensively ill who encounter the dark side of market-driven health care. We criticize market medicine not to obscure or excuse the failings of the past, but to warn that the changes afoot push nursing and medicine farther from caring, fairness, and efficiency.

Another commentator observed that "American 'market theology' is being invoked as an excuse for the downgrading of patient care and the growing absence of compassion in health care." (Bob LeBow, Nation Needs to Take Control of Health Care System for Patients, not Profits, Idaho Statesman, Dec. 2, 1997, at 6A). Instead of providing health care, doctors are forced to "spend many hours persuading health insurance companies that we are not trying to manipulate them into paying more money than Medicare does for kidney transplants." (Gabriel M. Danovitch, et al., And How the Decisions Are Made, 331 New Eng. J. Med., at 331–32 (1984).)

In order to minimize health care costs and fatten corporate profits for HMOs, primary care physicians face severe restrictions on referrals and diagnostic tests, and at the same time, must contend with ever-shrinking incomes.

Sixty percent of all managed-care plans, including HMOs and preferred-provider organizations, now pay their primary-care doctors through some sort of "capitation" system, according to the Physician Payment Review Commission in Washington, D.C. That is, rather than simply pay any bill presented to them by your doctor, most HMOs pay their physicians a set amount every month—a fee for including you among their patients. At Chicago's GIA Primary Care Network, for instance, physicians get $8.43 each month for every male patient . . . and $10.09 for every female patient. . . Some HMOs, such as Oxford Health Plans, Cigna and Aetna, have "withhold" systems, in which a percentage of the doctors's monthly fees are withheld and then reimbursed if they keep their referral rates low enough. Others, like U.S. Healthcare, pay bonuses for low referral rates. (John Protos, Ten Things Your HMO Won't Tell You, Inside, June 30, 1997, at 44.)

There is ample evidence that the bottom-line mentality is taking over. HMOs refer to the proportion of premiums they pay out for patient care as their "medical-loss ratio"—a chilling choice of words. The Association of American Medical Colleges reported last November that medical-loss ratios of for-profit HMOs paying a flat fee to doctors for treatment averaged only 70% of their premium revenue. The remaining 30% went for administrative expenses—and profit.

* * * * *

Along the same lines as its "market forces" argument, the dissent submits that the defendants' plan "encouraged physicians to use resources more efficiently." Although we agree, at least in principle, with the idea that financial incentives may very well bring about a more effective use of plan assets, we certainly are far from confident that it was at work in this particular case. The Carle health plan at issue was not used as efficiently as it should have been. Indeed, the eight-day delay in medical care, and the onset of peritonitis Herdrich incurred as a result of such delay in diagnosis, subjected her to a life threatening illness, a longer period of hospitalization and treatment, more extensive, invasive and dangerous surgery, increased hospitalization costs, and a greater ingestion of prescription drugs.

The dissent also somehow contends that "ERISA tolerates some conflict of interest on the part of fiduciaries," and therefore, "allowing a plan sponsor to designate its own agent as a fiduciary reassures the sponsor that, in devoting its assets to the plan, it has not relinquished all ability to ensure that the plan's resources are used wisely."

* * * * *

A doctor who is responsible for the real-life financial demands of providing for his or her family—sending four children to school (whether it be college, high school or primary school), making house payments, covering office overhead, and paying malpractice insurance—might very well "flinch" at the prospect of obtaining a relatively substantial bonus for himself or herself. Here, the Carle physicians were intimately involved with the financial well-being of the enterprise in that the yearly "kickback" was paid to Carle physicians only if the annual expenditure made by physicians on benefits was less than total plan receipts. According to the complaint, Carle doctors stood to gain financially when they were able to limit treatment and referrals. Due to

the dual-loyalties at work, Carle doctors were faced with an incentive to limit costs so as to guarantee a greater kickback.

* * * * *

In summary, we hold that the language of the plaintiff's complaint is sufficient in alleging that the defendant's incentive system depleted plan resources so as to benefit physicians who, coincidentally, administered the Plan, possibly to the detriment of their patients. The ultimate determination of whether the defendants violated their fiduciary obligations to act solely in the interest of the Plan participants and beneficiaries, see 29 U.S.C. §1104(a)(1), must be left to the trial court. On the surface, it does not appear to us that it was in the interest of plan participants for the defendants to deplete the Plan's funds by way of year-end bonus payouts. Based on the record we have before us, we hold that the plaintiff has alleged sufficiently a breach of the defendants' fiduciary duty.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF CULLEN T. GALLAGHER ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a truly outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. Recently, I had the opportunity to nominate Cullen T. Gallagher for an appointment to attend the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

I am pleased to announce that Cullen has been offered an appointment and will be attending the Air Force Academy with the incoming cadet class of 2003. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is one of the most rewarding and demanding time periods these young men and women will ever undertake. Our military academies turn these young adults into the finest officers in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Cullen has demonstrated the kind of leadership and dedication needed to enter the Air Force Academy with the class of 2003. While attending Perkins High School in Sandusky, Ohio, Cullen excelled academically attaining a grade point average of 3.795, which ranks him forty-first in his class of one-hundred sixty students. Cullen is a member of the National Honor Society, the Academic Challenge Team, and the Who's Who Among American High School Students. In October, 1998, Cullen was named the Rotary Club's Student of the Month.

In addition, he attended the National Youth Leadership Forum on Law and the Constitution in Washington, D.C., and attended the United States Air Force Academy Summer Scientific Seminar. Outside the classroom, Cullen is the president of the Ski Club, and is a member of the Spanish Club, Drama Club, Marching Band, and Show Choir. On the fields of competition, Cullen is a member of the Perkins High School Varsity Cross Country and Tennis teams.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would ask my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Cullen T. Gallagher. Our service academies offer the finest education and military training available anywhere in the world. I am sure that Cullen will do very well at the Air Force Academy, and I wish him much success in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO WESTLAKE HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the designation of Westlake Hills Elementary School as a United States Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School.

The Blue Ribbon Award for Educational Excellence recognizes a school's achievement in all facets of academic development including teacher training, student achievement, educational innovation, and community involvement.

Westlake Hills Elementary School has far transcended the norm in all these areas and has demonstrated its deep commitment to molding well rounded, socially conscious leaders for the 21st century through its outstanding range of programs.

Westlake Hills teachers frequently participate in workshops and conferences on a wide range of educational issues, showing the tremendous value Westlake Hills places on maintaining the high caliber of its faculty and keeping its teachers abreast of new idea in education. These teachers then employ these ideas in the classroom, resulting in projects including a 6th grade "wax museum" and a 1st grade "dinosaur dig." In addition, Westlake Hills recognizes the importance of involving a child's first and most influential teachers in the learning experience, with 75% of Westlake Hills parents logging in an astounding 12,000 hours of volunteer time.

These efforts are reflected in the test scores of the student body, which place Westlake Hills above all the other elementary schools in its district. Westlake Hills has also answered President Clinton's "America Reads Challenge" by forging a partnership with nearby Pepperdine University, in order to ensure that each and every child can read both independently and effectively.

Along with its demonstrated excellence in the classroom, Westlake Hills realizes the importance of extracurricular activities in creating the "total" student. Over 200 children participate in clubs for subjects including drama, physical fitness, and Spanish. A club also exists for computers, making use of the school's technology center.

Westlake Hills believes that their goal in forming the "total" student would also be incomplete without instilling in the students a sense of their responsibilities as members of their local community. They have joined General Colin Powell's "Make a Difference" volunteer program, where the children share their time assisting senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in celebrating the recognition of Westlake Hills Elementary School as a National Blue Ribbon School. It is a prime example of the extremely positive effects which a partnership between all members of a school community can produce. Westlake Hills' approach to public education is a paradigm which all American schools should strive to emulate.

A TRIBUTE TO THE DE JONG FAMILY

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the de Jong family of San Diego County, California. Over the last few years, I have had the privilege of working with Arie de Jong and other members of a family that epitomizes the American success story. The de Jong's are close friends to America, which has given them the opportunity to lead and succeed.

On May 26, the de Jong family celebrated 50 years of American heritage with a reunion in Poway, California. Since 1948, when Tom de Jong moved to America, the de Jong family has been an important piece of San Diego's community.

I have attached an article from the online edition of the San Diego Union Tribune that explains more family history and this recent celebration.

In addition, I want to extend my personal congratulations on their first 50 years in American history, and wish them health and happiness for the next 50 years.

FAR-FLUNG FAMILY MEETS, MARKS 50 YEARS IN U.S.

(By John Berhman)

POWAY—The de Jong family is a coming-to-America success story.

Fifty years ago, from their native Holland, the family—a mother, father and 10 children—traveled across the United States to a relative's sparse cattle ranch here. From that beginning, they grew into one of the most successful and well-known families in North County.

The family's Hollandia Dairy in San Marcos in an institution. Family members have spread out all over California and the country, many of them working in the dairy business.

Yesterday, many of them returned to their American roots, celebrating 50 years of being in this country with a family reunion where it all started.

They met at Old Wyoming Picnic Grounds, the family homestead at the end of Old Pomerado Road in south Poway. They gathered around shady oak trees and three stone buildings that served as the family's first homes in this country to reminisce and give thanks.

It is quite an extended family now. From 10 brothers and sisters have come 54 children and nearly 100 grandchildren, most of whom are expected during the reunion. About five family members, mostly cousins, are attending from Holland. Other family members have come from Oregon, Michigan, New Mexico and various parts of California.

"This is wonderful. This is what family and friends are all about. And, this great

country. We feel so privileged to be a part of this country,'' Tom de Jong, at 73 the oldest of the 10 brothers and sisters, said yesterday at the kickoff of the event.

Tom was the first of the family to come to America. That was in 1948, when he took a job working on his uncle Sam Bruinsma's ranch in what is now Poway. Bruinsma was married to Tom's father's twin sister, Tante Jet.

Impressed with America and the opportunities it offered, Tom wrote to his parents, insisting they join him.

The rest of the family did indeed follow the oldest son, arriving in New York on May 26, 1949. This week's reunion—expected to draw more than 200 de Jongs and close friends—marks the 50th anniversary of that event.

''I will never forget that day,'' Arie de Jong, 60, perhaps the best known of the clan, said yesterday. ''The Statue of Liberty and that New York skyline—and coming to America.

''America has been good to us.''

Arie, after helping his family start the Hollandia Dairy, became a millionaire in the trash-hauling business. Among the possessions he has acquired are the three stone structures in Poway that his family first lived in.

The reunion, the first of its kind for the family, was Arie's idea.

''It's really for the kids and the grandkids through,'' he said. ''It's to show them where their family started in this country.''

Arie has arranged a busy schedule that included a barbecue picnic last night at the old family homestead, a trip to Catalina today and tomorrow, another barbecue and picnic Saturday at nearby Big Stone Lodge, and church on Sunday followed by final farewells.

A TRIBUTE TO H. GAYLON GREENHILL

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished public servant. H. Gaylon Greenhill, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, has decided to retire after 37 years of dedicated service to the institution and our region. Chancellor Greenhill has done so much to advance the cause of higher education in Wisconsin, and it is for his service that I salute him today.

H. Gaylon Greenhill has served in a variety of capacities at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater throughout his tenure. Before being appointed chancellor in 1991, he served as Chairman of the Political Science department, Dean of Summer School and Extension Services, Acting Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, and Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties.

Chancellor Greenhill received his Bachelor's degree in Social Studies at University of Wisconsin-River Falls and earned his Master's and Doctorate degree in Political Science from the University of Illinois. He was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Oslo from 1960–61.

During his tenure as chancellor at UW-Whitewater, the university developed and implemented the campus exterior plan, constructed the Irvin L. Young Auditorium, renovated the James R. Connor University Center and Hyer Hall, and made major technological advances such as the construction of a fiber optic computer network, the addition of numerous workstations in computer labs and the complete wiring of the residence halls.

Under Chancellor Greenhill's leadership, UW-Whitewater has been ranked in U.S. News & World Report's top tier of midwestern regional universities for five consecutive years. UW-Whitewater has also recently received accreditation from the North Central Association and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Chancellor Greenhill initiated the Excellence for the 21st Century Campaign to raise $10 million for scholarships and university betterment. Not only did UW-Whitewater surpass this goal, it did it two years early and had $2.4 million in excess.

Chancellor Greenhill will retire from UW-Whitewater effective June 30, 1999. I know that I speak for everyone in the UW-Whitewater family when I wish him and his family well as they begin this new and exciting stage in their lives together. Thank you for your service to your community, Chancellor, and thank you for what you have done for the university.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE MAJOR JOHN B. MAHAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy-heart that I wish to take this moment to recognize the life and career of one of The United States' great men, Major John B. Mahan. Sadly, Major John Mahan died after suffering a stroke in 1995. While his family and friends remember the truly exceptional life of Major Mahan, I, too, would like to pay tribute to this remarkable man.

Major John B. Mahan served proudly in the U.S. Army from 1938 until his retirement in 1961. During that time, he served in North Africa. While in North Africa, Major Mahan was wounded and had to spend months in a stateside hospital to recover. In the Marine Division, Major Mahan served in the Korean War as a liaison officer/transportation officer in some of the war's most intense months.

Later in his life, Major Mahan was stationed at Fort Carson as company commander. In 1957, he was chosen to be the Commandant of Cadets in the R.O.T.C program for the Denver Public School District. Major Mahan put his all into the R.O.T.C. program, running it until his retiremment.

Although his professional accomplishments will long be remembered and admired, most who knew him well remember Major John Mahan, above all else, as a friend, It is clear that he is truly missed, yet his family can take solace in the knowledge that each is a better person for having known Major John Mahan.

ANOTHER REASON WE NEED A RX BENEFIT FOR EVERYONE IN MEDICARE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, a number of us have introduced H.R. 1495, a bill to provide a prescription drug for everyone in Medicare. A provision in that bill requires a system to prevent drug errors and the use of contraindicated drugs.

Over-prescription and reactions among multiple prescriptions costs Americans billions of dollars a year in illness—and thousands of deaths. If we can reduce those errors, the total health care system can make enormous savings.

A new article in the May/June 1999 issue of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association provides another example of why we should improve the quality of drug use among all Medicare beneficiaries. Following is the abstract of Rajender Aparasu's study entitled. ''Visits to Office-Based Physicians in the United States for Medication-Related Morbidity.''

Objective: To examine the prevalence, nature, demographics, and resource use associated with visits to office-based physicians in the United States during 1995 for medication-related morbidity.

Design: A nationwide cross-sectional survey of ambulatory care visits to physician offices, based on data from the National Center for Health Statistics' 1995 National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey.

Setting: Physician office-based settings in the United States.

Patients: Patients visiting office-based physicians for principal diagnoses of adverse effect of medications (ICD–9–CM E-code 930.00–947.9).

Main Outcome Measures: Weighted measures of prevalence, nature, demographics, and resource use associated with visits related to adverse effects of medications.

Results: An estimated 2.01 million (95% confidence interval, 1.69 to 2.34 million) visits for medication-related morbidity were made to office-based physicians in the United States during 1995, representing an annual rate of 7.70 visits per 1,000 persons. Medication-related visit rates were greater in women, in patients between 65 to 74 years of age, and in the Midwest. The most frequently cited reasons for medication-related visits were skin rash, nausea, and shortness of breath. The therapeutic agents responsible for medication-related visits were most often hormone and synthetic substitutes (13.32%), antibiotics (11.55%), and cardiovascular drugs (9.30%). Medication-related visits most often involved diagnostic services and medication therapy. The majority included instructions for a scheduled follow-up, and fewer than 1% resulted in hospital admission.

Conclusion: Medication-related ambulatory care utilization can pose a significant burden on health care resources unless specific strategies are initiated to control medication-related problems. The provision of pharmaceutical care can play an important role in reducing medication-related problems and associated health care costs.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ELBERT GILL IN CELEBRATION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE OTTAWA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a very special tribute to one of the truly outstanding individuals from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District, Mr. Elbert Gill. On Monday, May 31, 1999, Elbert Gill will retire from service as Chairman of the Ottawa County Board of Elections.

Elbert Gill has certainly been a valuable asset to the Ottawa County Board of Elections. Since joining the Board of Elections in March 1989, Mr. Gill has worked diligently to serve the voters of Ottawa County in every manner possible. Whether it is his generosity in taking the staff to meetings or assisting with trouble-shooting on election night, Elbert Gill has given unselfishly of his time and helped make Ottawa County one of the best Boards of Elections in the state of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, Elbert Gill embodies the very spirit of American workmanship through his conscientious attention to detail. In his job as Chairman of the Ottawa County Board of Elections, Mr. Gill has epitomized the word that best describes him—service. Although he is retiring after ten years on the board, his hard work, commitment, and dedication to the citizens of Ottawa County will continue long into the future.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that America succeeds due to the remarkable accomplishments and contributions of her citizens. It is very evident that Elbert Gill has given freely of his time and energy to assist in the preservation of American ideals. Our electoral process is the backbone of our nation, and those individuals, like Elbert Gill, who work hard to make that system free and democratic are true American patriots.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would urge my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Elbert Gill. On the occasion of his retirement as Chairman of the Ottawa County Board of Elections, we thank him for his service and we wish him all the best in the future.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE FOR HOMICIDE VICTIMS

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Justice for Homicide Victims. The Board of Directors of the California Center for Family Survivors of Homicide, which includes its action arm, Justice for Homicide Victims has been a constant advocate for victims rights.

Today, we honor those who make it possible to help create a working environment with legislators so victims and their survivors may attain equal rights. Marcella Leach, Executive Director of JHV, is one of the many dedicated individuals who help to make the public and legislators alike aware of the need for victims rights.

Justice for Homicide Victims was founded in 1984 by Ellen Griffin Dunne. The first goal of JHV was to establish a public perception that those who commit serious or malicious crimes should be punished accordingly.

JHV has been working tirelessly to effect legislative change. As a result, JHV helped implement a newly passed Victims Bill of Rights. In addition to support services through their hotline and at murder trials, JHV cooperates with the District Attorney's office on a regular basis which results in positive relationship and spreads JHV's goals and objectives.

JHV has worked for many years to educate and inform legislators on many aspects of the law. This year, JHV was honored to be the most organization for the Governor's Crime Summit and their efforts helped in the passage of legislation that was previously thought to be unattainable.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in celebrating the success of the California Center for Family Survivors of Homicide and Justice for Homicide Victims.

LEGISLATION HONORING FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution honoring firefighters throughout our nation that have died in the line of duty. It is appropriate that the Congress pay its respect to these individuals.

Just last week, the District of Columbia lost two brave and dedicated public servants. Firefighter Anthony Phillips died while fighting a fire at a DC town house. Firefighter Louis Matthews died days later from burns sustained while fighting the same blaze.

There are over 1.1 million firefighters on active duty everyday in the United States, and over the last 10 years, we have lost 1,109 of these courageous individuals to circumstances associated with doing their job.

Almost a month ago, the National Fire Protection Agency announced that 91 firefighters died in the line of duty during the year 1998. That is the lowest number of deaths in the last 10 years, and one of the lowest totals on record. While we are pleased to see the number of deaths decrease, clearly all Americans look forward to the day when we don't lose a single firefighter.

These brave individuals, many of whom serve as volunteers without compensation, risk their lives daily to insure that we can exit safety from our homes when they catch fire and provide life-saving care when we are injured in an accident. It is for these reasons that we honor these courageous individuals.

I trust my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice, both in the District I serve, and all across the nation.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE STAFF SERGEANT ALVIN W. PLASTER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a man who exemplified courage and determination, Staff Sergeant Alvin W. Plaster. Tragically, Alvin Plaster died in 1996 after a long battle with a grave illness. While family and friends remember the truly exceptional life of Staff Sergeant Alvin W. Plaster, I, too, would like to pay tribute to this remarkable man.

Persistence and dedication displayed on the part of Alvin Plaster is what got him into the Army. Failing the physical examination twice, he convinced an Army physician to bend the rules slightly and let him enlist. From 1942 to 1945, Alvin Plaster was Staff Sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps. He served with integrity, enthusiasm, and most of all, pride.

Individuals such as Alvin Plaster, who contribute selflessly, are a rare breed. Though his family and friends no doubt mourn his absence, they have all gained immensely through knowing Alvin W. Plaster.

CHILD SAFETY AND YOUTH VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACT

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House Judiciary Committee will introduce legislation designed to help fight the scourge of violence among young people. Included in this bill is a proposal I authored with my colleague ROD BLAGOJEVICH of Illinois.

Our plan, HR 1717, known as the Violent Youth Offender Accountability Act, will prohibit violent juvenile felons from ever purchasing a firearm. Under current law, many states permit juveniles who have been convicted of violent felonies to have their criminal records expunged upon reaching age 18. As a result, it is perfectly legal for a juvenile with a record as a violent felon to legally purchase a deadly weapon. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong.

As many of my colleagues know, I spent nearly a dozen years as a criminal trial court judge and gang murder prosecutor. Some of the most serious crimes I have seen were committed by juveniles. We need to ensure that our streets are kept safe, and that young people learn how serious committing a violent crime can be. One of the surest ways to meet this goal is by keeping firearms out of the hands of serious criminals of any age.

We must also take steps to ensure that the law applies equally to all Americans. The Juvenile Justice bill includes a key provision of our bill which will apply the same standard to juveniles as to adults who have committed serious felonies. Crimes that are considered "serious violent felonies" and would disqualify an adult from legally purchasing a firearm must also apply to juveniles. Under current federal

law, these crimes include: murder, rape, manslaughter, robbery, extortion, arson and similar severe crimes.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep guns out of the hands of violent criminals. I am proud that my colleague ROD BLAGOJEVICH and I have reached across party lines to stand for what is right: protecting our nation's youth. Later this week, the Judiciary Committee will mark up legislation incorporating our proposals and a number of key measures to ensure that the same goal is met. We must not cease in our efforts to ensure safe, effective schools and communities our children deserve nothing less.

MEDICARE MODERNIZATION NO. 8: SETTING THE GOAL OF MOVING TO A SINGLE, UNITED P.P.S. SYSTEM FOR POST–CARE HOSPITAL SERVICES

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as part of a series of bills to provide for the modernization of Medicare, I am today introducing a bill to set the goal that by the year 2010 Medicare develop and use a single, united prospective payment system for post-acute hospital services.

Currently, payment for post-acute care is a Tower of Babel, with different PPS and non-PPS systems used depending on whether one goes to a non-PPS hospital, a skilled nursing home, a home health agency, or some other form of therapy. The different payment rates and systems greatly increase Medicare's complexity and makes the system vulnerable to 'gaming'—the placement of a patient where the provider will get the most money, not where the patient will get the best care.

The Congressional advisory commission MedPAC, and other health experts, have long-warned that the proliferation of payment systems makes it evermore difficult for us to know what we are buying and how well patients are being treated.

But moving to a single, unified, and simpler system is not easy. In many areas, the data or basic research is not available. Therefore, my bill sets out a long-term goal for Medicare to move in this direction. I hope that HCFA can develop these simplifications and cross-comparisons sooner, but if not, the bill sets a 'hammer' of requiring the provider communities and HCFA to come together to achieve this goal by the end of the next decade.

In the long run, this effort should yield savings and improve quality measurement. My introduction of this bill is a signal that this is the direction we should be moving.

Following are some quotes from the March 1999 MedPAC report to Congress on why this wonky issue is also an important issue:

> To guide the development of consistent payment policies across post-acute care settings, MedPAC recommends that common data elements be collected to help identify and quantify the overlap of patients treated and services provided. Further, it is important to put in place quality monitoring systems in each setting to ensure that adequate care is provided in the appropriate site. We also support research and demonstrations to assess the potential of alternative patient classification systems for use across settings to make payments for like services more comparable. . .
>
> A lack of readily available data on patient function and health status limits the ability to identify where differences and overlaps in patients occur and to compare costs and payments across provider types. In particular, policymakers are concerned that payment policies may furnish incentives for providers to place patients in settings for financial, rather than for clinical reasons. A core set of common data about patients in all post-acute care settings will improve considerably the ability to monitor and make policy decisions about post-acute care.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF THE LATE MAJ. GEN. WALTER A. CHURCHILL (RET.), U.S. MARINE CORPS, FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to a truly outstanding individual from the state of Ohio, the late Major General Walter A. Churchill (ret.), United States Marine Corps. On Monday, June 7, 1999, a special celebration will take place in Toledo, Ohio to honor the outstanding life and military career of General Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Augustus Churchill, Sr. was born on November 12, 1903. At the age of 19, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and began a distinguished military career culminating with the rank of Major General in 1962. General Churchill retired from the United States Marine Corps on December 1, 1963, after a remarkable 41 years and 8 days of service to his country.

During his career in the Marine Corps, General Churchill served the United States proudly around the world at Guantanamo Bay, Iceland, Guam, Guadalcanal, and other areas of the Pacific theater in World War II. While serving in World War II, General Churchill was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V" for Valor and a Gold Star as Commander of the Fifth Field Service Command, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

After his military career, General Churchill was instrumental in forming the United States Marines Youth Foundation, whose goal is to keep children free from the dangers of drugs and substance abuse. General Churchill was also the Chairman of the Board and CEO of Churchill Supermarkets, Inc., the family business of five supermarkets. His tireless dedication and innovation helped propel General Churchill's standing in the business community.

Always the community activist, General Churchill was a member of the Toledo City Council and was Chairman of the Toledo Republican Executive and Central Committees. He was a member of the Toledo Rotary Club, National Association of Grocers, Ohio Automobile Association, and many more. Among others, General Churchill was recognized as "Marine of the Year," "Grocer of the Year," and, in 1992, he received the President's Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to stand and join me in paying tribute to the late Major General Walter A. Churchill. For his unwavering service above and beyond the call of duty, we owe him our most gracious thanks.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID AND ELAINE GILL

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Elaine and David Gill for their almost fifty years of leadership and devotion to the Brandeis-Bardin Institute and the Los Angeles Jewish community.

Since they first attended the Brandeis Collegiate Institute in the 1950s, Elaine and David have forged a warm, longstanding relationship with the Brandeis-Bardin Institute as a whole. Both of them have served on the Board and David is a member of the Executive Committee. Elaine has served as chair of the Alonim Committee, the Women of Brandeis-Bardin, and as co-chair of the Brandeis-Bardin Associates. The Gills have recognized the important role that BBI plays in enhancing the spiritual life of Jews of all ages and levels of observance, and they have committed their time and energy to ensuring the Institute's continued success and development.

The Gills' relationship with the Brandeis-Bardin Institute exists on the personal level as well. All four of their sons have attended Camp Alonim, the youth resident summer camp held on the grounds of the Institute. Between 1971 and 1994, at least one of their sons was involved with the camp either as a camper or a staff member. In fact, both of the couple's married sons met their wives at Alonim. A third generation of Gills, grandsons Jasper, Jonah, and Micah, are all future campers.

In addition to all their efforts on behalf of Brandeis-Bardin, Elaine and David have found time to volunteer with several other Jewish organizations, showing that their dedication to the local Jewish community extends far beyond the tree-lined gates of the institute.

At Valley Beth Shalom, one of the largest Conservative synagogues in the San Fernando Valley, the Gills have both been active members. They have served as pararabbinic counselors and they have been instrumental in developing the synagogue's havurah program, which brings together families with similar interests for social and religious fellowship. David has been chairman of the Board and has led two building fund campaigns. Elaine is currently Religious Vice President.

The Gills have also devoted an extraordinary amount of time to the Los Angeles Jewish Federation which offers a wide range of activities and services to individuals throughout Los Angeles. Together, David and Elaine

have led several missions to Israel and they have each chaired committees too numerous to mention.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring Elaine and David Gill's outstanding work with the Brandeis-Bardin Institute and the Los Angeles Jewish community. They are the true embodiment of the concept that "all Israel are responsible for one another."

MILITARY HOME OF RECORD ACT OF 1999; LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY THE "HOME OF RECORD" FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE 2000 CENSUS.

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to introduce legislation that I feel is essential to achieving an accurate count in Census 2000.

Military personnel are a unique group because they often pay taxes and vote in a state in which they are stationed; therefore, it is difficult to clearly define their actual residence. Most would not be residing in the place they have been stationed were it not for their military service. Many have family in another state.

My bill will provide clarity by ensuring that military personnel are allocated to their "Home of Record." This will ensure that federal funding and redistricting are based on an accurate count of the population.

Currently, the Census Bureau plans to use "Home of Record" data for counting military personnel who are stationed overseas in Census 2000. This bill requires the Census Bureau to work in partnership with the Department of Defense to count military personnel who have been stationed in the United States as well.

This bill is not a radical shift in policy for the Census. In the 1990 Census as well as in the 1970 Census the Department of Commerce utilized "home of record" data. In 1992, the Supreme Court stated that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce was acting within the law when he used "home of record" data from the personnel files to count military personnel in the 1990 Census.

I am not seeking to uproot years of tradition here today; I am merely fighting to ensure that the Census is done in a fair and equitable manner, accounting for all U.S. citizens in their proper home. These men and women have claimed a state to be their "home"-why shouldn't we honor that claim. There are many states that, merely based on location, have been chosen to house military personnel. Counting military personnel as residents of these states when they are voting and paying taxes elsewhere simply does not make sense.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE DR. THEODORE MILLER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I wish to take this moment to recognize the remarkable life and significant achievements of one of Pueblo, Colorado's treasured pediatric physicians. Tragically, Dr. Theodore Miller died after a long battle with prostate cancer. While his family and friends remember the truly exceptional life of Dr. Theodore, I, too, would like to pay tribute to this remarkable man.

As a pediatrician in Pueblo, Colorado, for forty years, Dr. Miller's bedside manner was the best around. According to former patients and colleagues, Dr. Miller was the kind of man who took time for the children to get them directly involved with their diagnosis and recovery. Dr. Miller's love for his work was evident through his dedication to his partner, and his patients.

Dr. Theodore Miller served in the medical corps in World War II, and moved to Pueblo Colorado soon after. He graduated from Northwestern Medical School in 1945 and started his partnership in 1951. After forty years of serving the community of Pueblo, Dr. Miller retired in 1991. He was a member of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the Colorado State Medical Society Dr. Miller also served on the American Board of Pediatrics, and was once president of the Pueblo County Medical Society.

Although his professional accomplishments will long be remembered and admired, most who knew him well remember Dr. Miller, above all else, as a friend. it is clear that the multitude of those who have come to know him, mourn his absence. However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that, in spite of this profound loss, the family and friends of Dr. Theodore Miller can take solace in the knowledge that each is a better person for having known him.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF RUTH SQUIRES

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 36th year of service for a teacher in my district. Sadly, as students and parents in La Crescenta, CA, would agree, it also marks the end of her distinguished career in education. To honor this service to our youth and to our Nation, I ask my colleagues here today to join me in saluting Ruth Squires.

Ruth's career in teaching would carry her from coast to coast. She began her career in New York State, earning a degree at the State University Teachers' College In Cortlind. Eventually finding her way to California, Ruth joined the faculty at Rosemont Middle School in La Crescenta in 1963. She immediately became actively involved in both community and school events. She is best known for her leadership in the school's production on the United States Constitution. This community event is Ruth's trademark, bring to life the two-hundred year old document that is the foundation of our government.

In her 36 years at Rosemont, Ruth has taught history, social science and economics, and served as a mentor for her peers. Currently, she is the chair of the history and social science department. And her leadership has not gone unnoticed. In 1988, she was awarded the prestigious Masonic Award, and in 1993, received the John Del Monte Award for her service to campus and community. Ruth is also recognized by "Who's Who, American University and Colleges Edition."

Mr. Speaker, too often, the service of those who mean the most goes unnoticed. Although another school year has come to an end, we must not let it pass without recognizing the service of the men and women in education who have unconditionally served our youth. Ruth Squires is one of these patriots.

For her three decades of service to the families of California's 27th Congressional District, and for her distinguished work in the La Crescenta community, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of Ruth Squires.

TRIBUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA FOR CELEBRATING THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS INDEPENDENCE ON MAY 30, 1999, AND FOR OPENING A NEW CONSULATE GENERAL IN CHICAGO ON APRIL 8, 1999

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Republic of Croatia for celebrating the 9th anniversary of its independence on May 30, 1999, and for opening a new Consulate General in Chicago on April 8, 1999.

I am proud, and especially proud today, to be one of the more than 2 million people of Croatian descent living in the United States who have maintained their links with Croatia. Croatian Americans arrived in the United States with little except for the belief in the "American Dream" and a perseverance to succeed and watch their children excel. Since they first arrived in large numbers in the United States more than one hundred years ago, Croatian Americans have done well in all aspects of American historical, socio-cultural and political life. Their sons and daughters have grown up to be doctors, lawyers and other professionals who have served the country which welcomed their ancestors with open arms.

Croatia is a country rich in history, culture and beauty. Its people have a special appreciation for the United States and Americans. A Croatian poet, Antun Gustav Matos, wrote in 1906 that "America is presently the most important factor in the creation of Croatian democracy, the best school of Croatian vitality."

Today these words are even more meaningful than they were in 1906.

We all remember Croatia's lengthy war for independence that made headlines worldwide in the early part of this decade. We celebrated when Croatia finally broke from the Serbian-dominated Yugoslavia in 1991, after such great loss of human life, to become its own independent country. Today, we stand with the Croatians to pay tribute to their courage and perseverance. We pay tribute to Croatia's fully functioning, democratic political structure, and its commitment to further economic development.

I also want to pay tribute to the Republic of Croatia's opening of a new Consulate General in Chicago on April 8, 1999. The three-day series of events entitled Croatia in Chicago was the largest gathering ever of the Croatian community in the U.S. and it demonstrated that the partnership between Croatia and the U.S. is constantly being strengthened. One particularly special event was a Gala Dinner organized by the Croatian community in Chicago. There were 1,400 guests in attendance and the revenues of the dinner went to benefit the children's hospitals in Croatia.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Ambassador Robert Gelbard at the Groatia in Chicago event. Mr. Gelbard said "As our trade and business ties grow so must Groatia's integration into the full range of Western and Euro-Altantic institutions." I believe we must do all we can to help Croatia achieve these goals, and we must continue to reinforce to the Croatian people that our goal is a full partnership with Croatia. Finally, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to th Republic of Croatia for celebrating the ninth anniversary of its independence and for opening a new Consulate General in Chicago.

THE POTOMAC—AN ENDANGERED RIVER

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, I am deeply concerned about the environment in and around our nation's capital.

Two years ago the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus held a monthly informational briefing on fishing in the Washington, D.C. area. Following that briefing I submitted for the record an article written by Charles Verharen, a Professor at Howard University and avid local fisherman, that highlighted threats to the Potomac River fishery.

At the request of local fishermen, a study on the impact of sediment discharge on anadromous fish was initiated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, the Interstate Commission for the Potomac River Basin, the District of Columbia Fish and Wildlife, and the National Marine Fisheries Service. The report concludes that this sediment discharge is causing a significant adverse impact to anadromous fish during the spawning season.

I have attached another article by Charles Verharen that describes the impact of this environmental problem. In addition, I have enclosed the summary of recommendations from the Fish and Wildlife Service report to update my colleagues on the problems facing the Potomac River environment.

JOE FLETCHER'S FISH STORY

(By Charles Verharen)

Joe Fletcher is tempted to cry over his beloved river. And a recent U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report claims he has good reason.

Joe and his family have rented fishing boats on the Potomac at Fletcher's Boat House for three generations. One of Joe's favorite stories—not about a fisherman but a ferry passenger—shows why he's sad.

Joe's story starts in colonial times when the Potomac was one of the greatest fisheries in the world. George Washington owned highly profitable commercial fishing rights on the Potomac near Mount Vernon. The king of all fish in the Potomac was the sturgeon, ranging up to ten feet in length and weighing over four hundred pounds. Potomac caviar was a delicacy prized around the world.

In colonial Washington, the only way across the Potomac was by ferry. One time a sturgeon leaped out of the water and landed on a Georgetown passenger sitting in a small ferry's stern. The fish was so huge that it crushed the man's hip and he died from the injury several weeks later.

Joe's doubly sad when he tells this story—sad about the passenger and sad that sturgeon leap out of the Potomac no more. But now Joe's got something else to be sad about. He fears that the sturgeon's fate threatens rockfish (striped bass) and shad, abundant at Fletcher's Cove even in times when the Potomac was one of the most polluted rivers in America.

Ironically, Joe blames this new threat of extinction on pure water. The Washington Aqueduct drinking water treatment plant discharges the equivalent of up to twenty five dump-truck loads of aluminum and copper sulfates and other waste material into the Potomac above Chain Bridge every day as a by-product of its water purifying process.

Joe fears the chemicals are damaging the spawn and fry—as well as fishing. "Every time the water treatment plant dumps a big load into the river," Joe claims, "the fish just stop biting."

Joe can't imagine Washingtonians would sit still if they saw twenty five trucks parked on Key Bridge dumping waste into the Potomac. And twenty five trucks a day adds up to over nine thousand trucks a year. "How many times would nine thousand trucks go around the Beltway?", Joe wonders.

A recent U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report on the Washington Aqueduct confirms Joe's fears. Prepared by Fish and Wildlife's Chesapeake Bay field office and a panel of area-wide fisheries biologists, the report advocates eliminating all Washington Aqueduct waste discharges into the Potomac, one of fourteen American Heritage Rivers targeted for "environmental, economic, and social restoration projects."

Surprisingly, the panel claims shortnose sturgeon have been found in the lower and middle Potomac, and Aqueduct waste discharge points are potential spawning habitats for sturgeon. The panel's report asks the Environmental Protection Agency to investigate the Aqueduct's potential threat to a sturgeon comeback.

The EPA gives the Washington Aqueduct a permit to discharge its waste. Long past its expiration date, the permit has been "administratively extended." The EPA won't renew the permit in its present form because the Army Corps of Engineers which operates the Washington Aqueduct isn't doing everything it can to clean up its waste.

The Corps could truck the waste to disposal sites but a citizens group that calls itself "CRUDD" (Committee for Responsible Urban Disposal at Dalecarlia, the old name for the Aqueduct) doesn't want the trucks threatening their children's safety and their Palisade neighborhood's clean air.

The waste could be pumped to Washington's Blue Plains waste water treatment plant through existing sewer lines, but the Washington Aqueduct would have to pay for using the lines and enlarging Blue Plains treatment capacity. The local governments that buy clean water from the Aqueduct don't feel that Washington area residents want to pay extra taxes to stop the Potomac pollution.

Those same customers want to save money by paying chicken farmers and other polluters upstream to stop their discharge. The EPA allows polluters to buy and sell pollution rights from one another. But that kind of exchange wouldn't save the fish.

Joe Fletcher thinks that if Washingtonians knew how dirty their clean drinking water makes the Potomac, they might want to pay a little extra so the shad and the rockfish have a chance to make a comeback. Joe even dreams about the day he might see a sturgeon breaking the water close to his boat—but not too close!

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Annapolis, MD, March 2, 1999.

Re: Washington Aqueduct Report.

MS. PATRICIA GLEASON,
U.S. EPA, Region III,
Water Protection Division,
Philadelphia, PA.

MS. GLEASON: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Interstate Commission for the Potomac River Basin, District of Columbia Fish and Wildlife, and National Marine Fisheries Service have completed a report on the sediment discharges from the Washington Aqueduct, Washington, D.C. The enclosed report concludes that significant adverse impacts to anadromous fish during the spawning season could occur from the sediment discharges. The report entitled, "Washington Aqueduct Sediment Discharges Report of Panel Recommendations" includes recommendations to the Aqueduct Administrators on how to minimize the impacts during the spawning season.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide information relevant to fish and wildlife resources. If you have any questions on this report, please contact David W. Sutherland at (410) 573–4535 or DavidXSutherland@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. PENNINGTON,
ACTING SUPERVISOR,
Chesapeake Bay Field Office.

Enclosure.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT SEDIMENT DISCHARGES

REPORT OF PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Fisheries Panel Summary of Recommendations, March 1999

A panel of fisheries biologists from the District of Columbia, State of Maryland, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, National Marine Fisheries Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was convened to provide recommendations on minimizing impacts to migratory fish from sediment discharges at the Washington Aqueduct. The fisheries panel provides these recommendations to the administrators at the Washington Aqueduct in an effort to advance the anadromous (and resident) fish restoration efforts in the Potomac River. By minimizing the adverse effects to water quality from sediment discharges at the Dalecarlia and Georgetown settling basins, fisheries resource managers have a better chance at achieving fish and habitat restoration goals for the Potomac River.

1. The goal is to eliminate sediment discharges to the Potomac River. If sediment discharges are absolutely necessary, the panel recommends eliminating the flocculent/sediment discharges from February 15 to June 15, to avoid the early and late spawning activities of migratory fish.

2. Mix the flocculent/sediments with raw river water in the settling basins to produce an effluent, that when discharged to the river, reduces the adverse impacts of concentrated sediments on migratory fish.

3. Slow the rate of flocculent/sediment discharge to the river to a minimum of 72 hours per basin. We recommend that the ratio of discharge to river flow be less that 0.1%. This will also reduce the adverse impacts to migratory fish from concentrated sediments entering the river.

4. Monitor water quality daily at the discharge sites to identify a time when water quality conditions are least sensitive to sediment discharges in the river. The water quality monitoring parameters include: pH, temperature, alkalinity, and conductivity.

5. Remove rocks from the Dalecarlia outfall to ensure controlled and measurable sediment discharge rates, and establish outfall maintenance and discharge monitoring plans to promote safe operation and predictable discharge rates.

6. Create a panel of stakeholders to assist the Washington Aqueduct with issues relating to the Potomac River ecosystem. These entities could include citizen coalition, local, state, interstate, and federal representatives.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICARE MODERNIZATION NO. 7: ''MEDICARE CLINICAL PRACTICE PATTERNS ACT OF 1999''

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the seventh bill in my Medicare modernization series: the ''Medicare Clinical Practice Patterns Act of 1999.'' This bill would give the Secretary the authority to document patterns of clinical practice in the Medicare program, determine the effectiveness of treatment, and bring medicare policy in line with that of the private sector. If implemented, the ''Clinical Practice Patterns Act'' would help to standardize the delivery of health services within Medicare, thereby improving the quality of care provided to Medicare beneficiaries and achieving savings for the program overall.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 1544, the ''Patient Empowerment Act of 1999.'' The ''Patient Empowerment Act'' was the first step toward eliminating the wide variation in treatment patterns across the U.S., as identified by Dr. John Wennberg in the Dartmouth Atlas. The ''Clinical Practice Patterns Act'' builds on this theme by developing evidence-based clinical guidelines to assist providers in treating various illness.

Mr. Speaker, there are literally millions of doctors, nurses, and health administrators working in thousands of different hospitals, all trained at different schools in different communities, who provide care to the 39 million elderly, disabled, and ESRD patients covered by Medicare. With all of these elements interacting together, it's no wonder that we have such wide variation in treatment patterns across the United States.

Medicare is a combination of both art and science. For most treatments, there are no empirical data on clinical effectiveness that suggest one method is better than another. In these cases, providers use their ''best guess'' to make treatment decisions—relying on their individual knowledge, preferences, and the resources available to them. This ''art'' of medicine exacerbates the variation in treatment patterns, and Medicare expenditures, across the U.S.

Yet, as Wennberg notes, there is virtually no difference in health outcomes between low and high spending areas. If less expensive treatments are available, why aren't we prescribing them more readily? By collecting and distributing data on clinical effectiveness, and encouraging providers to use treatment guidelines, we may be able to minimize practice variation. We simultaneously may be able to achieve substantial savings for Medicare.

Following is a portion of an interview from the May/June 1999 issue of Health Affairs by Princeton professor Uwe Reinhardt with HHS Secretary Donna Shalala discussing how Medicare's financial problems would be greatly reduced if the variation in clinical practices were minimized:

REINHARDT. ''Count on me to be a real thorn in the side of the status quo, then, because I believe that if everyone in America could consume medical care while spending at rates similar to those of Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin, providing health care to the aging baby-boom generation would be a piece of cake, wouldn't it?''

SHALALA. ''Absolutely, and the doctors would feel as though the system were fairer. But once the infrastructure is built and physicians get comfortable with consuming a certain level of resources, it's very difficult to work your way out unless you buy yourself out, as we have attempted to do with the downsizing of medical residency positions through HCFA's New York demonstration.''

Clinical practice guidelines are being used more and more throughout the private sector to improve the quality of health care as well as to increase the efficiency of the health industry. This practice does not in any way diminish the art of medicine, it only improves the science behind treatment decisions.

Medicare is a natural candidate for clinical practice guidelines. With an outstanding database of information on beneficiaries across the country, and the resources of the NIH and AHCPR at hand, Medicare could effectively implement a program to improve clinical effectiveness and achieve savings through efficiency.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM S. HEFRON ON HIS APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. GILLMOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that William S. Hefron, of Amherst, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Mr. Speaker, Bill as accepted his offer of appointment and will be attending West Point this fall with the incoming cadet class of 2003. Attending one of our nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education and demands the very best that these young men and women have to offer. Truly, it is one of the most challenging and rewarding undertakings of their lives.

While attending Lorain Catholic High School, Bill has attained a grade point average of 4.062 on a 4.3 scale, which places him third in his class of sixty-six students. Bill's scholastic honors include the Lorain Catholic Honor Roll and National Honor Society. Bill is also taking several AP classes to further his outstanding academic achievements.

Outside of the classroom, Bill has distinguished himself as an outstanding student-athlete. On the fields of competition, Bill is a Varsity letter winner in cross country, track, football, and basketball. During his Junior season, Bill was captain of the cross country team, Most Valuable Runner, and a school record holder. In track, Bill won the 800 meters at the District Track & Field Meet, and placed fifth in Regional competition. And currently, Bill is the Secretary of the Senior Class.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would ask my colleagues to stand and join me in paying special tribute to William S. Hefron. Our service academies offer the finest education and military training available anywhere in the world. I am sure that Bill will do very well during his career at West Point, and I wish him the very best in all of his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE KEITH CLARK

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I would like to take this moment to honor the remarkable life and exceptional achievements of a great Coloradan and American, Keith Clark. In doing so, I wish to pay tribute to Keith for all of his many years of service and sacrifice on behalf of this nation. At the same time, I would also like to offer my deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Keith as they grieve at his passing. Like those who knew him well, the entire Grand Junction community will miss both Keith and his tireless service on their behalf.

For 29 years in Grand Junction, Colorado's School District 51, Keith was a pillar of education who served with great distinction, both as a teacher and as an advocate for improving our schools. Keith was, for nearly three decades, a powerful voice of leadership and vision for education in the Grand Valley. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that his leadership in education will continue to benefit students in our school system for many years to come. I know that this is a legacy that Mr. Clark would take great pride in.

In addition to his service as an educator, Keith also served his country with great valor as a B–52 pilot during World War II. Mr. Clark flew and fought bravely over the skies of North Africa and Italy in defense of the nation he loved deeply.

At one might surmise from his sustained service and selfless sacrifice, Keith was also a fierce patriot and proud American. He believed deeply in our constitutional form of government and in the bedrock principles—like freedom, liberty, and individual self-determination—upon which this great republic stands.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Mr. Keith Clark for his decades of service, both in defense of our country as an airman and in defense of our future as an educator. He was truly a great American.

At the same time, I would also like to offer my heart-felt condolences to Keith's family: his wife of 52 years Anita, his children Katie and Cal, and his three granddaughters Amber, Lily and Hillary. I hope that these family members, like everyone who has had the good-fortune of knowing Keith, will take solace in the undisputable fact that they are a better person for having known him.

SALUTING THE SERVICE OF JOAN KELLY

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, none of us here today would have found success without the help and guidance of a teacher. As students, we were all influenced by those who commit their lives to the service of others. Too often, this service goes unnoticed. Today, I would like to salute the service of a teacher who has dedicated over a decade of her career to the students in my district.

Joan Kelly has taught in La Crescenta, California for 11 years. However, her work as a teacher began long before her move to my district. Throughout her life, Joan has committed herself to serving the needs of students and the needs of the community.

Joan is a native of Brooklyn, New York. A graduate of Fordham University, she taught elementary school and worked extensively in the New York area. Her work with students and parents led her to develop a counseling program in Yonkers, New York. This program is a shining example of her relentless pursuit of innovative and creative ways to reach students.

Joan joined the faculty at Rosemont Middle School in the Spring of 1987. Her efforts as a math, history, and English teacher and school administrator contributed to Rosemont being recognized as a U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon School of Excellence and a California Distinguished School.

In her years of service at Rosemont Middle School, Joan has proven herself to be a leader. She is often called on by colleagues to direct teacher in-service programs, passing on to her peers a lifetime of knowledge about education. Further, she has instilled in teachers the skills to help students be the best they can be. In 1993, she was awarded the prestigious Masonic Award for her service.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of our nation tomorrow depends on the quality of the education our youth receive today. And one need look no further than the roster of Joan's former students to see the leaders of tomorrow. For her service to our nation, and for her commitment to public education, I ask my colleagues here today to join me in recognizing Joan Kelly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY C. HULSHOF

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I missed three votes last night, rollcall Numbers 167, 168 and 169. These votes were missed due to a canceled airline flight. On these votes, I would have voted "aye".

TRIBUTE TO DR. AUGUSTO ORTIZ AND MARTHA ORTIZ

HON. CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Augusto Ortiz and his wife Martha, who have for half a century provided medical and clinical services to the Spanish-speaking population of Arizona. I wish to recognize their selflessness and commitment to the health and welfare of their fellow Americans.

During the past year in particular, we have witnessed many discussions about the role that Puerto Rican-Americans play in the mainstream United States. Some have questioned our right to equality as Americans because of our language and our culture, but I want to assure you that the patriotic and law abiding citizens of Puerto Rico have distinguished themselves in all facets of life in the United States, be it in defense of our nation, as community leaders, as athletes, professionals, scientists or as performing artists, making numerous contributions to our great nation. Our language and culture have enhanced and enriched our national culture, contributing to the service and understanding of our fellow citizens throughout the United States.

The merging of our cultures is especially evident in the life of Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz. Their lifelong commitment to Arizona is enhanced by the fact that Dr. Ortiz is a Puerto Rican-American who together with his wife have dedicated their lives to the service of their fellow human beings. Thousands of Arizonans feel deep gratitude for Ortiz' commitment to their health and lives.

How is it that this "Jibaro Puertorriqueño" came to lead his life in the desert? While a boy in Puerto Rico, Dr. Ortiz dreamt of helping others. His parents encouraged his love of learning and dedication to the public service. After graduating from medical school at the University of Illinois in 1945, he joined the military and served as a physician at several posts throughout the country. In the early 1950's, while stationed at Luke Air Force Base in Phoenix, Arizona, Dr. Ortiz volunteered to assist Dr. Carlos Graeth to provide medical services to the 80,000 Hispanics in Maricopa County. They were the only two Spanish speaking doctors in the County.

Dr. Ortiz became a champion for the rights of those he served. His involvement in improving human needs and access to medical care, better education, housing and jobs led him to become politically active and an ally for people who lacked a voice, particularly farm workers. He worked to improve field sanitation conditions and was instrumental in enacting state laws to regulate the use of pesticides.

Martha Ortiz was the organizational brains of this effort. She served as the full time administrator, personnel director and business manager of the office mostly as a volunteer, because she refused to accept payment for her services. She ably handled the many "pay what you can" patient alternatives that enabled the medical practice to continue to make health services available and affordable to low income and indigent residents of Arizona.

Since 1972, Dr. Ortiz has headed the University of Arizona Rural Health Office and has successfully directed more efficient health services including prevention-focused health campaigns, mobile clinics and community health boards. He is a living model to aspiring doctors and others in the health professions.

During their 50 year commitment to their fellow man and woman, Dr. and Mrs. Ortiz have been awarded many rightfully deserved honors and recognitions at the community, state and national levels.

As a fellow Puerto Rican-American, as a fellow Hispanic and as a fellow American, I am

pleased and proud to recognize the achievements of this couple who have made a difference in the lives of thousands. Dr. Ortiz deserves our deepest gratitude and the nation's recognition. I ask my colleagues in Congress to join with me in saluting and honoring, Dr. Augusto Ortiz and his wife Martha Ortiz.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ROBERT M. ''BOB'' ROSE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Robert M. ''Bob'' Rose was honored with the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities during the 1999 academic convocation at Missouri Valley College on Sunday, May 16, 1999.

Mr. Rose is a graduate of Marshall High School in Marshall, Missouri. He also earned a degree from the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, N.Y., a Master of Arts degree in English Literature from the University of Pennsylvania, a Master of Arts degree in International Affairs from The George Washington University and is a graduate of both the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

In 1949, Mr. Rose was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant and he remained a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army until 1971. His overseas service included Germany from 1950 to 1953, Korea from 1960 to 1961, another tour in Germany from 1965 to 1967 and Vietnam from 1967 to 1968. His service time in the United States was divided among Fort Knox, Ky., Fort Meade, Md., Washington, D.C., and various service schools.

Key positions held by Rose while in the U.S. Army included instructor and assistant professor of English at the U.S. Military Academy in West Point from 1956 to 1959, commander of combat units from platoon to division support command in Vietnam and staff officer from battalion to Department of Army headquarters (Pentagon). Rose was promoted to colonel in 1968 and he retired from military service on February 1, 1971.

As a civilian, Rose was the managing partner of Rose and Buckner Store on the east side of the Marshall square. Bob was the third generation of the Rose family in this position. The store closed upon his retirement. Other local business and civic offices held by Rose include being past president and board member of the Marshall Rotary Club, serving on the board of directors of Wood and Huston Bank in Marshall, serving on the board of directors of Wood and Huston Bancorporation Inc. in Marshall and acting as past chairman of the board for Corwin Corporation in Kansas City.

Rose was also a board trustee of Ridge Park Cemetery Association in Marshall, a board member of the Missouri River Chapter of the American Red Cross, executive board member of the Great Rivers Council of Boy Scouts of America, past chairman of the Missouri Valley College Board of Trustees and a member of various military, veteran and civic organizations.

Rose in an active member of First United Methodist Church in Marshall. He and his wife Betty are the parents of one son.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House will join me in congratulating Robert M. ''Bob'' Rose for his honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities, and for his lifelong service to his community and to his country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote on final passage of H.R. 1915, Jennifer's Law or Grants to the States to Improve the Reporting of Unidentified and Missing Persons. If I had been present I would have voted ''aye''.

TRIBUTE TO D. MAE JOHNSON, W. RAY JOHNSON, MYSER JAMES KEELS, PASTOR CHESTER RIGGINS, AND JAMES E. WALTON

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to D. Mae Johnson, W. Ray Johnson, Myser James Keels, Pastor Chester Riggins, and James E. Walton, Ph.D., for being selected the 1999 Portraits of Success program Honorees by KSEE 24 and Companies that Care. In celebration of African-American History Month, these five leaders were honored for their unique contributions to the betterment of their community.

D. Mae Johnson was a teacher in Fresno and Oakland for twenty years; during this time she also obtained a master's degree in both Counseling and Guidance from California State University, Fresno (CSUF) and Administration from Pepperdine University. For the past 20 years she has been executive director of Quality Group Homes one of the Central Valley's largest providers of residential treatment care for adolescents and children. Mrs. Johnson is involved with many professional, church and community organizations, including being a lifetime member of the NAACP. In 1997, she helped found the Fresno chapter of Links Inc., a nonprofit humanitarian organization that provides support services to enrich the quality of life through cultural, civic and educational activities. Inspired by her niece's long struggle with Sickle Cell Disease, she worked with Fresno Links and St. Agnes Hospital, to bring to Fresno, the only Sickle Cell Anemia program in the Valley.

W. Ray Johnson has been a dedicated public servant for three decades. He is the Director of Community Resources for the City of Fresno. He reports to the City Manager, and works closely with the Mayor and City Council members. He was formerly the Fresno Deputy City Manager and Director of Human Resources. One of his proudest accomplishments was his role in establishing a facility for the African-American Museum for which he has helped to secure almost half-a-million dollars in funding over the years. He is currently instrumental in setting up the African-American Multi-Service Center as a one-stop facility to work with youth and gang members. Mr. Johnson has served on many boards and commissions, including two terms as vice president of the NAACP. His many awards include State of California Black Women Organized for Political Action, Man of the Year award, United Black Men Community Service award, California State Assembly Civic Involvement award, and the California State Senate Outstanding Community Contribution award.

Myser James Keels has long given himself to benefit the Fresno community. For 27 years, he was a groundsman with the Fresno County Parks and Recreation Department until has retirement in 1995. Along with park upkeep and worker supervision, he also provided supervision of adult and youth offender programs. He gave ten years to the County of Fresno Social Security Board, eight to the County Human Services Advisory Board, and two to the Equal Opportunities Commission. Mr. Keels also served on the Conservation Corps Commission Community at Large Revitalization Board, Southwest Edison Planning Committee, Fresno Neighborhood Alliance, as a deacon for St. Joseph's Baptist Church, president of the Black Political Council, president of the Coalition for Cooperative Development & Community Development Corporation, treasurer of King of Kings Center Board of Directors, vice chairperson of Westside Fellowship and board member of Central California Legal Services. Honors and awards have come from these entities and many more including a special Certificate of Appreciation for 11 years of assisting alcoholics in their recovery.

Pastor Chester Riggins has served the St. Rest Missionary Baptist Church since 1950 as a Sunday School teacher, Baptist training union instructor, church clerk, financial secretary, deacon, chairman of the Deacon Board and chairman of the Church Pulpit Committee. For many years he was a mail carrier for the Postal Services, but resigned in 1979 to serve the church full time. Pastor Riggins' activities outside the church have included being the temporary chairman for organizing the Fresno Model Cities Program, member and officer of the West Fresno Interdenominational Ministers' Alliance, charter member of the Fresno Police Program, member of the Concerned Citizens for Quality Education, secretary-treasurer of the Home Mission Board of the California State Convention and 1st Vice Moderator Emeritus of the St. John Missionary Baptist Association.

Dr. James E. Walton, Ph.D., has been teaching since 1967 and has been a professor of English at CSUF since 1990. He previously taught at Mt. Union College for 20 years and was an exchange professor in Osaka, Japan in 1988. Dr. Walton served as a member of Search Committees at CSUF for the Dean of Education, Human Relations Director and vice president and has been a member of the Committee on Academic Policies and the

Committee on Faculty and Strategic Planning. Apart from the university, he has served as Library Trustee, on the Fair Housing Board, and as a Board Member of the American Red Cross, Junior League, and the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to D. Mae Johnson, W. Ray Johnson, Myser James Keels, Pastor Chester Riggins and Dr. James E. Walton, Ph.D. for being recognized as the KSEE 24 Companies that Care 1999 African-American Portraits of Success honorees. I applaud the contributions, ideas, and leadership they have exhibited in our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing these fine people many more years of success.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT D. ANDERSON, JR.

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert D. Anderson, Jr., an extraordinary citizen of San Mateo County, California, who will be honored by the San Mateo Central Labor Council on Saturday, June 12, 1999.

Robert D. Anderson, Jr. has been a leader in both the labor movement and his community for the last twenty-five years. After nineteen years of exceptional leadership and service, Bob has announced that he is stepping down as President of the San Mateo County Labor Council.

Throughout his career bob has dedicated himself to improving the living and working conditions for families in San Mateo County and the airline industry nationwide. He is a former United Airlines mechanic and a member of the International Association of Machinists, Local Lodge 1781. He is currently the ground safety coordinator at San Francisco International Airport.

During his tenure as President he helped establish, build and chair the San Francisco Airport Labor Coalition and its predecessor, the Airport Health and Safety Coalition. He has also served on the advisory boards of the California Occupational Safety Coalition and Health Administration, and the Labor Occupational Health program at the University of California, Berkeley.

Over the last twelve years bob has worked with labor and community leaders to bring affordable, high-quality, around-the-clock childcare to families who work non-traditional hours. He has also served on the Board of Directors of PALCARE, San Mateo County's community-based childcare center since its opening in 1993.

Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Anderson, Jr. is an outstanding individual, a respected labor and community leader, and a valued friend. I salute him for his remarkable contributions and commitment to our community and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him upon his retirement as President of the San Meteo Central Labor Council.

HONORING NAVAL COMMANDER KENT ROMINGER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the career of one of Del Norte, Colorado's natives who has shown great character and motivation, Naval Commander Kent Rominger. In doing so, I would like to honor this individual who has illustrated the notion of duty and service for Colorado and the Navy alike.

Kent Rominger has been flying for the Navy since 1978, when he earned his degree in civil engineering from Colorado State University. As a Naval officer, Rominger flew in Operation Desert Storm. In 1992, Officer Rominger was selected to join the astronaut program. Since his start in the astronaut program. Commander Rominger has piloted three previous space missions, one of those being in the space shuttle *Discovery*.

On May 27, 1999, Kent Rominger returned to the space shuttle *Discovery* and guided six astronauts into orbit. As commander, Rominger oversaw all aspects of the mission and the crew. This is a great honor for Rominger to command a space shuttle that he once piloted into space.

Kent Rominger is an outstanding citizen of Colorado who's accomplishments will be long remembered and admired. Selfless service and dedication makes Commander Rominger a valued and respected man. His achievement are a great service to us all, and for that we owe him a debt of gratitude.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SOLANO COALITION FOR BETTER HEALTH

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to recognize the Solano Coalition for Better Health (SCBH), which is celebrating its 10th Anniversary year. On June 5, SCBH kicked off its 10th Anniversary Celebration by hosting an Enrollment Day for the Solano Kids Insurance Program (SKIP), in an effort to promote free or low cost health insurance options for Solano County children, and it's fitting that we honor SCBH at this time for its many contributions to the community.

SCBH is a nonprofit organization of health care administrators, government officials, local physicians, representatives from the business and educational communities, and neighborhood advocates. Its focus is to improve the health and quality of life in Solano County by sharing resources through effective partnerships. It is a nationally recognized model of public and private partnerships, creating system changes in the provision of care and services to promote and improve the health and safety of the people and their communities.

SCBH works in a collaborative fashion and places high value on efforts that benefit the community, neighborhoods and people of Solano County, and meets the interests and needs of individuals and specific constituencies within the community.

SCBH recognizes and values diverse communities, neighborhoods and people within Solano County and encourages their participation in improving the health of all county residents, through a multi-lingual network of health and social services providers, reflective of the population of Solano County in gender, sexual orientation, culture, ethnicity, and disability.

SCBH is innovative in its approach to addressing the health needs of Solano County residents and is not adverse to taking risks for potential rewards. Further, it recognizes and values the unique importance of innovative approaches in responding to health issues that disproportionately impact ethnic communities.

SCBH has initiated such unique programs as:

(1) the Partnership HealthPlan of California, a public/private organization designed to provide a cost-effective method of health care delivery to Medi-Cal recipients in Solano County, which has now expanded to include Napa County

(2) Healthier Solano Communities, an initiative that promotes wellness in each of Solano County's seven cities by creating or supporting a team in each city to look at issues in each city that impact health and wellness; identify one or more issues in each city that can be addressed; and, develop partnerships and plans to address those issues.

(3) the Community Services Task Force, which includes volunteers who are service providers from public, private, County nonprofit, and community based organizations, and advocates for health and human services that are culturally, linguistically, geographically, physically, and financially accessible to all residents of Solano County.

(4) Solano Health Improvement Initiative (SHII), which addresses the most critical indicators of health in the community, and has expanded countywide efforts to pursue strategies that address three initial goals:

1. All children will be healthy and ready to learn when they enter school.

2. Comprehensive prevention, early detection, and support services will be developed for individuals living with cancer in Solano County.

3. People with diabetes or at risk of diabetes will live well and independently in the community.

In recognition of the SHII's outstanding cancer community outreach efforts, the U.S. Postal Service presented the first Prostate Cancer Awareness Stamp Dedication in California on June 5th at the SCBH's 10th Anniversary celebration.

(5) SKIP which provides outreach efforts to enroll children in free or low cost health insurance options in Solano County.

Mr. Speaker, SCBH participants are people who are personally committed and who dedicate their time, talent and knowledge to influence the organizations they represent to support the Coalition's mission. I commend them for their outstanding contributions to the community.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF REBECCA KREPICK

HON. GENE GREEN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievement of Rebecca Krepick. On May 29, 1999, Rebecca graduated from Klein High School. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and her family.

Although this achievement deserves recognition in and of itself, Rebecca accomplished much more. When she was in second grade, the Anthony Robinson Foundation offered 600 students a $20,000 scholarship if they maintained a B+ average, participated in community service, and were a model student for 10 years. On the day of graduation, less than thirty of these students completed the program. Rebecca's achievement should be recognized and commended.

Rebecca and her fellow scholarship recipients are examples of what is right with public education. They should be held up as role models for other students everywhere to emulate.

Rebecca plans to use the scholarship at the University of Houston, one of the finest universities in our nation. Rebecca's parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Barbosa, family, friends and community are very proud of her. We wish her well in her future education pursuits. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members join me in congratulating Rebecca Krepick for her outstanding achievement.