

The primary purpose of the bill is to authorize funding for networking and information technology (IT) research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for the following agencies: National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency. The NIH should be authorized to participate in programs outlined in the bill because, like the agencies listed above, we share the commitment to, and investment for, both the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development (NITRD) and Next Generation Internet (NGI) initiatives. In fact, in fiscal year (FY) 1999, NIH funding for information technology and high performance computing and communications activities was \$110,535,000. We estimate that we will spend approximately \$182,782,000 in FY 2000 and \$217,127,000 in FY 2001 for related activities.

With regard to H.R. 2086, Section 4 of the legislation authorizes only the agencies mentioned above to participate in the NITRD grant program for long-term basic research on networking and information technology. Priority is given to research that helps address issues related to high end computing and software and network stability, fragility, reliability, security (including privacy), and scalability. It is important to note that the biomedical community is increasingly using the power of computing to manage and analyze data and to model biological processes. Recognizing that biomedical researchers need to make optimal use of IT, NIH supports (1) basic research and development in the application of high performance computing to biomedical research, (2) basic research, education, and human resources in bio-informatics and computational science to address research needs of biomedicine, (3) research in, and application of high-speed networking infrastructures such as the NGI for health care, health and science education, medical research and telemedicine through the High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) Initiative. Enclosed are the funding levels for NIH in this area.

Section 5 of the legislation reauthorizes funding for agencies in support of the NGI initiative. Though excluded in this reauthorization funding, the NIH has made a serious commitment to furthering telemedicine by sponsoring dozens of projects around the country, in a variety of rural and urban settings. NIH has funded studies about privacy and confidentiality issues, how telemedicine projects should be evaluated, and what medical uses might be made of the NGI. In fact, over the next three years, the NIH is funding test-bed projects to study the use of NGI capabilities by the health community.

In summary, because of the commitment and investment shared by NIH in both the ITRD and NGI initiatives, we deem it appropriate that the legislation allow other agencies, such as NIH, to participate in the NITRD program and to specifically reauthorize NIH for the NGI initiative.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can give us on the matter. I can be reached on (301) 496-3471, should you or your staff have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

MARC SMOLONSKY,
Associate Director for
Legislative Policy and Analysis.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESENTING CONGRESSIONAL
GOLD MEDAL TO JOHN CAR-
DINAL O'CONNOR

SPEECH OF

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH-HAGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the passage of H.R. 3557 to bestow a Congressional Gold Medal to John Cardinal O'Connor. With the Cardinal's retirement arriving in the near future, it is time for us to publicly thank him for his important contributions to American public life.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you are aware, Cardinal O'Connor is arguably one of the most influential American Catholic prelates in the second half of this century. He is a Priest, a Bishop, and Cardinal of the Catholic Church. But he is also more than that. He is a retired Admiral in the United States Navy, a statesman, an accomplished academic, and a leader in the pro-life movement.

From his boyhood in Philadelphia to his present-day residence in New York City, Cardinal O'Connor has served the poor and the sick. Throughout his career, he has worked with local charities to provide needed assistance for the poor. Additionally, he was critical in extending health care for AIDS patients in the early days of the AIDS crisis. To this day, the Archdiocese of New York is still the largest health care provider for AIDS patients in New York City.

However, fewer people are aware that Cardinal O'Connor is a veteran. For twenty-seven years, Cardinal O'Connor served his country honorably as a Chaplain in the United States Navy. He later was ordained a Bishop by Pope John Paul II so he could serve as the Bishop for the Military Archdiocese. After serving in this position for four years, he became Bishop of Scranton, Pennsylvania and was then evaluated to his Cardinalial See in New York City 1985.

Furthermore, Cardinal O'Connor provided one of the most important voices in America for the unborn. His commitment to the unborn is a well-known and important aspect of his pastorate as the Cardinal in New York City. He has been an effective advocate for the unborn in both a pastoral and legislative capacity. Additionally, he headed the Secretariat for Pro-Life Activities for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. He is completely committed to ending the horror of legalized abortion on demand and will be remembered for that.

Many times, people on the side of keeping abortion legal claim that the pro-life movement does little to support pregnant women. Cardinal O'Connor's example refutes this. On January 23, 2000, he re-stated publicly promised.

On the 15th of October in 1984, I announced from this pulpit that any woman, of any religion, of any color, of any race, of anywhere could come here to New York and we would do everything that we could if she were unable to meet her needs herself to provide free hospitalization, free medical care, free legal care, whatever she needed so that her baby could be born.

February 16, 2000

Mr. Speaker, we should take this opportunity to commend and impart our thanks to Cardinal O'Connor by bestowing this Congressional Gold Medal upon him.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3673
UNITED STATES-PANAMA PART-
NERSHIP ACT OF 2000

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 3673, the "United States-Panama Partnership Act of 2000."

The purpose of this legislation is to give our President authorities that he can use to seek an agreement with Panama to permit the United States to maintain a presence there sufficient to carry out counternarcotics and related missions.

This legislation is virtually identical to a bill I introduced in 1998, H.R. 4858 (105th Congress). The original cosponsors of H.R. 4858 included DENNIS HASTERT, now Speaker of the House of Representatives; CHARLIE RANGEL, Ranking Democratic Member of the Committee on Ways and Means; CHRIS COX, Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; BOB MENENDEZ, now Vice Chairman of the Democratic Caucus; DAVID DREIER, now Chairman of the Committee on Rules; FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman of the Committee on National Security; HENRY HYDE, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary; DAN BURTON, Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and BILL MCCOLLUM, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I am introducing H.R. 3673 because Panama and the United States today stand at a crossroads in the special relationship between our two peoples that dates back nearly 100 years. As the new century dawns, our two nations must decide whether to end that relationship, or renew and reinvigorate it for the 21st century. We must decide, in other words, whether our nations should continue to drift apart, or draw closer together.

In the case of Canada and Mexico—the other two countries whose historical relationship with the United States most closely parallels Panama—there has been a collective decision to draw our nations closer together. This decision, embodied in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), was grounded in a recognition that, in today's world, our mutual interests are best served by increased cooperation and integration.

The legislation I am introducing today offers Panama the opportunity to join Canada and Mexico in forging a new, more mature, mutually beneficial relationship with the United States. In exchange, the legislation asks Panama to remain our partner in the war on drugs by agreeing to host a U.S. presence, alone or in conjunction with other friendly countries, sufficient to carry out counternarcotics and related missions.

In accordance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977, the United States terminated its military presence in Panama at the end of

1999, and Panama assumed full control of the Panama Canal and all former U.S. military installations.

A 1977 protocol to the Treaties provides that the United States and Panama may agree to a U.S. presence in Panama after 1999. For three years, U.S. and Panamanian negotiators sought to reach just such an agreement. On September 24, 1998, however, it was announced that these negotiations had failed and that the U.S. military would withdraw from Panama as scheduled.

This was a regrettable turn of events for both of our countries. The United States and Panama both benefited in many ways from the U.S. presence in Panama. For the United States, that presence provided a forward platform from which to combat narcotrafficking and interdict the flow of drugs, which threatens all countries in this hemisphere. These benefits to the United States cannot be duplicated at the so-called "forward operating locations" that the Administration is seeking to set up in several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

For Panama, the U.S. presence added an estimated \$300 million per year to the local economy, fostered economic growth by contributing to a stable investment climate, and helped deter narcoterrorism from spilling over into Panama.

In retrospect, the Clinton Administration acted precipitously in 1995 when it rejected Panama's offer to negotiate an extension of our traditional presence in exchange for a package of benefits to be mutually agreed upon. In the wake of that decision, the effort to establish a Multinational Counternarcotics Center failed to gain broad support across Panama's political spectrum.

My legislation returns to, and builds upon, the concept proposed by Panama in 1995 of permitting a U.S. presence in Panama beyond 1999 in exchange for a package of benefits. The legislation also accepts the idea first proposed by Panama of permitting counternarcotics operations from Panama to take under multinational auspices.

The legislation includes four specific provisions of benefit to Panama.

First, and most importantly, the bill offers to bring Panama into the first rank of U.S. trade partners by giving Panama the same preferential access to the U.S. market that Canada and Mexico currently enjoy. The economic value of this benefit for Panama is difficult to quantify today, but over time it should lead to significantly increased investment and employment there, which would directly benefit all Panamanians.

Second, it offers a scholarship program for deserving Panamanian students to study in the United States.

Third, it offers assistance in preparing for the construction of a new bridge across the Panama Canal.

Fourth, it offers assistance in preparing for the construction of a new sewage treatment plant for Panama City.

Taken together, these specific provisions give substance to the larger promise of this legislation, which is to renew and reinvigorate the special relationship between our two peoples as we enter the 21st century, provided the people of Panama decide they want to remain our partner.

Under Article I, section 7 of the U.S. Constitution, this bill can only originate in the House of Representatives. The list of original cosponsors of the version of this bill that I introduced in 1998, H.R. 4858, makes clear that, if brought to a vote on the House floor, this legislation would pass the House of Representatives. I am confident that the Senate would join the House in approving this measure, provided that the people of Panama indicate that they too wish to strengthen relations between our two countries along the lines proposed in the bill.

It is my sincere hope that Panama will accept this invitation to reinvigorate the special relationship between our two peoples. I recognize, however, that the right to make this choice rests with the people of Panama, and naturally our nation will respect their decision.

SUMMARY OF UNITED STATES-PANAMA
PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2000

INTRODUCED FEBRUARY 16, 2000

Offers trade and other benefits to Panama if the President certifies to Congress that the United States and Panama have reached an agreement permitting the United States to maintain a presence at four installations in Panama (Howard Air Force Base, Fort Kobbe, Rodman Naval Station, and Fort Sherman), alone or in conjunction with other friendly countries, sufficient to carry out necessary counternarcotics, search and rescue, logistical, training, and related missions for a period of not less than 15 years.

The benefits that would be made available to Panama include:

1. NAFTA-equivalent treatment under U.S. trade laws for exports from Panama.

2. Assistance from the U.S. Trade and Development Agency for design, planning, and training in connection with construction of a new bridge across the Panama Canal.

3. Assistance from the U.S. Trade and Development Agency for design, planning, and training in connection with construction of a new sewage treatment plant for Panama City.

4. \$2 million per year in scholarships for deserving students from Panama to study in the United States.

The NAFTA-equivalent treatment for exports from Panama would be made available unilaterally by the United States during a three-year transition period. Prior to the conclusion of the transition period, the United States and Panama would negotiate and enter into an agreement providing either for Panama's accession to NAFTA, or for the establishment of a bilateral free trade arrangement comparable to NAFTA. Free trade benefits under this agreement would be guaranteed for a period at least as long as the period during which the U.S. is permitted to maintain a military presence in Panama.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose

of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Legislative Branch Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Capitol Police Board, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Congressional Research Service, and the Joint Committee on Taxation.

SD-116

10 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the international trafficking in women and children.

SD-419

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings to examine U.S. assistance options for the Andes.

SD-215

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH-219

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on East Asia in 2000, focusing on problems and prospects in the year of the dragon.

SD-419

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending judicial nominations.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Administration's effort to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest lands for increased protection.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 23

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for Indian programs.

SR-485