SENATE—*Saturday, October 28, 2000*

(Legislative day of Friday, September 22, 2000)

The Senate met at 9:31 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:

Gracious God, we thank You for a different kind of continuing resolution. You resolve to continue to be with us, to bless us with Your grace and Your goodness. You have promised Your continued providential care for us as a beloved Nation. You have guided us through the years. We resolve to trust You to help us now when we need to overcome our differences and unite to lead the Nation. So our real continuing resolution is to call on You, seek Your solutions, end the power struggle, and complete the business of this Congress. So I sense that Republicans and Democrats would express their yeas and nays to a continuing resolution to praise You for being sovereign of our beloved Nation. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHUCK HAGEL, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting Senate majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on a continuing resolution that funds Government through tomorrow. I understand that the House will be voting on that resolution at approximately 10 or 10:30. However, it was our hope that we would have the Senate vote on the joint resolution immediately this morning. We will be unable to reach an agreement to allow that to occur earlier. Therefore, the Senate will vote as soon as the continuing resolution is received from the House.

The Senate will also convene on Sunday at 4 p.m. to consider another continuing resolution with a vote scheduled to occur at 7 p.m. A vote will also occur on Monday to continue Government funding and the vote will occur at a time to be determined. Senators will be notified as Monday votes are scheduled.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration as we work these different issues out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the House is right now voting on approval of the Journal. They should vote on the CR momentarily. We should have that shortly. I know a number of people have asked when we will complete that.

On Sunday, they are supposed to vote on their CR at 6 o'clock that night. I hope that is the case. Senator STEVENS and a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee are meeting. They met yesterday, hoping to wind up negotiations on Labor-HHS, which will be the last train moving out of the station. With the compromise that is in the air, I hope we can wrap up the tax package and the Labor-HHS bill maybe as early as Monday and Tuesday at the latest. I hope that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we had put the continuing resolution on the desk hoping we could get agreement with the other side to move immediately to accommodate Senators' schedules. That is not going to happen. As I have said, we will wait for the House to vote.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m. and the time be divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, if the CR gets here sooner than that, would the Senator agree that we should begin the vote before 10, because there are people who have come to me indicating they have schedules to meet. I am sure he has the same on his side.

Mr. CRAIG. I see no objection to that. I think we are here purely dependent on the House's ability to act as quickly as they can. When it arrives at the desk, my guess is there is going to be a large number on our side who would wish the same consideration.

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

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the session is winding down. We are at a point where we are doing pro forma things.

I have neglected to do something I think is important to do and that I have wanted to do. I will take the time available to us at the moment to fulfill my obligation.

I wish to pay appropriate tribute to the senior Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, on the occasion of his retirement. I have already done this within the committee on which we jointly sit, but I think at a more formal setting it is also appropriate.

I first met PAT MOYNIHAN when I was serving in the Nixon administration. He was then a member of the White House staff. I was serving in the Department of Transportation. He was the President's primary enforcer, if you will, of improvements and efficiencies in the executive branch, particularly in domestic departments. We at the Department of Transportation were a little bit in awe, if not in terror, of the thought of PAT MOYNIHAN showing up and checking on us to make sure we were doing things right.

I remember one meeting in the White House where we were outlining what we wanted to do, that which I considered to be fairly bold, and listening to MOYNIHAN saying: Well, in a Republican administration, this is probably about the best you could expect. He wanted us to be considerably bolder than we were. He wanted to go into directions of new initiatives that would have been very good for the country.

In addition to this, he was one of the architects of Nixon's program of family maintenance which, had it been enacted over the objections of the Democrats, probably would have solved many of our welfare problems.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN was well respected then. President Nixon later used him as Ambassador to the United Nations and Ambassador to India. When he was running for a seat in the Senate, even though he was a Democrat, I, for one, was rooting for him to win.

I have just finished reading a book called ''The Trust,'' which is the history of New York City. I was interested to find that the editorial board of the New York Times almost unanimously decided that in that primary they were going to endorse Bella Abzug for the Senate seat in New York. Fortunately, the publisher of the New York Times, Punch Sulzberger, came to his senses long enough to dictate a New York Times endorsement of PAT MOYNIHAN, and this body was spared the experience of having Mrs. Abzug as the Senator from New York.

Senator MOYNIHAN and I have disagreed about a number of issues since we have been here. We have debated on many issues and clashed many times, but we have served together in many areas. He was a member of the Senate Y2K committee, a committed, active member who scheduled hearings in his home State of New York. We went there often. I was always impressed and uplifted by the amount of bipartisan support he gave to that effort. He was always well informed and completely without guile or without bitterness.

He now goes on to a career he loves, which is teaching. I have read some of his books and wish I could be one of his students.

This country will hang on to PAT MOYNIHAN as a major resource and a national treasure for the remainder of his life. But we in the Senate have been well served by having him here as our colleague.

One last thing I will say about PAT MOYNIHAN, which is little known but which demonstrates the man, there is a story going around in Washington that says when John F. Kennedy went down Pennsylvania Avenue in his inaugural parade, he saw how shabby the avenue was, and with that vision often attributed to the Kennedy clan, he said we must do something to clean up Pennsylvania Avenue, and the restoration of Pennsylvania Avenue then occurred. Well, in fact, from the scholarly writings of PAT MOYNIHAN, we find that it was not John F. Kennedy at all; it was Arthur Goldberg, who was in that parade and saw that shabbiness of Pennsylvania Avenue, who pointed it out to President Kennedy and, to his credit, the President said, ''Yes, let's do something about it.'' But he probably gave it no more thought than that.

The assignment of seeing that something was done to the Nation's most monumental avenue ultimately fell to a young staffer named PAT MOYNIHAN. It was he who drove the effort to see to it that Pennsylvania Avenue was cleaned up from the pawnshops and the other shabby architectural edifices that were there to the monumental avenue that it is today. Interestingly enough, it was while he was chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, leaning on the public works side of that environment, where he led the effort within the Congress to see to it that the necessary money was appropriated to build the monumental buildings of which we are all so proud.

So we have a lasting architectural legacy to the public career of PAT MOYNIHAN right here in the District of Columbia. I, for one, shall miss him. But I look forward to staying in touch with him as he tells me that he is going to stay in the Washington area and teach. I hope that at some point, when my career in the Senate ends, he is still teaching and I can take one of his classes. It has been a great privilege to serve in the Senate with the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

THE WORK OF CONGRESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on the pending status of the work of the Congress. Yesterday, Senator STEVENS took the floor and outlined the work of the Appropriations Committee, making it plain that nothing could be done on the last bill on appropriations for Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, until Tuesday because there had to be a reading of the bill and the other procedural matters which had to be attended to, even if the conferees came to agreement on Friday.

Senator STEVENS suggested that there was no point in having the Senate and the House in session on Saturday and Sunday and Monday. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding Senator STEVENS' contacts with the President and the President's men, we are here. We are here for absolutely no reason. I chair the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over that appropriations bill and we have been in negotiations with the White House for weeks. We have not been able to come to an agreement because of the intransigence of the White House. They may say it is the intransigence of the Congress. We have a way of saying the other party is intransigent. But there is no doubt that they are at least 50 percent responsible for the fact that we have not been able to come to terms on this bill.

On this bill, the subcommittee that I chair met the President's figure of $106 billion. It was hard to do. My colleagues in this body and the Republicans in the House didn't like that figure; they thought it was too much money. But the chairman of the House committee and I prevailed to meet the President's figure so we can come to terms and have an accommodation and get the bill passed. We put $600 million in that bill—more for education than the President did. And the President asked for $2.7 billion for school construction and teachers. It was the view of many colleagues that that was not a Federal responsibility, but we gave this figure. We put an addendum on that if the local school boards decided they wanted it for something else, they could use it for something else, so that there would be local control, which is the essence of education in America, contrasted with the Washington, DC, bureaucratic straitjacket.

Notwithstanding that, the White House, his negotiators, wanted every semicolon their own way. So that bill is still languishing in negotiations. But it is certainly not the fault of the Congress.

We are here today and we will be here tomorrow. The Members —535 of us—had thought we would have concluded our business a long time ago. I can tell the American people—if anybody watches C–SPAN II—that the fault is not that of the Congress that we are still here. The President has decided that we will be in session on 1-day continuing resolutions, as his way of trying to make a political point. He is not making a governmental point, he is making a political point. He is making a political point to try to blame the Congress as a ''do-nothing'' Congress, when that is not the fact. He is trying to blame the Congress for a situation the White House is really responsible for—at least 50 percent responsible.

We have come to a situation where the quality and parity between the Congress and the executive branch has long since evaporated. When the Government was closed down at the end of 1995, that was an enormous shift of power, so that now the Congress is really over a barrel to yield to whatever the President has to say.

Being aware of that, we structured this final bill on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education to finish it so that it could be presented to the President in September. The Senate acted on it on June 30, which established a record, going back to 1976 for the earlier set of action on this bill. Then we finished the conference report on July 27. It should have been presented to the President in September, and that projection was made so that we would be able to present it to the President and, if he vetoed it, have a national debate; and we thought we would be in a position to make our priorities stand up because the Constitution does give the Congress the responsibility and authority to establish the priorities.

Mr. President, the essential point that I am coming to is that if we were not over a barrel in our relations with the President, we would submit to the President a continuing resolution for 3

or 4 days. But we are not doing that because it would be unseemly. We are not doing that because we don't want to engage in what might be viewed by the American people as a childish food fight.

If we sent him a continuing resolution for 4 days, which would be reasonable under the circumstances, since we can't get anything done until Tuesday, and there was a stalemate and there was a closing of the Federal Government, the American people would say a plague on both of your houses. But the reality is that the Congress is being intimidated by the President and we are, in fact, being humiliated by what the President is doing. There needs to be some semblance of good will and comity between the Congress and the President. It doesn't exist and hasn't existed.

This Senator has gone out of his way to try to work with the White House and try to find accommodations. But when you have this intimidation and what is really humiliation, it lingers. It has to be a factor considered, as we have so many delicate relationships with the executive branch of the Government. Frankly, I would like to see us submit a continuing resolution for 4 days and lay down the gauntlet to the President, if he wants to keep us around here doing nothing. But the parity between the branches has been lost and we are here wasting the time of 535 Members of Congress.

We are wasting the time of the Congressmen, and we are also putting the people of America to a disadvantage because we have responsibilities to our constituents that will not be attended to today, or tomorrow, or Monday, or thereafter. I think it is high time that the Congress stood up and confronted the President because of this situation, which is simply intolerable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I certainly understand the frustration of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He does a good job of chairing that subcommittee. But his facts are wrong.

Here it is 9 days until the election, and we are still in session. We are here because the leadership of the majority has simply refused to move this Congress along like it is supposed to. Since the first of September, we have passed only three or four appropriations bills. We struggled through the month of September, and nothing happened.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. REID. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPECTER. What facts are wrong?

Mr. REID. I was just laying those facts out.

Mr. SPECTER. Does the Senator from Nevada deny the fact that the President and the White House, or at least the people in question, are responsible for the failure to come to agreement on the one outstanding appropriations bill?

Mr. REID. We have 13 appropriations bills. This debate cannot relate around one appropriations bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania worked hard on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. A number of us have worked on it. But the Republicans have left this bill to the last bill so they can attach everything to it that has not been done and that should have been done previously.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. No. I will not.

I say to the Chair and to those Members listening that the President doesn't need to take any blame for what is taking place here in Congress. We have a constitutional framework that gives him separate but equal power with the Congress. He is exerting that now. Thank goodness he is able to exert that because what has gone on here, according to pundits and according to what I believe having been here for almost 20 years, is a travesty.

Here we are trying to work our way through Congress 8 days before an election. This should have been completed a long time ago. We have not been able to have debates on issues in this Congress. Why? Because the majority has taken the position they don't want to have to take any difficult votes. As a result of that, we don't take any votes. We don't have debates.

It is interesting to note that we haven't done anything on a Patients' Bill of Rights. We have done nothing on prescription drugs. On education, for the past 2 years in this Congress, we only have spent parts of 6 days dealing with education. The American people say it is the most important issue facing the American people. Members of Congress say it is the most important issue. It seems to me that we could spend more than 6 partial days talking about education.

We need help with school construction. In Las Vegas, we have the sixth largest school district in America. We have to build one new school every month to keep up with growth.

In the small State of Nevada, last year we spent $112 million just on interest on the money we borrowed to build schools. We need help with school construction and modernization. Schools all over America need help. The average age of schools in America is over 40 years. We also need to reduce class size. Unfortunately, we haven't had a meaningful debate that has allowed us to discuss how important and successful class size reduction is for our schools.

A year and a half ago, following the Columbine massacre, we passed what we felt was minimal gun safety legislation. Nothing has happened since then to move that forward. We have not had a conference. The result is that we still have pawnshop loopholes where just anyone can go in and buy guns. They can be felons. The same happens not only in pawnshops but at gun shows. We need that legislation cleared for further action. We have been unable to do that.

I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that, again, I appreciate his frustration. I appreciate his hard work.

But the fact is that constitutionally the President has a role, and he is fulfilling that role. I repeat that I am glad he is fulfilling that role.

We have so many things that we need to do in this Congress that we have simply been unable to do.

As a result of our friend, Paul Coverdell, having unexpectedly passed away, the composition of the Senate changed. As such, we felt there should be another vote on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We were denied that.

There are so many things that have been taking place here that has prevented the Senate from operating as the Senate.

My friend from Pennsylvania is frustrated as a result of his dealings with the subcommittee.

I am frustrated as a Member of the Senate that we are not able to talk about issues that I think are important. We have been prevented from being able to talk about those issues.

In America today there are 3,000 children dropping out of school every day. Shouldn't we be allowed to talk about that? The answer has been no. We haven't been able to have a meaningful debate about the serious problem of children dropping out of school.

The fact is the President is concerned about this $250 billion tax bill. The minority has been shut out of all negotiations. The ranking member of the Finance Committee has not been involved in anything, let alone any other members of the Finance Committee.

We have conferences that are uniquely held with only one party.

There is a lot of frustration to go around.

I want to reassert and reemphasize that the President is doing the right thing. I believe he is doing the right thing, which is supported totally by the minority. He is doing the right thing by having us work every day.

What good does it do? We should have been having 24-hour continuing resolutions 2 weeks ago. If so, we would have already completed our work 2 weeks ago. So, we are doing 24-hour continuing resolutions right now. If, in fact, we had a 4-day continuing resolution, people would fly out of here and back to their parades and campaigning and leave the work that needs to be done here in Congress undone.

I am supportive of what the President is doing. It is good for Congress. It is good for the American people.

Does the Senator from Pennsylvania have any questions of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SPECTER. No. I can have some time of my own.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader if I may have 5 minutes at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think the way to adjust this is we had hoped we could go ahead and get a vote notwithstanding the receipt of the papers from the House. But that is not going to be possible. I think the way to be fair to everybody is to ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 10:30 under the same provisions as earlier agreed to. The Senator would then be able to get time in his own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will Senators be allowed a few minutes to speak on an unrelated matter?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we would alternate back and forth, and other Senators certainly would be able to speak.

The time limit under the earlier agreement was the time would be equally divided between now and 10:30.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Would that allow enough time? I am not sure how many want to speak.

Mr. LOTT. The only one I know of who seems to be anxious to speak on that side is the Senator from Louisiana.

I ask unanimous consent that after Senator SPECTER speaks that the Senator from Louisiana be recognized.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, how long is the Senator from Pennsylvania going to speak?

Mr. LOTT. Not more than 15 minutes. I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Nevada, I listened very carefully to what the Senator from Nevada said and was looking for something which the Senator from Nevada said that factually disputed my representation of what has happened here. I did not hear anything disputed about what I have said.

The facts are, No. 1, that there is one bill outstanding to finish the work of the Senate; that is the appropriations bill on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

All of the other complaints which the Senator from Nevada made—the litany that has been repeated day after day after day about what is wrong with the Republican Senate—is all prologue.

We are standing here today on a Saturday session—we are going to have a Sunday session and we are going to have a Monday session—and nothing is going to be done because the President wants to gain political advantage.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. No.

He wants to gain political advantage by trying to make a representation that it is a do-nothing Congress.

I will tell you what he is in effect doing. He is creating a do-nothing Congress on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday because we can't do anything in Washington.

But there is a lot we could do in our States where we have a lot of meetings and a lot of constituent business and a lot of legislative business.

But it is going to be a do-nothing Congress today, tomorrow, and Monday because right now the appropriations bill on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education has to be read, has to be printed, and has to be completed. So we are not doing anything.

When the Senator from Nevada says that we ought to be working every day, I replied to the Senator from Nevada that he works every day. I have seen him work. He works every day. I would say to the Senator from Nevada and the other 98 Senators that I, too, work every day. So do the other 98 Senators.

But we don't work at the direction of the President. We don't work for the President. We work for the American people. I work for 12 million Pennsylvanians. I don't work for the President.

The Constitution has separation of powers. When the Founding Fathers organized the Constitution, they put Congress in article I. They didn't get around to the executive branch until article II. But today the system is inverted.

Since the Government was closed down in 1995 and our business has gone over into October and sometimes into November, there is no way for the Congress to do anything—at least we think so—but to yield to the President. That is why, as I have said earlier, we structured this bill on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education so it could be finished and be presented to the President in September.

The mistake we made, quite candidly, was that we were negotiating with the President. We have undertaken in recent years nonconstitutional proceedings. The Constitution says that Congress will present a bill to the President after the Congress decides what the legislation should be, and then the President either signs it or vetoes it. But that has been turned around.

Now we have members of the President's executive branch sitting in our legislative conferences. We ought not have that. We ought to present our bill and let the President sign it or veto it. This Senator tried mightily to get that bill presented to the President in September. Then if the President wanted to veto it, so be it, that is his constitutional prerogative. But he doesn't have a constitutional prerogative to sit in on the legislative process and the Congress accede to it. We ought to change that.

I think if the American people had seen this bill, they would have preferred the congressional priorities to the President's priorities. The Congress gave the President 90 percent of what he wanted—more than 90 percent. We have a bill which is $40.2 billion for education. The President's staff objected to $3.3 million, less than 10 percent of $40.2 billion. But we had some other priorities we wanted. We wanted special education. We also wanted money for the National Institutes of Health, where they have made enormous strides in conquering Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, breast cancer, ovarian cancer, heart ailments, and a whole range of medical problems.

We had different priorities. I think if we had presented those priorities to the American people, the American people would have sided with the Congress. So September went by the board. There were negotiations in September. And I make the representation that it was the intransigence of the White House which resulted in those negotiations not moving forward. I make that representation because our priorities were as good as theirs or better.

But having given the President 90 percent, he should have been willing to accommodate to the 10-percent change in our priorities without demanding to control every semicolon in the bill. I think we met him more than halfway when we gave him $2.7 billion for school construction and for teachers, but we said this ought to be local control if the local district needed something more.

I was interested to hear what the Senator from Nevada had to say about the Las Vegas school system, its expanded school system and its need for schools. I can understand the need in Las Vegas for schools. However, I have a hard time understanding why Las Vegas schools ought to be paid for from Washington by the American taxpayers.

If there is one area in the country which has a tax base to support their local needs, it is Las Vegas. Las Vegas is the gambling capital of the world, and I say that with respect. I have been there. I haven't gambled, but I have been there. They have an enormous tax base. If we are putting up $1.4 billion for school construction in the big bond issue for American cities such as Las Vegas where they can afford it themselves, I have grave questions as to

whether we ought to be doing that. But we did it.

We presented it for the President. The President's men wouldn't come to a compromise. So what has happened is all the bills are finished except one bill. That bill can't be acted upon until Tuesday at the earliest. And the President is keeping us here to make a political point.

My preference would be, as Senator STEVENS said yesterday on the floor, he was considering amending the continuing resolution to provide for a 4-day continuing resolution which would carry us to Tuesday just to send to the President; then let the President sign it or veto it.

The difficulty with that is that the Government of the United States, the executive and legislative branches, are not exactly held in high esteem by the American people. And my instinct is that if we got into that sort of a situation, a game of chicken, a game which resembles a childish food fight, the people of America would say a plague on both of your Houses. It reminds me just a little bit of the confrontation that Piazza had with the Yankee pitcher. Piazza decided not to confront the Yankee pitcher after he threw a bat at Piazza. I think Piazza did the right thing, although people criticized him for not confronting the Yankee pitcher.

We are in a situation where the President is keeping us here so he can make a political point to try to have a democratically controlled Senate and a democratically controlled House and win the Presidency. We are not here doing the business of the people. We would be doing the business of the people if we attended our regular schedules and were free to do constructive work instead of sit around here on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.

I do believe, Mr. President—speaking to the President of the Senate, Senator BENNETT, who is presiding—we have been intimidated. The President is doing this as a form of punishment, a form of humiliation. We have a lot of very delicate relationships with the executive branch. It has to linger in the background among some minds as to just what the executive branch is doing, whether they are operating in good faith.

I say bluntly, keeping the Congress in session without any purpose is the worst of bad faith. We will do our job notwithstanding the executive branch and the President's men and women exercising the worst of bad faith, but we won't forget about it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from Nevada.

WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, the President, I repeat, is doing the right thing. The right thing is having Congress do its work. This is all a game.

Now if we could complete our work by Tuesday, it seems to me if people hung around here and did their work now—they said they have to start reading the bill—let them read it now. I also say if people want to expedite matters and challenge the President's authority, I am standing right where I am today and yesterday. I said we will agree on a voice vote to the tax bill and send it to the White House this afternoon. Nope, objections from the other side. They wouldn't let us do that. They wouldn't let us do that. They are here stalling for reasons that some of us are having a little trouble determining, but they are stalling. They have continued to stall. That is why we wouldn't get any appropriations bills passed until very recently.

My friend from Pennsylvania said there is no factual variance. I was going to run through some of those, but the analogy is something like this. He says we gave the President 90 percent of what he wanted. Whether that is right or not, the point is, it is like a football game. You go to the 10-yard line and you almost make a touchdown; does that mean you should get the score? The answer is no. The score should not be given to the majority because they have not done their work. They haven't even gotten to the 10-yard line.

I say Members should be here working. The President is saying we should work. We don't need to go home. Some of us have a long way to go to go home. We should be here doing our work. I think the American people understand that the President is equal to the Congress.

I don't know why the framers of this Constitution had article I the legislative branch, article II the executive branch, article III the judicial branch. They could have been reversed. It doesn't matter. They are separate but equal.

I am so thankful that the President recognizes his ability to take a look at what is going on here and say, ''I don't like it.'' That is what he said. He doesn't like it and 46 of us over here, we don't like it either.

Because of that, we are in the position we are now in. No one is being humiliated. The word was used twice by the Senator from Pennsylvania. But, no one is being humiliated. The Constitution has been in effect for over 200 years. The President has an absolute right to do what he has done. If, in fact, the majority does not think the President will veto these bills, send them down and we will find out.

The problem is really that the bills are unfair. We have had very little input. We will let the American people decide who is right, whether President Clinton is right in doing what he is doing or the Republicans are right, doing what they are doing. I think the American people will resoundingly proclaim that what has gone on over here has been not only procedurally unfair, it has been substantively unfair.

I also say, using Nevada as a State that doesn't need help—no one is asking that local control of schools be taken away. This is something the majority always uses. Only about 7 percent of what any school district in America gets comes from Washington. There is not a person on the Democratic side who says they want to take control away from local schools. We are saying that schools need some help in helping pay the interest on the bonds. The illustration I used was that the State of Nevada spends $112 million in interest without paying a single penny on the principal. We are a small State, 2 million people. His State is 12 million people. We believe the people of America realize the school problems we have, the education problems in America are national in scope and Congress has to take a look at some of the national problems. Schools are crumbling, classes are too large, too many kids are dropping out of school. The solution the majority has is to take control away from public schools and put all the money in private schools; do what you can to damage and destroy public schools. We are not willing to do that. We believe that because the vast majority, in fact almost 95 percent, of kids go to public schools, we should do what we can to improve public schools.

Again, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania does an excellent job as chairman of that subcommittee. I understand his frustration. A lot of the control has been taken away from the subcommittee chairs and ranking members in these last days of Congress. The majority leadership is calling a lot of the shots. That is what we read about. The Democrats can only read about it because we are not in many of these negotiations. But the Senator's frustration does not take away from the fact that the President of the United States has done the right thing in saying Congress should be working this weekend, every day, until Congress completes it work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TAX CREDIT FOR SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to begin by commending the Senator from Nevada for his remarks, and to say that I agree with him and urge the President to veto the upcoming tax package. As written, the tax bill allocates tax breaks and tax benefits to many different interests and entities throughout America. While there are some good provisions in this bill, it could be more fair, more just and could

give greater tax relief to those who need it the most. As it stands know, the package fails to demonstrate our commitment to many of the principles that we claim to stand for here on this floor.

That is why I have come to this floor a number of times over the last couple of days, to just raise awareness about one small, but I think very important, part of the tax bill. I am happy to note that yesterday our majority leader, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. LOTT, and one of the leaders on this issue, our colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, came to the floor and recognized that there had been, perhaps, a mistake made or a phrase not included, that if left out, could have some dire consequences for some of the children in this Nation—quite a large group, I might add, about 100,000 of them and potentially several hundred thousand more—who are really the most vulnerable among us.

These are children who no longer have parents. They are the orphans of living, if you will. They are the children who are in foster care. These are the children who have already been abandoned once by an adult who was supposed to be taking care of them.

I say to the Members on this floor—I see my good friend, Senator GRASSLEY, who has been an outspoken advocate on this issue—that we have the opportunity because when this bill is presented to the President, he has said he will veto it because it is not distributing these benefits as equally across the board as they should be. I am hoping we can come to a bipartisan agreement, with Republicans and Democrats and the President himself, to fix what is missing in this tax credit.

Let me explain a little bit about that. In 1996, there was for the first time a credit put in our Tax Code to advance adoption. I am the proud mother of two adopted children. They have brought my husband and me the greatest joy. In fact, when he was 5 years old my husband was adopted from an orphanage in Ireland. We talk publicly about the great joy of adoption. We want people to know it is a wonderful way to build a family.

There are Members in this Senate, Republicans and Democrats, who have adopted children and who speak regularly about the choice of building families through adoption. The benefits to a birth mother, the benefits to the adoptive family, and most certainly the benefits to children, young and old. Some people think you don't need a family when you are 18, you just sort of age out of the system and with a good education and diploma in your hand you can go on.

I am 45. I am looking forward to going home to Thanksgiving dinner with my mother and father. My husband is 50. He is looking forward to going home for Christmas with his family. You are never too old to need a mother and father, and that is what this is about, changing attitudes in America to say every child deserves a family.

We have a provision in this bill that is a good provision in that it proposes to increase and extend this very important adoption tax credit. It is now $5,000. In this bill, it would be doubled from $5,000 to $10,000 for adoptions because, as we all know, the expense associated with adoption can be high. There are legal expenses. There are expenses associated with home study, agency fees. In fact, those expenses can range anywhere from a low of $2,000 to a high of $30,000, depending on what agencies you use or whether you are going through a domestic or an international adoption.

So far all is good because we have a tax credit in place and we are about ready to double it. It could not be at a better time because the number of adoptions are up in America. Last year we had 130,000 adoptions, 130,000 families. That is a lot of people affected, if you think about happy grandmothers and grandfathers and aunts and uncles and siblings. It is quite a number of happy Americans whose lives were made better through adoption.

But there is a problem. I have tried to keep raising this issue until it is fixed. In the current bill, although the special needs adoption is being doubled to $12,000, this Treasury report which was issued this month and other letters and reports that have been written over the last several years, have indicated that the credit is not working for the special needs children. Because of the language in the law, not—let me underline ''not'' because of a wrong interpretation by IRS—but because of our inability to write the proper phrase in the law—either our inability or our unwillingness—the tax credit is related to adoption-related expenses. We need to remove that phrase so the act of adoption itself of special needs children can get the credit.

I wish to show you pictures of a couple of the children who are going to be left out if we do not make this fix. There are 100,000 children in foster care. Jennifer is one of them. Because Jennifer has been in foster care for some time, her adoption will not be handled by a private agency. Her adoption, if a family would come forward to adopt her—and as you can see she is a beautiful and lovely child—if someone would come forward to adopt Jennifer, they would probably go through a public agency.

There would be minimum home study expenses. The agency might actually pay for those.

There would really be no ''qualified adoption expenses'' because the public agency, wanting to have Jennifer adopted, would minimize the expenses to the adopting family. So this adoption could potentially go through with less than $1,000 of direct expenses to the family. Therefore, if a family adopted Jennifer, the expenses they had would not qualify for a $5,000 tax credit or for a $10,000 tax credit because they do not fit into the bill's definition. Yet adopting a child such as Jennifer can bring much added expense to a family, particularly a working family, a middle-class family, perhaps having children already of their own but thinking God would like them to make room in their homes for another child.

It is a tremendous financial responsibility, as all of us with children know, to raise a child. Much less, a child with special needs. A family who adopts a child with special needs does have additional expenses, they just are not covered under the very narrow definition of the code. Unless we change the law, they will not be able to get the tax credit. That is not what we intended.

They say Jennifer is very sweet and has a great sense of humor. She likes to play outside, ride bikes, and swim. She is a very active child. She has some emotional disorders. Anyone would have emotional disorders if they were abandoned as a baby, abused, and grossly neglected. These children need healing, and we need to do everything we can to support that.

This is Joshua and Jonathan. They are 5-year-old twins. As a sibling group, the hope is that they will be placed together. Therefore, a family who adopts them must have room in their hearts and homes for two children. Joshua is described as well-mannered, sneaky, and babyish. He enjoys school and its challenges. He has a nice smile and likes to cuddle. Jonathan is described as eager and easygoing. He likes to be helpful around the house. He likes talking about his feelings and explaining himself. Both are in excellent physical and mental condition. These are children we hope a family will identify and bring into their home and love.

There are many examples. If we do not fix the tax credit, the families who adopt Jennifer, Joshua, and Jonathan will not get the full benefit of the tax credit.

Some people have been critical about my passion with regard to this issue. They say: Senator, you shouldn't speak about it; at least the adoption credit is working for children from China, Honduras, and Guatemala. You know the desperate situation in those countries. Since this is the only form of financial assistance for families who want to adopt these kids, if it expires, they will be left with nothing.

Yes, I want this tax credit to work when families choose to adopt internationally, when families choose to adopt a domestic healthy infant, and when they choose to adopt perhaps an older child, a sibling group, and give these kids who have already been let

down once a chance to come into a family. I am here today because I want the tax credit to be available for all families regardless of what type of adoption they pursue. Mr. President, as I am sure you are aware, their are many different types of adoptions, each with different costs, different processes, and different children. All I ask, is that we have a tax code that recognizes and appreciates those differences.

I believe there is consensus. There is an easy and relatively inexpensive way to fix this problem once and for all. That is why I am taking this time now to bring it to the attention of those who have the power to fix it at this late date, and hopefully we can.

Some say we should wait until next year to fix it. If we can fix it now, why take another year out of the lives of some of these children? Why not help parents now?

I will make one final point. The Senator from Iowa may be interested to know this. Yesterday, as I was on the floor speaking about this issue, the New York Times ran a full-length story about the problems with our foster care system. For the first time in our Nation's history, two girls in the foster care system and their attorneys successfully sued the Department of Social Services of Florida and received a judgment of $4.4 million.

The case was brought by an attorney who believed that the children had been shortchanged. These two beautiful little girls had been abandoned by their mother. They were left in a Miami park or public place when they were 2 or 3 years old. Instead of determining whether these children could ever be reunited with their mother, father, or some relative to make them safe, the Department of Social Services put them in foster care. Those little girls spent the next 14 years of their lives going from home to home, with 30 different placements. They were sexually molested and physically abused.

The court rightfully said the State of Florida now owes these two little girls 4.4 million dollars. There is a happy ending. They have subsequently been adopted by a wonderful family.

I am here to say we had better fix this tax credit because if this case goes forward—and I think it will—the taxpayers of the United States are going to pick up a far greater expense than perhaps providing a few thousand dollars to families willing to adopt these children.

Even if it is not the money, it is the justice and morality of this Nation, which is the strongest nation in the world. We do not have our strength represented by how high our stock market goes up. Our strength is represented by our willingness and ability to help kids and families, and if we cannot do this, then I do not know what we are doing here.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank Senator LOTT, Senator CRAIG, and Senator GRASSLEY for their great leadership in this area. I look forward to working with them on this project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the New York Times article in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 27 2000]

FOSTER-CHILD ADVOCATES GAIN ALLIES IN INJURY LAWYERS

STATES FACE THE DUAL THREAT OF CLASS ACTIONS AND HUGE INDIVIDUAL DAMAGE AWARDS

(By Nina Bernstein)

The girls were 2 and 4 when their mother abandoned them near a city park in Miami in 1986. Under federal law, the Florida Department of Children and Family Services was supposed to place them for adoption or return them home within 18 months.

Instead, over the next 14 years the sisters were shuttled through more than 30 foster homes and institutions, beaten, raped and repeatedly separated from each other while a stream of caseworkers overlooked such obvious evidence of abuse as the diagnosis of syphilis in the older girl when she was 9.

The sisters' ordeal could have been just another horror story in a national litany of foster care abuses. But last year a Florida Circuit Court jury awarded them $4.4 million in damages from the state.

The case laid the groundwork for a new strategy in which advocacy groups for children and personal injury lawyers, some fresh from winning billions of dollars in legal settlements with the tobacco companies, are using the threat of multimillion dollar damage awards to try to change the deeply troubled foster care system.

In the past, individual damage suits for injured foster children were typically settled behind the scenes for small amounts. And efforts to win systemic changes through court orders have often been frustrated by failures of enforcement.

But court rulings that make government agencies easier to sue and sizable jury awards in foster care cases like the one in Florida have encouraged advocates for foster children and personal injury lawyers to join forces over the past few months in two-track litigation. Their lawsuits ask the courts to change the system, while separately seeking damages on behalf of children already harmed.

''This is for change, and to get the attention of the powers that be—any money will go to the kids,'' said Robert Montgomery, the lead counsel in the tobacco settlements in Florida and one of a dozen top trial lawyers who began working without pay on the foster care suits this summer.

The sisters' case was filed by Karen Gievers, who has a lead role in both the lawsuits for damages and the class action seeking changes in the Florida system.

Across the country, a similar pincer approach is typified by Tim Farris, a Bellingham, Wash., trial lawyer who has brought damage suits in state courts for 13 children shuttled from foster home to foster home in a total of 208 placements. The California-based National Center for Youth Law, a nonprofit children's advocacy group, recently joined his effort to leverage those cases into a multi-million-dollar overhaul of the state's child welfare system.

''In my own small-town way I said, 'Look, you can move these children as often as you wish, but if you do, you're going to have to pay for the damages you do to them.'' Mr. Farris said, ''and it's going to be cheaper to treat them right.''

Few suggest this kind of litigation is a shortcut either to riches or to an overhaul of the state programs that are trying to care for 600,000 children outside their homes. State agencies typically can only be sued for compensation, not punitive damages, and they can make it daunting in time and money to unearth confidential records needed to prove a case and collect. The $4.4 million Florida verdict is on hold pending an appeal.

But at a time when child-friendly policies figure prominently in election campaigns, the political potency of such cases may outweigh the legal drawbacks, said John Coffee, a professor of law at Columbia University. ''Plaintiffs' lawyers have learned that the class action can be very, very useful when the state agency has some vulnerability,'' he said.

The vulnerability of government agencies has grown considerably in some states. Jeff Freimund, as assistant attorney general for Washington, said courts there had rejected legislative caps on negligence awards, and government payouts in civil cases in general have quadrupled in six years, to $38 million in the last three months alone.

''The courts have opened the door to litigation on child welfare activities,'' Mr. Freimund said. ''They're very difficult cases to defend in front of juries because juries often have the benefit of 20–20 hindsight.''

Some officials, including Kathleen A. Kearney, the secretary of the Florida Department of Children and Families, say such litigation unfairly detracts from continuing efforts to improve child welfare, diverting resources that legislatures, not courts, should control. But others, frustrated at the persistence of problems documented and denounced for 20 years, welcome the new strategy.

''Money talks, and money makes policy,'' said Jean Soliz, who headed Washington's Department of Social and Health Services for three years, until 1995. She recalled that state legislators made all the right speeches during her tenure, but put $30 million into a new sport stadium rather than provide court advocates or mental health care for Washington's 11,000 foster children. Today, fewer than half have an advocate in court proceedings, and more than a third have been moved through three or more foster homes, studies show.

''The torts give you leverage to make them take it seriously; the torts don't fix anything,'' said Ms. Soliz, who now directs the spending of a tobacco tax earmarked for children in Nevada County, Calif. She emphasizes the importance of enlisting national advocacy groups that can draw on lessons from court consent decrees they have won in suits against child welfare systems in at least 20 states.

Bill Grimm, a lawyer with the National Center for Youth Law, said groups like his had become more open to alliances with personal injury lawyers because conventional strategies had run into obstacles. While Congress has enacted tougher foster care requirements—foster care time limits, for example, are now set at a year rather than 18 months—federal judges in some states have recently made it harder for children to seek enforcement of those laws in federal court. Their rulings hold that Congressional requirements intended to protect foster children do not constitute rights.

We are at a bit of a crossroads,'' Mr. Grimm said.

Even in states already operating under sweeping settlements, damage suits are playing a more prominent role. In New York City, where an ambitious child welfare consent decree imposed a moratorium on new class-action lawsuits, the Administration for Children's Services has paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in settlements to fathers who were not notified that their children were in foster care. And city lawyers are negotiating to settle a multi-million-dollar lawsuit over a toddler who was beaten to death by foster parents with a known history of abuse.

But there are perils to trying to turn such cases into a broader crusade in the absence of national allies or deep pockets, said Lawrence Berlin, an Arizona lawyer who has won settlements averaging $250,000 for a dozen children sexually abused in foster care. His motion to turn the cases of some children into a more powerful class action was denied in federal court after six years of litigation that consumed his practice, he said. The state rejected his offer to settle for systemic changes.

''I'm not saying children haven't been abused,'' said Tom Prose, an assistant Arizona attorney general in charge of liability cases, who emphasized that the current administration had made child protection a top priority. ''The issue is, is it pervasive and are we ignoring it? And my answer to you is, in Arizona, it's neither.''

In Florida, where the number of children in foster care has nearly doubled since 1998, to 15,000, the class-action suit contends that foster children are now in greater danger of emotional and physical injury from the state than from the families from which they were taken.

''We had a toddler in a foster home so overcrowded the kid spent the weekend strapped into a car seat,'' said Marcia Robinson Lowry, the director of Children Rights, a national advocacy organization based in New York, which recently joined the Florida class action.

Among the companion damage suits in Florida are some that highlight the harm flowing from one bad foster home, that of a couple in Hillsborough County. After the couple were arrested in May on 40 felony charges of child abuse and neglect, it emerged that the state had entrusted them with 28 foster children over four years, even as caseworkers recorded their abusive practices.

''My brother has severe problems because of what happened in that home,'' said Ashley Rhodes-Courter, now 14, who entered foster care at 3 because of her mother's drug problems, and endured 14 placements. She was 7 and her brother 4 during their year in the couple's home.

''He was abused,'' she said. ''He had hot sauce put on his tongue; he was dunked in a bathtub until he was nearly drowned. It was very frightening to watch someone you love being mistreated and you being able to do nothing about it.''

For Ashley, a resilient and academically gifted child, there was a happy ending. A family with the love, money and persistence to extract her from the system adopted her in 1998. But her brother, who entered foster care at birth, lives in a treatment center, still waiting for a family capable of coping with the damage he suffered. He is one of 22 plaintiffs in the class action.

Separately, he and Ashley are plaintiffs in damage suits brought or planned against the state on behalf of all the Hillsborough County couple's former foster children, including the 23 that the state has refused to identify, and 8 the couple adopted with state subsidies who are now back in the foster care system.

Proponents of double-edged litigation say that even if institutional change remains elusive, at least financial help can be won for a few of the children the system has wronged—children like the two Florida sisters, now 17 and 18, who are both literate and both mothers.

''You all hurt me all my life,'' the older sister told officials in a deposition last year, declaring her determination to keep her own baby daughter out of foster care. ''I hate every last one of you.''

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. If the bill has not come from the House by the time the Senator from Iowa completes his statement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be recognized for 10 minutes. He has been waiting for most of the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The majority has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I believe morning business is going to expire at 10:30. Do I need to ask unanimous consent to extend morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The situation is that the majority has an additional 5 minutes for morning business, after which the Senator from New York will be recognized for 10 minutes.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss a critical issue: adoption of children with special needs. I appreciate the work of my Senate colleagues who cochair the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, Senators CRAIG and LANDRIEU. I thank them for their dedication in furthering adoption. Both have demonstrated their commitment to adoption through word and deed. I respect their efforts and look forward to working with them in the coming years to increase adoptions and to improve the lives of vulnerable children.

The adoption tax credit which passed in 1996 was a step in the right direction. It provided a 5-year credit for adoptions of nonspecial needs children. It provided a permanent credit for adoptions of children with special needs. I commend Senator CRAIG for his efforts to extend the provision relating to nonspecial needs adoptions. As Senator CRAIG mentioned on the floor earlier today, while extending the credit is another step in the right direction, we must not rest on our laurels. There is more to be done especially as it relates to adoption of special needs children. The cost of adoption varies widely. Private or international adoptions can cost as much as $30,000 per child. In contrast, adoptions from foster care are often subsidized by the government.

Parents who choose to adopt a child from foster care or through a public agency incur little, if any, expenses related directly to the adoption process. However, they incur a great deal of ''incidental'' expense related to adoption. The adoption tax credit is available only for ''adoption related expenses'' which include necessary adoption fees, court costs, and attorneys' fees. This limitation works directly to the disadvantage of families adopting children with special needs, because the credit does not recognize the overwhelming indirect expenses associated with adopting such a child. These expenses might include fitting the home with a ramp for a wheelchair bound child, to cite one example.

When Congress passed the tax credit in 1996, it also directed the U.S. Department of the Treasury to issue a report on the effect of the credit. According to the Treasury report released this month, for tax year 1998, 77,000 adoptions were eligible for a tax credit—31,000 for special needs and 46,000 for non-special needs adoptions. However, of the 31,000 eligible special needs adoptions, only 4,700 received benefits from the tax credit. Compare that with 45,700 of the eligible 46,000 adoptions of non-special needs children that received benefits from the tax credit.

Let me put it another way. The Treasury Department reports 15 percent of eligible special needs adoptions received tax benefits compared with 99 percent of eligible non-special needs adoptions which received tax benefits for 1998. For those wondering why so few special needs adoptions benefited from the tax credit in 1998, here is one reason. Average expenses—allowed by current law—were reported for tax year 1998 as $3,540 per special needs adoption and $5,890 per nonspecial needs adoption. When you look at these expenses, it is clear that increasing the amount of the tax credit for special needs adoptions will have little to no impact on families seeking to adopt special needs children.

I view this as one of the flaws in current law that must be fixed. Let me be clear: I support the extension of the tax credit for non-special needs adoption. I also support taking a hard look at how the current tax credit impacts special needs adoptions. I urge my colleagues to consider the impact of the tax credit on families adapting special needs children. Again, I commend Senators CRAIG and LANDRIEU for their efforts on behalf of vulnerable children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friends from Iowa and Louisiana on this matter. The Finance Committee is very much concerned

with and for this legislation. It will become law.

SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise for the pleasant purpose of noting the decision by the Committee on Rules to add two names to that very special group that is portrayed in our reception room—six of the most distinguished Senators in our history. We have now added two—or shortly will have done so—Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan and Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York.

The story of Robert F. Wagner is a quintessential and essential one, describing the life of a poor immigrant child born on the east side of New York, who, by steady succession made his way to this Chamber. In the process, he changed the United States, recognizing, at long last, that we had become an urban Nation with needs, in legislative terms, that such a transformation requires.

The census of 1920 determined, for the first time, that the majority of Americans lived in urban areas—rather loosely defined, but still—and intensely so on the island of Manhattan. It may seem difficult to believe, but in 1910, the population of Manhattan was twice what it is today, and the conditions were difficult indeed.

Yet there was a degree of social order, a very powerful and progressive political organization, Tammany Hall, which dates from the Revolutionary War days. Aaron Burr was the head of Tammany at one point. And in the person of Charles Francis Murphy, it became unexpectedly, but unmistakably, the single most powerful source of progressive ideas for social legislation in our history—ideas that became law that changed lives.

Perhaps the critical event was the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire of 1911. In downtown Manhattan, there were women in a sweatshop, as we would call it. A fire broke out. The doors were locked. They were left to leap from eighth-story windows. And the city never got over it. Frances Perkins, having tea in Gramercy Park, five blocks away, never got over it. But it was Robert Wagner and Al Smith who did something about it.

They had gone to Albany under the auspices of their district leaders, big Tom Foley in the case of Al Smith, from the lower east side, and McCardle from the upper east side.

Smith became speaker of the assembly; Wagner, President pro tempore of the Senate.

They chaired together a commission on the Triangle Shirtwaist fire. They came out with legislation calling for safety and sanitary conditions, restricting child labor, limiting the hours of working women and protecting the activities of trade unions—events which never before appeared on the legislative calendar of any State legislature, much less the Congress. And they passed.

Smith went on to become Governor of New York and created, with his company, a legislative agenda which Franklin D. Roosevelt, who succeeded Smith as Governor, would take to Washington. We call it the New Deal.

Wagner had already arrived in Washington and was well positioned to take up his work, beginning with the National Industrial Recovery Act in 1933, and, in 1935, the defining Wagner Act, which is technically the National Labor Relations Act. It created the National Labor Relations Board and gave labor unions a right to exist and to be heard and not to be harassed.

He went on under President Truman. He allied himself with Robert Taft, and the first major housing legislation passed this body. Then health care was proposed by Wagner, with Truman's support. A half century has gone by, and we are still dealing with that issue. But it is well that we recognize the person—a person, not the only one—who singularly brought this matter to the nation's agenda.

I, as a New Yorker, am pleased, as all New Yorkers will be. I hope Senators will recognize that a just and honorable choice has been made. I am a member of the Rules Committee so it would not be appropriate to congratulate the Rules Committee, but I certainly thank the chairman and the ranking member, Senators MCCONNELL and DODD.

I see my friend from New Mexico is on the floor, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I don't know the parliamentary situation. I need 3 minutes.

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

THANKING SENATOR MOYNIHAN

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator MOYNIHAN, I was listening to your speech on the television set before I arrived on the floor. First, I thank you for what you said this morning. It is something we ought to hear, something that ought to be placed permanently in our RECORD. And that is what happened.

I personally want to say to you, over the years in my work as Budget Committee chairman and other legislation, I have found you to be a real friend. I think that is more important than talking about what you did here in terms of this Senator. I can remember, believe it or not, when we produced a most difficult budget, and it looked like a pretty good budget. I was wondering whether it would pass. I had the votes counted. All of a sudden, I won by one more vote than I thought. As he walked out, he put his hand on my shoulder and said: You did a great job. I voted for you.

Now, we have talked a lot about other things, including you have asked me regularly about my wonderful family and my beautiful wife Nancy. I thank you for that concern.

I guess in the remaining time I want to say to you, there are many ways to be a great Senator. Sometimes you become a great Senator because you get a lot of big headlines. Sometimes you become a great Senator when you promote yourself, which is permitted around here, and there is nothing wrong with it. But I can say, I think you are a great Senator. I don't think you did either of those. I think you just worked. And when people had to hear something that was vitally important, that had some history to it, I don't think we have had anyone around here in my 28 years—maybe there are Senators who have been here longer who might have experienced it, but I don't think I have ever had a Senator who had so much impact because he knows a lot and he remembers history and he always calls matters to our attention when we ought to have them there. You have served on an important committee. Your knowledge of the world and trade and what it means to us in the world has been a tremendous asset for the Senate. I thank you for that.

I am certain that many are not going to have time to commend the distinguished Senator from New York because we are in some kind of a strange, 1-day-at-a-time funding resolution. We are just adding to the appropriations by 1 day at a time, which I have never heard of before. I have never had it happen to me in 28 years. I don't think it has happened. Nonetheless, we are here, and that is going to make it difficult for Senators to find the time that they want to commend you in this RECORD. But I am sure many Senators are thinking today that they would love to get down here and say thanks to you.

I thank Senator MOYNIHAN very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I simply thank my revered friend. We have been together, even across the aisle, for a near quarter century. There is no one whose regard I greater value and whose remarks I could not be more moved by.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. REID. The Senator from Indiana, Mr. BAYH, and I were here as you were getting ready to speak. We talked, shared some of our thoughts about you.

The Senator from Indiana and I agreed on everything, but the one thing that sticks out in my mind is we agreed that you have been a visionary. You have been able to look out and find out what is going to happen and try to alert us. Frankly, we haven't followed a lot of the vision that you have had as quickly as we should.

I always loved going to school from the time I was a little boy until the time I finished my professional schooling. But the one thing that always worried me was taking tests. So for me personally to be able to serve my entire time in the Senate on the same committee as you, during the short period of time when you were chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, before you moved to chairman of the Finance Committee, that it has been like going to school.

In fact, in the back of the Chamber today, I recited to the Senator some of the things he taught me about transportation and some of the things that need to be done. The good part of being educated by Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN is that I haven't had to take any tests. As a result of that, I feel I am a much better Senator and certainly a much better person for having had the good fortune to serve in the Senate and on the Environment and Public Works Committee with someone who the history books will write was one of the great Senators to serve in the history of our Republic.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I do so very much thank my friend. This is a very special moment for me.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to make a couple of comments expanding on some I made the other day on the economy and what is happening. The reason I want to do that is there is a lot of discussion these days about what is happening in this country. Some say, well, what has been done in 8 years?

That is a legitimate question. There is this old saying that bad news travels halfway around the world before good news gets its shoes on. Let's talk about good news for a moment. Maybe we can get that fully addressed about this economy and what is happening in this country.

I want to talk about what has happened in the past 8 years. In 1992, we had a $290 billion Federal deficit that was growing by leaps and bounds. On this chart, these are the red ink numbers from 1985 forward. As you can see, there are massive quantities of deficits year by year. In 1992, it was $290 billion alone. At this point, Congress developed a new economic program. President Clinton proposed to change the direction with a new program, and Congress adopted it by one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate. You can see what has happened to deficits since then. The deficits have been reduced and finally eliminated. We have turned it around and we now have budget surpluses. That is good news.

Mr. President, 22 million jobs have been created in the economy that has been growing during the past 8 years. That is an extraordinary number of jobs compared to what had been created in the previous 12 years.

This chart reflects what happened to the inflation rate. It has gone down, down, and stayed down, which is wonderful news for our country. We have the lowest poverty rate in two decades. What has happened in recent years? You can see what happened here from 1993 on down. On this chart, the Federal spending related to the gross domestic product is down to the lowest level since 1966—related to the GDP of this country. So we have a lot of good news.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Looking at where the chart is peaked up, who was President during that time?

Mr. DORGAN. The highest levels of spending relative to GDP occurred during the Reagan and Bush administrations. That had a lot to do with the size of the economy. As the economy has grown rather substantially, especially in the recent 8 years, what has happened is that Federal spending as a percentage of GDP actually decreased.

I think it is important to talk about what has happened in recent years because people raise the question of the tax burden for middle-income taxpayers. As the chart shows, $39,000 is the average income. Federal income taxes, as a percentage, have actually decreased; the Federal income tax burden has decreased.

There are a couple of other things I want to mention about our economy. In the last 8 years, the $290 billion deficit has gone, and now we have the biggest surplus in history. Eight years ago, economic growth averaged 2.8 percent for the previous decade. All of the leading economists in this country at that point said they expected we would have in the entire 1990s anemic, slow economic growth.

In fact, they were all wrong. We have had economic growth averaging 3.9 percent annually since 1993. Job growth: 22 million new jobs since January 1993.

The unemployment rate from 1981 to 1992 averaged 7.1 percent annually. Now it is at 4.1 percent—the lowest level in 30 years.

Home ownership fell from 1981 to 1992, but the growth was the highest in history in the last 9 years.

The Dow Jones was 3,300 in 1993, and it is now over 10,000.

The point is this: A lot of good things have happened in this country. Some say: Well, it is the rooster taking credit for the Sun coming up.

I don't know who is to share the credit here. It seems to me the country was headed in the wrong direction, and then President Clinton came to office and said: Let's change direction and plans. The planning proposed was not very popular. It passed by only one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate, and it gave the American people confidence that Congress would make some tough decisions. It increased some taxes—not many but some.

It cut some spending, and we had a new plan—a new direction. The country moved in the new direction.

The American people had confidence that things were going to change. Our economy rests on a mattress of confidence. If people are confident about the future, they do things that manifest that confidence. They buy a house and they buy a car. They do the things that represent their confidence in the future. If they are not confident, they decide not to do those things, and the economy then contracts.

The point is that we have an economic plan in this country that has worked very well. The results are self-evident.

The question is: What is the plan for the future?

That is why we have this Congress. We have debates in Congress about what to do about the future.

Some say: Well, we expect 10 years of budget surpluses for the next 10 years. I don't know of a group of economists in this country that has been right for 5 years, let alone 10 years.

We would be very wise in this country, in my judgment, to take the conservative course on the question of what we do in fiscal policy. Economists don't know what is going to happen in the next year or in 3, 5, or 10 years from now.

We ought to establish as a priority paying down the Federal debt first. If during tough times you run the Federal debt up, it seems to me that during good times you ought to pay down the Federal debt.

I inquire whether that is a continuing resolution. If it is, I will suspend.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The continuing resolution just arrived. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res 118) making further continuing appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been considered read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would each vote ''aye.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Feingold	Moynihan
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Allard	Frist	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Reed
Bayh	Gramm	Reid
Bennett	Grassley	Robb
Biden	Gregg	Roberts
Bingaman	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brownback	Harkin	Santorum
Bunning	Hatch	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Levin	Thurmond
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Mack	Wyden
Edwards	Mikulski	
Enzi	Miller	

NAYS—2

Leahy	Stevens

NOT VOTING—31

Ashcroft	Gorton	Lugar
Bond	Grams	McCain
Boxer	Helms	McConnell
Breaux	Hollings	Nickles
Bryan	Hutchison	Roth
Burns	Inhofe	Sessions
Campbell	Jeffords	Thomas
Cochran	Kohl	Torricelli
Crapo	Kyl	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	
Feinstein	Lieberman	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FIGHTING FOR FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to attempt to put some transparence on what is going on around here.

This summer, the Republicans very successfully convinced the American people that their party was for estate tax relief and marriage penalty relief and that the Democrats were not. Well, my friends, that is simply not the case. The Democrats are for eliminating the estate tax for small businesses and family farms valued at $8 million and for all other estates worth $4 million. And, Mr. President, it is the Democratic plan for marriage penalty relief that completely eliminates the marriage penalty found in 65 provisions in the tax code.

So, isn't it a bit frightening that the Republicans have so successfully twisted the debate so as to mislead the American people into thinking that they are actually the party supportive of tax cuts. Reality is, however, that they are the party of political rhetoric and political maneuvering. If the Republicans really wanted to give the American people estate tax relief and marriage penalty relief, they could have—they had many, many opportunities for sending the President real relief. Instead of giving the American people empty rhetoric—we could be sitting here today with elimination of the estate tax and marriage penalty tax relief for virtually all Americans.

Now, why do I bring all this up. Because it is happening over and over again. The Republicans are misleading the American people on a host of critical pieces of legislation, including: patients bill of rights, prescription drug coverage, minimum wage increase, tax cuts, health insurance coverage and education.

Instead of actually providing the American people with real relief—this year—the Republicans prefer the politics.

I have heard from constituents who ask me—''If both Republicans and Democrats want patients bill of rights, then why can't the Republicans and Democrats just work together to get something done?'' That is an excellent question. Why?

Why is it that we cannot just reach agreement? Is it that we are missing some magical force here in Washington to bring bipartisanship to all? Unfortunately, the answer is that the Republicans want the rhetoric—and the Democrats want real reform. So, until the Republicans stop pandering and posturing and start sincerely and openly working together, there can be no agreements. You see, the Republicans have a more difficult time even working with each other—there is nothing partisan or bipartisan about that. Yet they have misled the American people to think that the Democrats—not the Republicans—are the ones holding up the works and refusing to work in a bipartisan manner. Mr. President, that is truly overstepping the bounds of the reality of what is going on up here.

Our efforts to fight for fundamental fairness in health, education and tax cuts, are being twisted into political pandering and posturing by the Republicans. But all we are doing is fighting for the fundamental fairness that the American people have fought for by working hard every day of their lives.

Let me illustrate this by highlighting the differences between the policies of the Republicans and the Democrats with respect to the bill that we have before us.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we do as much as possible to meet America's need for safe and modern schools.

Democrats solution—enact the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson proposal to finance $25 billion in bonds to construct and modernize 6,000 schools.

Republican's bill—is thoroughly inadequate—it provides no guaranteed funding for urgent school repairs, provides only $16 billion in bonds, and does not include the important Davis-Bacon

provision to ensure that the construction workers who build and repair our nation's schools receive a fair wage for their work.

Result of their plan—the arbitrage provision encourages delay in urgently needed school construction and would disproportionately help wealthy school districts.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we promote bipartisanship in health care by coupling both the Republican and Democrat priorities on health care and long-term care.

Democrats solution—our FamilyCare proposal would expand coverage to 4 million uninsured parents at a cost of slightly over $3,000 per person.

Republican's bill—provides additional coverage to one-seventh of the people at $18,000 per person—that is one-seventh of the people at 6 times the cost. Their approach is inequitable, inefficient, and counterproductive to health care policy.

Result of their plan—completely ignores a proposal to cover millions of uninsured, working Americans and jeopardizes the insurance coverage of those individuals currently receiving employer-based coverage. In fact, on the Republican health deduction, the Joint Tax Committee estimates that while over 26 million individuals would receive benefits under the proposal, only 1.6 million individuals would be newly insured as a result. In contrast, the Democrats in Congress and the Clinton-Gore Administration plan would expand coverage to 5 million uninsured Americans.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we help the families who care for our nation's elderly.

Democrats solution—accept the Republicans deduction for long-term care insurance in exchange for inclusion of a proposal to provide a $3,000 tax credit for long-term care costs.

Republican's bill—provide a health care deduction for long-term care costs.

Result of their plan—they provide half of the benefits of the long-term care credit that the Democrats provide.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that all Americans are insured.

Democrats solution—bipartisan policies for health insurance options for children with disabilities, legal immigrant pregnant women and children, and enrolling uninsured children in schools, needed payment increases to hospitals, academic health centers, home health agencies and other vulnerable providers.

Republican's bill—provides over one-third of the cost of their medicare bill to the HMOs.

Result of their plan—there is no accountability to prevent excessive payment increases to HMOs and failure to address the urgent health needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and children.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we encourage medical research and expand vaccine distribution to proactively approach medicine.

Democrats solution—a bipartisan tax credit for vaccine research and purchases for malaria, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and any infectious disease that causes over 1 million deaths annually.

Republican's bill—nothing.

Result of their plan—this is a failure to address a problem of serious ramifications. These diseases cause almost half of all deaths worldwide of people under age 45, killing over 8 million children each year and orphaning millions more.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that low and middle income individuals save and invest for their future.

Democrats solution—provide savings incentives to low and middle income individuals through retirement savings accounts.

Republican's bill—they specifically dropped this provision from the bipartisan Senate Finance Committee bill.

Result of their plan—a failure to address the lack of pension coverage for 70 million people. I want to just add one point here. Every year, through tax incentives, private pensions cost the fisc $76 billion. Yet 75 percent of American households in the 15 percent tax bracket—that means income of about $30,000—receive little or no tax incentive on their IRA or pension contribution.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we meet our current obligations before we promise new programs for distressed communities.

Democrats solution—fully fund the currently existing empowerment zones to spur economic development in distressed communities.

Republican's bill—create new renewal communities without meeting our promise to the existing empowerment zone communities.

Result of their plan—irresponsible pandering to wealthy business owners who will benefit from their new renewal communities at the expense of low and middle income entrepreneurs.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we don't turn our backs on those areas most in need.

Democrats solution—provide an economic activity credit to encourage business investment in jobs for the residents of Puerto Rico.

Republican's bill—they specifically rejected this provision.

Result of their plan— this equates to turning their backs on the hard working people of Puerto Rico. Even while at an historical low of about 10.1 percent, the unemployment rate in Puerto Rico continues to remain well above that of any state; the per capita income in Puerto Rico, which was $9,908 in FY 1999, is less than half that of any state; and well over 50 percent of the labor force in Puerto Rico are within $1.00 of the current minimum wage.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we encourage adoption of special needs children from foster care programs.

Democrats solution—change a few words in the current tax code to ensure that families who adopt children from foster care can benefit from the same tax credit which is available to parents who adopt international children.

Republican's bill—specifically ignored a more inclusive approach.

Result of their plan—the Republicans turned their backs on those children with the greatest needs.

Let's look at some of those who do benefit under the Republican plan for example—the Texas State Universities. Now, stay with me on this. The Republicans—well I should say only about 4 or 5 Republicans, in their closed door, secret meetings included a couple of interesting rifle shots in their tax bill. The one, interestingly enough, would provide a specific exception just for the Texas state universities, that would make their interest on bonds nontaxable. The American people are giving the Texas state universities a $4 million gift —while our public elementary and high school students are learning in trailers.

The bottom line is that the Republicans want to help big business and the HMOs. The Democrats reject this approach. The Democrats are fighting for fundamental fairness for the American people—our children, our elderly, and all individuals of every race, color, and creed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President I rise again today to urge President Clinton not to veto the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill that the Senate passed yesterday.

President Clinton has threatened a veto because we did not include his so-called Latino fairness act. But have included something much better—the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act, the LIFE Act. This act reunites families and restores due process to those who have played by the rules. Our proposal does not pit one nationality against another, nor does it pit one race against another. Our legislation provides relief to immigrants from all countries. A veto of CJS would be a blow against immigrant fairness.

But a veto would do far more than that. A veto would cut off funding for some of our most important programs.

CJS appropriations allocates: $4.8 billion for the INS and an additional $15.7 million for Border Patrol equipment upgrades, $3.3 billion for the FBI, and $221 million for training, equipment, and research and development programs to combat domestic terrorism, $4.3 billion for the federal prison system; $1.3 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration; and $288 million for the Violence Against Women Act program—legislation that I have strongly supported and that provides

assistance to battered women and children.

Actions have consequences. If President Clinton vetoes this bill, he's putting the public's safety and well-being at risk both at home and abroad. and he's doing this all in an effort to play wedge politics. the President's veto threats ring especially hollow because this appropriations bill provides many proposals to help immigrants. The President himself has stated that he wants ''to keep families together and to make our immigration policies more equitable.'' Well, this is exactly what the LIFE Act does.

So, please, I ask Mr. Clinton, sign CJS appropriations so we can keep all of these programs funded for the American people.

UPCOMING ELECTION AND THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is not often that the President of the United States, the editorial board of the Washington Times, People for the American Way and Gary Bauer all agree. They all do about the importance of the upcoming election to the rights of Americans in the decades ahead because of its impact on the third branch of the Federal Government, our federal judiciary.

This first national election of this new century will give the American people a choice—a clear choice for President and for Congress. Also at stake is the third branch of our Federal Government, the judiciary. It is this branch of government, headed by the Supreme Court, that is the guardian of our rights under the Constitution.

The next President is likely to nominate not only the next Justice on the United States Supreme Court, but possibly as many as four of the nine members of the Supreme Court over the course of his term. The next Senate will be called upon to vote to confirm or reject the President's nominations to the Supreme Court and the federal courts throughout the country.

These are the judges who can give meaning to the Bill of Rights in cases they decide every day or who can take away our rights and the authority of our elected representatives and impose their own narrow view of our Constitution. The rights of free speech, to practice any religion or no religion as we choose, the right to be treated equally by the government, the right to privacy and a woman's right to choose are fundamental rights that require constant vigilance and protection. This new century will pose challenges to our fundamental rights. Will we have a President and a Senate who will combine to provide judges to protect those rights, or ideologues who will erode them?

Nothing is more sharply at stake this November than the future of our constitutional rights.

Five-to-four—five-to-four is how closely the Supreme Court is now dividing on fundamental issues. One or two votes on the Supreme Court can, for the next half century, tip the balance away from the right to choose, away from rights of privacy, away from equal rights and toward government establishment of religion and government orthodoxy over free expression. One or two votes could make it much harder to protect the environment or pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

This last year by a five-to-four majority the Supreme Court held that a rape victim can bring no claim in federal court and that Congress was wrong to provide that remedy in the Violence Against Women Act. By five-to-four majorities the Supreme Court held that state employees have no rights to be paid for overtime work and have no protection from age discrimination, in spite of the laws passed by Congress. What will this mean for other laws prohibiting discrimination in the workplace, regulating wages and hours and health and providing safety standards for working Americans? And by a mere five-to-four vote, the Supreme Court decided that a Nebraska law imposed an undue burden on a woman's right to choose when it sought to prohibit medical procedures by vague language and without regard to the health of the woman.

I am confident that AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN will nominate women and men who understand the proper role of judges as protectors of our rights and the proper limits on judicial power. On Tuesday evening the President of the United States spoke about the importance of the election to the Supreme Court, to the federal courts generally, to our rights and to the distribution of power in our country. The President noted that ''the American people will make a decision in this election which will shape the Supreme Court and the other federal courts, and the range of liberty and privacy, and the range of acceptable national action for years to come'' and that ''whether we have a new form of ultra-conservative judicial activism that rejects the government's authority to protect the rights of our citizens and interests of our citizens'' is at stake in the November election. As the President explained:

> Now we're just a vote or two away from reversing Roe v. Wade in the United States Supreme Court, and I think it's inevitable that the next President will have two appointments to the Supreme Court, could be more. Beyond that, as I intimated in my opening remarks, there has already been a majority in this Court for restricting the ability of Congress, even a bipartisan majority in Congress, to get the states to help implement public interest legislation that protects people.

There is much at state in the next election and in the appointment of our Supreme Court Justices and other federal judges. In June, the People for the American Way Foundation published an extensive report called ''Courting Disaster: How a Scalia-Thomas Supreme Court Would Endanger Our Rights and Freedoms'' that considered the future makeup of the Supreme Court and its likely effects on our fundamental rights. In his message accompanying that report, Ralph Neas observed:

> The United States Supreme Court is just one or two new Justices away from curtailing or abolishing fundamental rights that millions of Americans take for granted.

The Washington Times lead editorial on Thursday noted pointedly:

> Before the Supreme Court could overturn Roe vs. Wade, it would take the appointment of two pro-life justices to replace two pro-choice jurists—and their successful confirmation in what would undoubtedly be among the most explosive battles in U.S. Senate history.

Mr. Bauer made much the same point in a recent appearance on NBC's Today Show, in which he said: ''I think if Governor Bush gets to put a couple of justices on the court, we will be more likely to protect our unborn children under the Constitution.''

The Republican party platform talks of ideological litmus tests for judges and the end of a woman's right to choose. The Republican candidate for President says that his models for judicial nominees are the most conservative current Justices, Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas. If they formed the majority in the years ahead, our rights would be greatly diminished, protections approved by Congress would be routinely invalidated and our Constitution would be harshly reinterpreted.

While the other party's platform is filled with calls for rewriting the Constitution, we Democrats seek to preserve the Constitution and protect our fundamental rights as the guaranties of our freedoms. While the Republican Senate has delayed and dissembled over judicial nominations during the last six years—to the point that the Chief Justice of the United States chastised them for refusing to vote up or down—Vice President GORE, Senator DASCHLE and I have pressed for action on outstanding judicial nominees, including historic levels of women and minorities.

While Republican Senators all voted lockstep against the confirmation of the first African-American Justice on the Missouri Supreme Court to become a federal judge, Democrats voted for Ronnie White of Missouri, for Richard Paez and Marsha Berzon of California, for Sonia Sotomayor of New York, for Julio Fuentes of New Jersey, and for Barbara Lynn and Hilda Tagle of Texas.

While the Republican leadership of the Congress sought to intimidate federal judges, Vice President GORE and Democrats have been working for fair up or down votes on the nominations of

qualified women and minorities such as Enrique Moreno of Texas, Judge James Wynn of North Carolina, Roger Gregory of Virginia, Judge Helene White and Kathleen McCree Lewis of Michigan, Judge Legrome Davis of Philadelphia, Dolly Gee of California, and Rhonda Fields of the District of Columbia.

While the Republican candidate for President made a fine statement in which he called for votes on judicial nominations within 60 days, he has not prevailed upon the Senate Republican majority to treat nominees fairly now. Instead of 60 days, we see Judge Helene White's nomination to the Sixth Circuit pending more than 1400 days; Elena Kagan, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, pending 500 days; Judge James Wynn, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, pending more than 440 days; Kathleen McCree Lewis, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, pending more than 400 days; Enrique Moreno, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, pending more than 400 days; Bonnie Campbell, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pending more than 240 days; Roger Gregory, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, pending more than 115 days; Lynette Norton, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, pending more than 1300 days; Judge Legrome Davis, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, pending more than 800 days; Patricia Coan, U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, pending more than 500 days; Dolly Gee, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, pending more than 500 days; Rhonda Fields, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, pending more than 350 days; Linda Riegle, U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada, pending more than 180 days; Ricardo Morado, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, pending more than 165 days. The Senate is adjourning leaving 33 judicial nominees whose nominations have been pending without Senate action for more than 60 days.

And while the Republican majority in the Senate refused for over three years to vote up or down on the confirmation of Bill Lann Lee to head the Civil Rights Division, this outstanding American continued to do his job on behalf of all Americans. With Vice President Gore's support, this Senate slight has finally been made right by the recess appointment of the first Asian-Pacific American to lead the Civil Rights Division.

The election next month presents a clear choice. The choice the American people make will determine what kind of judges sit on the Supreme Court and on federal courts all across the country. Those elected by the American people in November will select the judicial guardians of our liberties and the enforcers of our constitutional protections next year and in the decades to come. The future for our children and grandchildren hangs in the balance. I am proud that to support AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN. They will nominate judges who understand the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Kelaher, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Sullivan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 614. An act to provide for regulatory reform in order to encourage investment, business, and economic development with respect to activities conducted on Indian lands.

S. 835. An act to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1586. An act to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian Lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2719. An act to provide for business development and trade promotion for Native Americans, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Sand Creek Massacre Historic Site in the State of Colorado.

H.R. 2780. An act to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults.

H.R. 2884. An act to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 4404. An act to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4957. An act to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the legislative authority for the Black Patriots Foundation to establish a commemorative work.

H.R. 5083. An act to extend the authority of the Los Angeles Unified School District to use certain park lands in the city of South Gate, California, which were acquired with amounts provided from the land and water conservation fund, for elementary school purposes.

H.R. 5157. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure preservation of the records of the Freedmen's Bureau.

H.R. 5314. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the adoption of retired military dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs.

H.R. 5331. An act to authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass.

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ORDERS FOR SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 4 p.m. on Sunday, October 29. I further ask unanimous consent that on Sunday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate proceed to a period for morning business until 6:45 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Sunday, it stand in recess until 5 p.m. on Monday, October 30; that following the routine convening requests, there be 2 hours for debate on the continuing resolution to be equally divided in the usual form.

I further ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on the passage of the continuing resolution, if the resolution contains funding for 1 day, if received from the House, at 7 p.m. on Monday, and that paragraph 4 of rule XII be waived. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to occur at 7 p.m. on Sunday now begin at 6:45 p.m., assuming the papers have been received from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

I have no objection.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we will convene at 4 p.m. on Sunday with up to 2 hours 45 minutes equally divided for morning business. Under the previous order, there will be a vote occurring on

the continuing resolution at 6:45 p.m., assuming the papers have been received from the House, and earlier, if possible, or a little later, if it is necessary. But I believe around 6:45 we will be able to vote.

On Monday, the Senate will convene at 5 p.m. with 2 hours for debate on the continuing resolution. A vote on the continuing resolution will occur at approximately 7 p.m. on Monday, again assuming the papers have been received from the House.

RECESS UNTIL 4 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:34 a.m., recessed until Sunday, October 29, 2000, at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Saturday, October 28, 2000*

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord of history and Eternal God, tonight each one of us will take timepieces in hand and upon common agreement change time itself.

Help us to realize, Lord, that this simple and silent gesture, performed in the depths of darkness, is symbolic for the whole world.

We cannot stop the passage of time or slow down its relentless beat, but we can come together and measure differently, reading each passing hour with new consensus.

Forced by obvious limitations, we find a way to help one another through the darkest days.

Because of limited light, we adjust ourselves and allow each other another day for greater progress.

In each moment, let us seek first Your presence, acknowledge our own limitations, and seize the opportunity to serve Your people.

For You are the ever present One, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. 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. 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 256, nays 60, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—256

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NAYS—60

Allen
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Berry
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Carson
Costello
Cramer
DeFazio
English
Etheridge
Filner
Gejdenson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hill (MT)
Holt
Hooley
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kucinich
Latham
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Peterson (MN)
Ramstad
Rogan
Rothman
Sabo
Sanchez
Schaffer
Slaughter
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Waters
Weller
Wicker
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—115

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bonior
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Fattah
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Ganske
Greenwood
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hulshof
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Lazio
Lipinski
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mink
Morella
Neal
Nethercutt
Owens
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Sandlin
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Vitter
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weygand
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 0925

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 660. An act for the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity.

H.R. 848. An act for the relief of Sepandan Farnia and Farbod Farnia.

H.R. 1235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes.

H.R. 2941. An act to establish the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 3184. An act for the relief of Zohreh Farhang Ghahfarokhi.

H.R. 3388. An act to promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin.

H.R. 3414. An act for the relief of Luis A. Leon-Molina, Ligia Padron, Juan Leon Padron, Rendy Leon Padron, Manuel Leon Padron, and Luis Leon Padron.

H.R. 3621. An act to provide for the posthumous promotion of William Clark of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, co-leader of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, to the grade of captain in the Regular Army.

H.R. 4312. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing an Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas.

H.R. 4794. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600 mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War.

H.R. 5266. An act for the relief of Saeed Rezai.

H.R. 5478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation suitable land to serve as the new location for the home of Alexander Hamilton, commonly known as the Hamilton Grange, and to authorize the relocation of the Hamilton Grange to the acquired land.

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation for the United States service members who were aboard the British transport HMT ROHNA when it sank, the families of these service members, and the rescuers of the HMT ROHNA's passengers and crew.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1444) ''An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design, and construct fish screens, fish passage devices, and related features to mitigate adverse impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and California.''

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2638. An act to adjust the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore to include Cat Island, Mississippi.

S. 2751. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Nevada, to the Secretary of the Interior, in trust for the Washoe Indian Tribe of Nevada and California.

S. 2789. An act to amend the Congressional Award Act to establish a Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Board.

S. 3181. An act to establish the White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a day of peace and sharing should be established at the beginning of each year.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1936) ''An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other National Forest System land in the State of Oregon and use the proceeds derived from the sale or exchange for National Forest System purposes.''

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2915) ''An Act to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer, to demand an immediate vote on prescription drug relief for seniors, to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DOGGETT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed, in resolving the differences between the two Houses on the funding level for program management in carrying out titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, to choose a level that reflects a requirement to prohibit, through the Secretary of Health and Human Services, any market exclusivity for a prescription drug manufactured by a pharmaceutical manufacturer if the manufacturer does not make available to individuals eligible for benefits under such title XVIII all prescription drugs manufactured by the manufacturer at the best available price (as defined in section 1927(c)(1)(C) of such Act) or at the lowest negotiated price paid to such manufacturer for such prescription drugs by any Federal agency or department.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. PALLONE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed, in resolving the differences between the two Houses on the funding level for program management in carrying out titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, to choose a level that reflects a requirement on Medicare+Choice organizations to offer Medicare+Choice plans under part C of such title XVIII for a minimum contract period of three years, and to maintain the benefits specified under the contract for the three years.

□ 0930

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 118, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 646, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 118 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 118

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106–275 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''October 29, 2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is another of those 1-day CRs, continuing resolutions, that are necessary because the President of the United States has refused to sign anything other than a 1-day continuing resolution. It does not make any other changes to the current CR; it just continues the appropriations process until midnight tomorrow night. I assume there will be some lengthy debate, as there was yesterday, on the last one-day CR, but we will get to a vote as soon as we can.

I would like to just briefly report that at the conclusion of business yesterday, we did resume negotiations with the other body and with White House representatives, and we made some progress. We will make more progress today, and we will make more progress on Sunday. If we could offer instructions to the conferees in the other body and instructions to the White House, the same as our colleagues want to offer instructions to the House conferees today and tomorrow, things might move along a lot more expeditiously. However, we only have the authority here to make nonbinding instructions to ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than the House involved in this process. I would just point out once again, as I have so many times before, the House did all of its appropriations business very early, and what is delaying the completion of the appropriations process today is not really appropriation issues. By far, the most part of the controversial issues that are out there have nothing to do with appropriations. They are philosophical in nature, they are political, and they are authorization issues as opposed to appropriation issues.

But, since appropriations bills are the bills that have to pass, they become very, very fertile vehicles for those who would like to add extraneous items to the appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I guarantee my colleagues, we will get to the end of this process; we will conclude this business, and we will have Members home at least in time to vote on Election Day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take 30 minutes. Let me simply say that the gentleman from Florida is right. We have to approve this resolution again to keep the government open.

I am concerned about two developments. Number one, early yesterday it appeared, in fact we were told, that the conference needed to be wrapped up by the end of the day yesterday so that we could have a bill on the floor immediately when we came back to the House on Monday or Tuesday. It will take about 2 days to go through all of the technicalities to do what is called a readout so that everybody's staff is sure of what every item is in that bill, so that at least somebody understands what each item is. So we were told that we should have all the work done Friday.

Then, after the meeting reconvened, we were given another schedule, which indicated, for instance, that we would not even be able to resolve the issue with respect to school construction until after the fate of the tax bill is resolved on Tuesday or so. That means that there is a high potential that we will be stuck here not just Tuesday, but Wednesday or Thursday, because if we are not going to be making those decisions until Tuesday, and if we have to go through the usual readout requirement, we could have a real problem.

In addition, as the gentleman from Florida says, I do not know exactly how many extraneous items there are on the bill at this point, but if we were to add all of them, many of which I would support if they were on individual pieces of legislation, but if we were to add all of them to this bill, this bill would wind up being longer than the Bible, the Talmud, the Koran, and add to it every comic book ever printed in the history of the United States. I think we would have results that were just about as silly as those comic books.

So there are going to be a lot of people who are disappointed, because we are being asked by authorization committee members on bill after bill after bill after bill to include this or that provision and some of them are very meritorious, and some of them would fit the needs of my district, some of them would fit the needs of some of others' districts, but we are going to have a very tough time producing a bill that is not the laughing stock of the Western world if we are not very disciplined in terms of what we wind up adding.

So I think we will see both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and myself, and probably the two conferees from the Senate, rejecting dozens of provisions which we ourselves personally favor, simply trying to keep this bill to a manageable size. I would ask for the forbearance of each individual Member who has a hot idea about what ought to be included in the last minute.

No question, there are some that are emergencies, and we will have to try to act on them. But this is not going to be an easy weekend, and I would say that my only point of disagreement with the gentleman who spoke, and it is not a disagreement with the way he has tried to perform. The very first bills that he brought to the committee this year were bipartisan in nature.

The first three bills that came up in committee could have had this year and last year bipartisan support, but somewhere along the line we all became prisoners of a set of assumptions in the budget resolution that was passed by the House at the direction of the leadership, a set of assumptions which were highly unrealistic and did not at all reflect what, in fact, this Congress intended to spend on these items in the end. That, to me, is the real problem.

I just want to say as an institutionalist in this House, I know a lot of us, every time we come to the end of the session, start shooting at the Committee on Appropriations and saying, if only the appropriators could get this done, we would not be in this mess. I honestly believe, if we left it to the appropriators to decide the appropriations issues without extraneous pressures, we could have a deal on all of this stuff in about 3 hours. I really believe that. The problem is that lots of other things are intervening.

I would also note that the real problem we have is that when we start with a budget resolution which is not real, that means that we cannot produce real appropriation bills until the budget resolution does get real, and it has taken about 8 months to do that.

I will give one example. Lest I be accused of partisanship, I will give one example of how that occurred in the deep dark distant past, in 1981. In 1981, when the budget resolution was before us in the first Reagan year, the last item holding up the conference on that budget resolution was whether or not the agriculture number was real. To meet the targets in the Republican budget resolution, it was decided that we had to cut, I believe it was, $400 million out of agriculture. In order to get the votes to pass that, the grain State representatives were told that that money was going to come out of dairy, and the dairy State representatives were told that the money was going to come out of grain. So we had two false assumptions that were used to pass a number that was unreal.

That has occurred many times over on the budget resolution that this committee was forced to operate under this year, and that is why the first 10

months were essentially wasted. So now, our committee is being asked to perform an impossible act and correct 10 months of disingenuousness in about 2 weeks, and that is just almost impossible to do, especially when we are not being given free reign to make the choices that you know would solve the problem.

So I hope that we will have a cooperative spirit in the conference, but we are going to have to have some choices made that allow the conferees to actually make some choices, because yesterday, on three successive major items, when we tried to resolve them, we were told, ''Well, we do not have any authority to deal with that; that is going to be made by somebody else.'' If that is the case, it is going to take a lot longer than anybody wants, because the people who we expect to put the deal together, we are told, are not being given enough reign to actually make those choices.

That is the institutional problem that I see; and until it is dealt with, I am afraid that we may wind up getting stuck in the ditch, even though on the Committee on Appropriations, both sides would like to make a deal and get the blazes out of here and go home.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, we said earlier that we realized that President Clinton is signing concurrent resolutions for only 1 day at a time. If he were to sign a 3-day resolution yesterday, for example, we could all be in our districts, the appropriators on both sides of the aisle could be doing their respective work, and we could have come back here Monday or Tuesday.

I would like to put a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if he would yield. I am told that one of the reasons the President has insisted on 1-day concurrent resolutions is his disagreement with the Republican majority regarding blanket amnesty being extended to hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens. Is this one of his reasons?

□ 0945

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have my own ideas as to why the President wants us here day after day, one day at a time, but I do not know for sure what his reason is.

However, on your question of amnesty, I would remind the gentleman, that during the development of the Commerce, Justice appropriations conference report, in the closing hours, the President did request a broad-based general amnesty for illegal aliens.

The House responded and the conference committee responded with a compromise that would provide amnesty for family reunification. Some of the families had already been granted citizenship, and this would allow them to unify their families. We did that in the Commerce, Justice bill.

We have been advised that the President is going to veto the Commerce, Justice appropriations bill, and one of the main reasons is because we did not give him the general broad-based amnesty that he requested.

Now, whether or not that becomes a major issue on the development of the Labor, HHS conference report, I am not really sure at this point. I think it is going to depend on what action he takes relative to the Commerce, Justice bill; and if he vetoes that, then we will have to determine how best to deal with that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

With respect to the last question, Mr. Speaker, on the, Commerce, Justice, State bill, as I think most people understand, there are five major issues that are dividing the President and the Congress in my view. One of the most important is the privacy issue, the illegitimate use of Social Security numbers to allow anyone who uses the Internet to invade the privacy of each and every American if they are shrewd enough on how to go about it. That is a very serious issue.

With respect to the immigration issue, it is important to understand that all the President is asking is that we provide the same rules for people who came from countries like Salvador as we provided at the request on two occasions of members of the majority party, for refugees from Nicaragua and several other Latin American countries. All of these people are here already.

There is not one additional person who would come into the United States. You have already made the decision to provide an easier way for people to stay in this country for those people, and we are simply asking that that same principle be applied to others. You are just as dead if you have been killed by the Salvadoran death squads, as you are if you were killed by the Sandanistas. And I think the President is on perfectly good ground.

We also have major environmental problems associated with that bill as I think everyone knows.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, we are at gridlock. We are 3 weeks plus the date that we are supposed to adjourn this Congress, and we still have not really sat down to negotiate the differences between the White House and the Congress. And the Members on my side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, have been left out of most of the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun papers got it right, and let me quote if I might, Mr. Speaker, Republicans gridlock again in Congress. GOP leaders cannot strong-arm Clinton to get their way on tax cuts and budgets. Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise? It seems to have vanished within the lexicon of Republicans on Capitol Hill. The result is more gridlock in Washington as Republicans try to force their political agenda down President Clinton's throat. This tactic has repeatedly backfired on the GOP.

The editorial goes on to say Republicans seem determined to send Mr. Clinton a take-it-or-leave-it tax cut plan that tilts benefits in favor of the well-to-do at a cost of $240 billion over 10 years. It would, for instance, give 58 billion in tax breaks to those able to buy long-term health care insurance, but it would not do what the President seeks to provide, care for 4 million uninsured parents at a fraction of the costs. Similarly, the Republican bill heavily favors HMOs, which have the political muscle over hospitals and nursing homes and restoring money cut by Congress in 1997. That is not fair, especially because nursing homes were devastated by the prior budget cuts.

There is room for compromise, but the GOP hard-liners will not budge. They want a partisan agenda enacted. Other Republicans think they can influence voters if they force the President to veto their tax cut bill. That is a poor way to run government. And I agree.

We should be sitting down and working together to try to resolve these differences. We should have done that 3 weeks ago, 4 weeks ago.

Now we are surprised that it is getting political when we are a little over a week before a national election? The reason why we are here day in and day out is because we need to break this gridlock by honest negotiations between all parties. And I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the statement of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and I do not think he was talking about the appropriations bills, because for the appropriations bills, I think the minority would concede that we have worked together very well with them.

We have not kept them out of any meetings or any consideration of appropriations bills and appropriations issues. And the gentleman's original statement that we had not yet begun to negotiate, I would ask him to talk

with his distinguished leader, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), because I cannot tell the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) how many hours and how many days we have spent negotiating with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) at the same table along with our subcommittee leadership and including the White House.

We have been honestly negotiating; and as I pointed out, the appropriations issues have basically all been negotiated. They have all been settled. It is the extraneous legislative-type, philosophical-type issues that are holding us up, not appropriations issues.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would say that, Mr. Speaker, I have no complaints with the way the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has dealt with the appropriations Democrats. I think he has been perfectly fair. That does not mean that appropriations bills have been produced with Democratic input, as the gentleman knows, with respect to Justice-State. In the end, the decision was made by the majority leadership to simply put together a package on their own without further consultation with us.

It contained a number of provisions which the majority knew were nonstarters with us; and if we had been in the room when those decisions were made, I think we could have avoided the veto that is now going to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, very frankly, the majority party has put a kinder, gentler face on what it has done over the last 8 months. That kinder, gentler, principled face is the face of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our Committee, the Committee on Appropriations; and like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said the Democrats were not included in the appropriations process, in the Committee on Appropriations, in the Commerce, Justice, State.

I will say, on my committee, that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I dealt together openly. The shame of it was that the Republicans on the Committee on Appropriations were not always included in the appropriations negotiation. That is one of the problems, one of the significant problems.

Mr. Speaker, 9 days ago, the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) came on this House floor and made some interesting and, I believe, incredible statements. He said this Congress, the 106th Congress, is one of the most productive Congresses in recent history. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELay) said that flipping through a document that apparently listed bills that were approved by this Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. I did not see that document, none of us did.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I can tell my colleagues with certainty, there was no meaningful patients' bill of rights in it. There was no Medicare prescription drug benefit in it. There was no targeted tax relief in it. There was no real campaign finance reform in it; and there was no school modernization, class-size reduction, and teacher quality initiative in that document. No, not one of those pressing critical issues which show on my colleagues polls and our polls as being the Americans focus.

As a matter of fact, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), has an ad running today on TV that I saw this morning that she is for patients' bill of rights, for school construction, for campaign finance reform; the only thing that ad lacked was a tag line of vote Democratic.

The bills that the majority in this Congress has refused to pass could go on and on.

Then, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) charged, and again I quote, ''We remain here today because some people simply will not support the principles of fiscal discipline.'' Hooey. I am pretty sure he was not talking about the Members on this side of the aisle, but now we know the truth.

Those are precisely the people who should have been listening. If nothing else, this do-nothing 106th Congress has finally debunked the myth of the free-spending Democrat and unmasked the fiscally irresponsible Republicans and who they are.

This majority has wasted the last 2 years trying to enact a tax scheme that would drain the entire projected budget surplus over the next decade and threatened to eat into that portion of the surplus set aside for Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, now, they are loading up spending bills at funding level over and above what the President requested in his budget.

As the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my good friend, pointed out earlier this week, the nine appropriations conference reports to date provide outlays that exceed the President's 2001 budget by $11.4 billion. None of them could pass. None of them could get to the President without the majority party's support.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) also noted that the 106th Congress is on track to increase spending on nondefense appropriations, and we ought to listen to this. We ought to listen to this figure, and I see the gentleman from Western Maryland, (Mr. BARRETT), my colleague, that the majority is going to pass, yes, the President can veto and my colleagues can say, gee, whiz, we could not get our way. I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about what my colleagues are going to pass and send to him.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) noted that the 106th Congress is on track to increase spending on nondefense appropriations at the fastest growth rate, 5.2 percent, since the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was enacted. The House is going to pass, not the President is going to sign and propose, the House is going to pass the largest increase in domestic discretionary spending since 1974.

Since enactment of the Budget Act, nondefense appropriations have grown an average of 2.1 percent when Republicans controlled the House, and only 1.2 percent, half of that, per year when Democrats controlled the House. That does not comport with the facts that my colleagues would like to portray. Those are the facts, and my colleagues can check with your CBO on whether I am inaccurate.

So tell me, who needs a lecture on fiscal discipline? I do not think there is a soul in this House who does not understand why our budget process is broken down this year and why this eighth continuing resolution is necessary.

The Republican majority insisted, not the appropriators, not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the 13 cardinals, insisted on passing a phony budget resolution last spring that turned our appropriations process into a sham.

As The Washington Post stated, and I quote, ''The Republicans continue to insist on a make-believe fiscal policy. The familiar fable is that they can cut taxes, finance the boomers' old age and increase defense and selected other spending while maintaining fiscal discipline.''

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done. It has not been done, and it is a shame.

□ 1000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, why do we have a loggerhead? Republican fault? Democrat fault? There is a very strong difference of opinion on who should control people's lives, either people or Washington, D.C.

The gentleman that just spoke in the well just talked about no Patients' Bill of Rights. Many of us feel that it is wrong, absolutely wrong to have unlimited lawsuits which would drive up health care costs and would force HMOs out of business. Many Americans like HMOs. Some do not. They have legitimate concerns on that side of the aisle and on our side of the aisle.

But then the liberal trial lawyers would go down and sue the small businesses that hire those HMOs or care providers in good faith, and it would hurt small business. That is why National Federation of Independent Business, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Associations were opposed to it. There is a legitimate concern on our side of the aisle that it hurts the economy and hurts business. So, no, we did not support it.

School construction. We feel within the Labor-HHS bill, I serve on that subcommittee, that if we want to give school construction dollars, my colleagues want amnesty to 4 million illegals in the Commerce, State, Justice, we have got 43 million uninsured Americans. We agree that that is terrible. But, automatically, we are going to have 47 million uninsured Americans on health care. They petition their families, and now we are going to have over 50 million uninsured Americans. Think what that is going to do to the cost of health care. Think of what it is going to do to our overburdened schools.

So, yes, we have a difference of opinion. In the school construction, we feel that, if we give Federal dollars down to the schools for construction, then it ought to be bid between the unions and private enterprise so that we can get the best quality and the best amount of construction for our schools.

But my colleagues on the other side want only the union wage, the prevailing wage, which costs about 35 percent in some States down to 15 percent in some States. We are saying, let it be bid, let the schools keep the extra money for class size reduction, teacher pay, those kinds of issues. But my colleagues on the other side, the President is saying, no, I want it for the unions.

I see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Minority Whip on the floor. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has gotten over $2 million from the unions. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), $1.7 million from the unions. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), $1.4 million. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), $1.3 million from the unions. They want to continue giving the money to the unions that goes to Democrats campaigns.

We are saying we want the money, not to go to the union bosses, but to go to the schools. There is a difference of opinion. I choose the schools over union bosses and campaigns.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has, in my view, questioned the motivation for Members' votes on the House floor. The use of innuendo may be clever, but it is not constructive. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is a good man, and he ought to be able to do better than that.

Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from California tell those gentlemen the he just named that he was going to use those names before he used them on the House floor, knowing they were in a Democratic caucus so they could not respond to him? Does he regard that as the gentlemanly thing to do?

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) was on the floor. I looked at him face to face.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how many men did the gentleman from California name?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Four.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman from California see all four of them on the House floor?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They were, Mr. Speaker, two of them were.

Mr. OBEY. No, they were not. Two of them were in the caucus. One of them happens to be the caucus chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is for the record, Mr. Speaker. That is right off the Web page.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, with all due respect, regardless of what the rules allow, I think it is simply not fair to raise individual Member's names on the floor and, through innuendo, question what their positions are without informing them ahead of time. I find it most unfortunate. In the case of the gentleman, I find it also to be habitual.

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

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin was offended, I apologize. But the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) was on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California named the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST). He named a number of other people. It seems to me that, if a Member is going to be attacked personally, that at least they are entitled to know that so that the TV audience does not get the impression that no response was given. The reason no response was given is because several of the gentlemen who were attacked were not even on the floor when the attack was made. I do not think that that suits the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the people that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) mentioned. He is right. I am proud of the fact that working men and women of America who are organized support me. They do so because they believe I support them. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

He moved in committee to strike provisions. We could build a lot of things a lot cheaper. But do my colleagues know, two Republicans, a gentleman named Davis and a gentleman named Bacon, two Republicans from New York said that they did not want cheap labor, scab labor, people who were brought in to work for wages that could not support themselves and their family? Two Republicans said that is not right. If we are going to spend public money, we ought to pay the people who build them fairly.

Now, we just passed a resolution, I will tell the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), some weeks ago about slave labor building this Capitol. It was much cheaper to do it that way, I will tell the gentleman from California, much cheaper; but it was wrong.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just got to say I am very encouraged about coming back to the 107th Congress, because it appears a new era of civility is dawning, because it seems to me, in the past 4 years, Members' names were thrown around all the time on this floor without advanced calling. In fact, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who was just offended, I believe, used the name of the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA). I will be talking to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) this morning to see if she got a postcard before that happened.

I understand why the Democrats are frustrated and upset. They got news last night that their Presidential candidate is down 13 percent. I would be upset, too. But they come to the floor, and they say that we have not done anything, and we have not passed anything this year.

In fact, one gentleman from Maryland came to the floor and actually said that we were in town because the tax bill did not pass. They know that is not the truth. It is not the tax bill that is keeping us in town. While he can quote a newspaper whose editor obviously does not know how Congress works, I am a bit disappointed he does not know any better. I expect the President to sign that bill after the election is over, but we will see. But that is not what is keeping us here.

I do want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member. I think he set a very positive tone this morning. I thank him. But others coming to the floor saying we have done nothing this year is disappointing.

We heard the gentleman from Maryland say we passed no prescription drug benefit. That is not true. We did. In fact, while we were working on the bill, the Democrats exited that door right there because they could not have their way. The same thing goes with the Patients' Bill of Rights.

I disagree with the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I think HMOs should be sued. But do my colleagues know what, we sit down, we talk about it, we negotiate it, we do not try to make it an election year issue. But what do they do? They run away and say we have done nothing on the issue.

The same thing with education. We actually want to fund education just as much as Democrats. The difference is we want teachers, parents and educators and hometowns to make the decision how that money is spent instead of Washington lawyers, politicians and bureaucrats.

There is a difference, and we can talk these differences out. But one cannot have one's way all the time. I learned that. I have been here for 6 years, and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) will tell you, I had a rough 2 or 3 years, because I thought it had to be my way or the highway. Well, I hope I have grown a little bit and understand the need to compromise.

Unfortunately, too many of our Democratic friends here today say we must have it our way or else the Republicans have done absolutely nothing over the past 2 years. That is not the case. One cannot have 100 percent of the pie.

Like George W. Bush says, and the reason why he is 13 points ahead, we need to change the way Washington works. We need to come together, make this institution work, and unite, not divide, not have Presidents flying to fund raisers across the country, not having Senators flying home whenever they feel like it, but people sitting down at the table.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) yield me 30 additional seconds?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since I would acknowledge that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) has in fact grown considerably during his time here, I yield him another minute.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have grown. I thank the gentleman from Florida very much.

But now is the time for everybody to follow my example of growing, come together, let us sit down, talk this out. Again, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, today. I thought that his comments were very positive, that the appropriators are willing to sit down, talk this out, do the people's business and go home and not use all this for election year issues.

So I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the additional 30 seconds and for recognizing my amazing growth over the past 4 years.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise us as to the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHRIST).

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much else I can add to what the other gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) has just said in a very eloquent way.

But there has been a lot of discussion here this morning that the Republicans are responsible for gridlock, phony numbers, and partisan politics. All I will say to that is this Chamber does allow each Member to be a responsible advocate for what they believe. What that means is there is, fundamentally, opportunity for a difference of opinion. So gridlock is each of us having the freedom, as Members of Congress, as do all Americans, to express their heartfelt opinions.

It has also been said this morning that the Republicans are spending $11 billion over what the President requested. That is true, because we are spending more money for health care and more money for education. That is where the dollars should go, and that is where the dollars are directed.

Now, the third point I want to make is that some of us on our aisle have a difference of opinion from those on the other side of the aisle dealing with health care, more specifically dealing with Medicare.

The President wants the Federal Government to be entirely in charge of the Medicare program; that is, Medicare part A, Medicare part B, and probably a prescription drug program or any other +Choice programs for our senior citizens; for the Federal Government, through HCFA, to pay all those expenses.

Those on our side of the aisle want a mix of Federal Government participation and the private sector. We want that mix, because when the baby boomers retire, we know that the Federal Government cannot sustain that program unless they increase the payroll taxes by about 500 percent. It is just not going to happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about politics today, so I figured I would weigh in on an issue that is of extreme importance to women and one that I am very critical of the President over. I want to express my absolute outrage over President Clinton's decision to play politics with women's health.

□ 1015

Early this month, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act cleared the Congress and was sent to the President for his signature. This measure is critical because it covers the cost of treating low-income women who are screened through Federal programs and found to have breast or cervical cancer. Thousands upon thousands of low-income women in America are affected by this very, very important measure and President Clinton knows it. That is why he signed it into law yesterday.

Unlike so many other bills, however, he signed this one into law with no White House ceremony, no fanfare, not even a press release, apparently, even though he of all people knows that such ceremonies are the best way of getting the media attention to focus on this issue. This month is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. It was a perfect opportunity for him to hold a ceremony to draw attention to a new option that will literally save thousands of lives. But he chose not to highlight it. And why? Because his wife is running for the Senate seat for New York against one of the main authors of the bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Apparently, the President did not want New York women to know that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) has been instrumental in ensuring passage of something that may mean so much to so many of them. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the decision to play down the importance of this bill because of petty politics is one of the most awful things I have heard of.

Two weeks ago, the President invited Republicans and Democrats onto the White House lawn to celebrate the signing of the Chinese trade bill. I guess he invited all of us there for bipartisan cover in case something goes wrong with the Chinese trade pact. But not for women, not for women with breast cancer, not for women who need treatment will we have a ceremony of such lavish proportion.

In a few minutes we will hear about the importance of home heating oil in New York. And when we had that bill and, unfortunately, one of our Members missed a vote, he was roundly and routinely criticized by his opponent in the New York Senate race for not having voted on that very important issue. So I would ask the next speaker, when we move into the next bill, to possibly explain to me why the President did not place an issue important to women at the same level of importance as he did the Chinese trade bill; why he did not choose to let women around America, who are of low-income stature,

know that they now have a new option; and why he did not seem to think it was so important to let every woman in America know about this vital bill?

Several of my friends have been stricken with breast cancer at very early ages in recent days, and I have been traumatized to watch them suffer through chemotherapy and lose their hair, while their families had to take care of their children, and it saddens me to think that while we are here in the waning hours of the 106th Congress that our President could not find it in his heart because of petty politics to have a bill signing that would bring to the attention of millions of Americans that, in fact, this Congress has acted on cervical and breast cancer.

So I plead, beg, and urge my colleague from Connecticut, who will occupy the next 45 minutes after we close debate, to join me in a chorus of urgency to tell the President of the United States, please, before the election day, sign the bill in a public ceremony, let Americans know the importance of this issue. After all, if I am not mistaken, it was his own mother that was stricken by breast cancer.

Too many women are dying in America, and we are sitting here on a Saturday hearing the story about how the Republicans have failed to pass landmark legislation. I voted for a patient's bill of rights. I voted for hate crimes legislation. I voted for a number of things that I think are bipartisan in nature and important to this country. But if we are going to hurl adjectives of blame at the other side of the aisle, we better stand up and be ready to take it; and we better let our President know that women deserve to be treated better than this.

The Chinese got a signing ceremony on the White House lawn with every major corporate fat cat in America. And we talk about campaign finance reform, look at the guest list that came to that even. Were women included in that event? Yes. But when it comes to women's health, I guess we should just let it go quietly; let us not make a commotion about it; let us protect the candidacy or future possibilities of a woman running for the Senate in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Chamber to stop arguing, and I urge the President to sign these bills and let us move on.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I quickly would like to say to my colleague who just spoke that I too share the gentleman's pain about what is happening to women with breast cancer or cervical cancer, being a cancer survivor. But I have a bill in this body, the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act. This is a bipartisan bill, with 220 cosponsors, providing women with 48 hours of coverage in the hospital for a mastectomy, 24 hours for a lumpectomy, or a shorter time if doctor and patient decide that that should be the case.

The House leadership, the Republican leadership of this body, would not bring this bill to the floor. Let us not talk about caring about women in this institution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the public is paying close attention to this debate. I am sorry for using the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), but the gentleman is here, and so I thought I would confront him with this personally because the issue of illegal immigration means a lot to me and a lot to those people in California.

In fact, all over the United States people are upset with the fact that we have had this massive illegal flow of illegal immigrants into our country. What the President is suggesting is not as the gentleman suggested earlier. The point is that the gentleman is incorrect, or at least he has left an incorrect impression when he stated that the President's blanket amnesty demand on this body had something to do just with El Salvadorans and making things right.

No. The fact is that what the President is asking for is a blanket amnesty, an amnesty for millions of people who have been here illegally since 1986. That is what the President is holding us hostage for. All this other rhetoric about health care or about whatever issue we are here on, the surplus or education funds, just keep in mind that the President is demanding that we have millions of illegal aliens granted amnesty so they will be eligible for government benefits.

What does that mean? It means draining money that should be going perhaps to pay down the deficit or perhaps to bolster Social Security, perhaps to help the education of our own people, to provide health care for our own people. Instead, the President wants a blanket amnesty for millions of people, which will drain scarce resources from using it to help our own people, to using it to help people who have come here illegally. In so doing, we put out a welcome mat, a shining light above the door saying, come on in, anybody who can get here, we are going to give amnesty and all will be able to get all of the resources and money that should be going to help our own citizens; whether that would be women who need health care or anybody else who needs health care; or our young people who need education. Perhaps we could even give a little bit of that money, and I know this does not sit very well on the other side of the aisle, a modest tax relief for our American people.

Instead, the President wants to grant a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants. This is a sin against our own people, and that is why he is keeping us here. That is the demand.

Let us remember this: the President of the United States vetoed welfare reform twice. Even though AL GORE is taking credit for welfare reform and the President takes credit for welfare reform, he vetoed it twice. What was the issue on which he vetoed it? I know what it was. It was whether or not noncitizens were going to be eligible for welfare. That is why the President vetoed that. Now he takes credit for all the welfare reform that we have had and the wonderful success that it has been.

Who is loyal to whom? Why are we here? The American people need to listen very closely.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. One simple question. The people the President is concerned about have been in this country for 15 years. If the gentleman does not want these people who came from the countries they come from to get the same treatment that prior immigrants got, then the gentleman ought to stand on the floor and repeal the changes in the law that the gentleman's party helped push through in order to allow people from Nicaragua and other countries to get the same treatment the President is now asking for these people.

Does the gentleman really want to come here and repeal the law for those folks? If he does not, then he is not for equal justice.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who would like to respond.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this is a blanket amnesty being proposed by the President for people who came here after the conflict in Central America was totally over.

The fact is that we are talking about a blanket amnesty. We are not talking about something to make it fair for certain people in Latin America. No, we are talking about people who have come here from all over the world, thumbing their noses at the United States, and the President wants to give them all the benefits; education, health, all the money we should be using for our own people would go to providing those people the benefits.

It even dilutes our vote by having a blanket amnesty. Those millions of people who come here illegally will end up voting citizens, diluting even the substance of each American's vote. That is what the issue is.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. The gentleman's comments are so far from the point that they do not even merit response.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for a closing statement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so much for trying to keep this debate low key this morning. I think both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I tried to do that; but I do not think we succeeded very well. No harm in trying.

All I would say in response to what I have heard is that I plead fully guilty in resisting the idea that American prosperity can only be expanded by further suppressing worker wages. In my view, when we try to disallow Davis-Bacon rules, that is what we do.

Now, my colleagues may call that big labor bosses, but I call that hard-working construction workers in towns like Wausau and Stevens Point and Superior and Park Falls and Wisconsin Rapids who work physically a whole lot harder than anybody in this Chamber that I am looking at right now, whose bodies wear out a whole lot faster than the bodies of anybody I am looking at right now in this Chamber. Lots of folks wearing suits, very comfortable on comfortable salaries, lecturing unions about how they ought to keep their wages down for their members because they are too inflationary. What a joke. What a joke.

I also make no apology whatsoever about wanting to be able to hold HMOs accountable in a court of law if they take actions or require doctors to take actions that injure patients. The rules, as they stand now, say that if a doctor in an HMO follows the rules of that HMO, he can get sued, he can get hung out to dry. But the guy who sets the rules, the board that sets the rules in the HMO, they cannot be sued under many, many of those same circumstances. Why should the guy following the rules get stuck with the lawsuit while the guy who makes the rules gets off scot-free if somebody's health is damaged or if their life is ended?

□ 1030

There are a lot of good HMOs in this country, but everybody ought to be held accountable in a court of law when it is required for the sake of elemental justice. That does not have a whole lot to do with the continuing resolution because most of the remarks I have heard on those subjects did not have anything to do with the continuing resolution. But I did want to make clear those two points.

I am unapologetic when it comes to supporting higher wages for workers, higher COLAs for seniors and health coverage for workers with repetitive motion injury. I think that government needs to be a big enough umpire to get between Mike Piazza and Roger Clemens in the economy. And the problem is that in the economy, workers usually are not as big and as powerful as the institutions they are up against. We are supposed to be here to help make certain that government is an umpire with enough powers to at least provide an even playing field for those workers. If you want to oppose the Labor-H bill and hold up the Labor-H bill because of our concern on issues like that, be my guest. That again says more about you than it does about us.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, people are all over the country, if they are up on a Saturday morning and not doing their chores, are watching us here, some of them, anyway, on C–SPAN and asking themselves, well, why are you meeting on a Saturday morning? I would like to offer a brief explanation.

We are here because instead of addressing the issues and the real needs of American families, reducing school class size, making prescription drugs available and affordable through Medicare, passing a strong Patients' Bill of Rights, the Republican majority instead made a conscious decision not to do these things. They have not done the work of functioning and making the government work by passing the appropriate money bills. We are almost a month past the deadline for having done that. Instead of behaving as legislators, they have opted to become unlegislators. As the Washington Post put it, instead of being a Congress, this has been an un-Congress, a body that ''for 2 years has mainly pretended to deal with issues it has systematically avoided.''

That is why today we are faced with the need to pass the eighth stopgap measure just to keep the government from shutting down. This is not to say the Republican majority has not had any priorities. Just ask their friends at the HMOs. The Republican leadership is trying to give them a $30 billion subsidy. Never mind that the HMOs have abandoned literally millions of Americans. Never mind that hospitals and nursing homes and hospices are getting shortchanged in the process.

Then again what do you expect? The HMOs did give almost $5 million to the Republicans in just the first half of this year alone in campaign contributions.

Let me remind my colleagues something else from an editorial that appeared today in the morning's Baltimore Sun, and I quote:

''Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise? It seems to have vanished from the lexicon of Republicans on Capitol Hill. The result is more gridlock in Washington, as Republicans try to force their political agenda down President Clinton's throat.'' The Baltimore Sun.

The editorial continues: ''There's room for compromise, but GOP hardliners won't budge.''

It has been said that, in a democracy, people get the kind of government they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve much better.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I listened carefully to my friend's statement that was just made on the floor as to why we are here, and he mentioned a number of continuing resolutions. Well, the reason we are here today, Saturday, and the reason that we have an excessive number of continuing resolutions is simply because the President of the United States would only permit us to do one continuing resolution for one day at a time. Had he been a little more reasonable, we could have done a continuing resolution until Monday night or Tuesday night and then the appropriators who are involved in the negotiations with the White House could have had the weekend undisturbed to do those negotiations rather than spending all of our time here on the floor Saturday and probably tomorrow, Sunday. That is why we are here today.

Are there differences? Of course there are differences. That is why we have the two different parties involved. There are major philosophical differences between the two parties. If there were not differences, we would probably only have one party, or no party. But compromise, when we have a very evenly divided House, a very evenly divided Senate both controlled by one party and the White House, the President of another party, is essential.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have spent a lot of time together. In fact, I think our families are keeping score and have decided that he and I are spending more time with each other than we are at home with our families. But that is okay. That is what we were hired to do. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for the willingness that he shows to compromise as we approach these difficult issues.

One of the big problems here is, though, that, as I have said before, there are three parties involved. There is the House of Representatives, there

is the Senate, and there is the President of the United States. Now, sometime we run into these negotiations with the President, and we find that compromise is compromise only if it is his way. Compromise means everybody gives a little, everybody gets a little and you try to come to a conclusion. In some cases the President has done this, but in other cases he has been stonewalling, and compromise is either his way or no way. In my opinion, that is not true compromise. That is not true negotiation. But, nevertheless, after we finish our work here on the floor today, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I are going to continue working with our counterparts in an attempt to reach the compromise on this one remaining appropriations bill where the appropriations issues have basically been decided. It is items that have nothing to do with appropriations that are holding up the compromise on that particular bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 339, nays 7, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

YEAS—339

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
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
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)
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Baird
Capuano
DeFazio
Dingell
Ford
Miller, George
Stupak

NOT VOTING—86

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Duncan
Dunn
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gillmor
Gordon
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hulshof
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Morella
Neal
Owens
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Porter
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Spratt
Stark
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weygand
Wise
Wynn

□ 1057

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DELAURO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on the highest funding level possible for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program in FY 2001 and FY 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, we had a very cold winter this past winter, and not only people in my community, but people all across this country, seniors and working families, saw their budgets stretched to the limit, making choices

between food and heat and rent and heat and other kinds of cruel choices that they should not have to make.

Last winter, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, provided critical assistance to low-income families facing skyrocketing home heating oil prices. Eligible families were able to receive assistance and to defray high heating costs. LIHEAP has proven to be one of the most important safety nets that this government offers to low-income families. However, this program is chronically underfunded. Since 1995, there has been approximately a 35 percent drop in the number of households that receive LIHEAP assistance, due to a reduction in funding levels.

Mr. Speaker, winter is just around the corner. These same groups are confronted again with high energy prices. Home heating oil prices are projected to rise an estimated 50 percent, and natural gas is expected to increase 40 percent. Winter bills are likely to increase $290 more than last winter, which was the warmest on record.

When the average recipient is the poorest of the poor, those averaging a household income of less than $10,000 per year, these costs are unconscionable. Households are forced to pay high energy costs, will be forced to reduce those budgets again, for food, for medicine and other household necessities. Current funding levels will not sustain the large rise in energy costs. As a result, additional LIHEAP funds are needed to allow the program to purchase the same amount of home energy as was purchased last year.

As elected officials, we do not have the ability to manipulate weather projections to prevent a harsh winter, though we kind of think we can do whatever we would like to do. We are in a position, however, where we can use the offices that we have to increase funding for a proven program that will provide one of the most basic needs. The President did the right thing a month ago by releasing $400 million in emergency LIHEAP funds. I urge my colleagues to do the same: fund LIHEAP at an adequate level to make sure that those vulnerable groups have the means to keep themselves warm this winter and next; funded at the level of $550 million and also, that we forward-fund for $1.6 billion for the year 2002.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the gentlewoman that we do intend to support this motion to instruct, but before we get to that point and actually formally accept it, I wanted to point out that we have already agreed to fund the LIHEAP program above the President's request, not only for this year, but for next year as well. The LIHEAP program was fully funded in the preliminary conference agreement at the President's requested level of $1.1 billion for fiscal year 2001, plus an additional $300 million for any emergency that might develop. With recent negotiations, we added another $300 million to this program, bringing the total funding for fiscal year 2001 to $1.7 billion. We have agreed to advance-fund another $1.4 billion for fiscal year 2002, so that States will be able to adequately plan for next year. The President requested only $1.1 billion for next year, so we again are above the President's request.

We have also provided an additional $600 million in the fiscal year 2000 supplemental bill this past spring, the same amount requested by the President for emergency spending in this program for this year because of the recent increases in fuel prices. So we have really gone above and beyond the President's request; but we understand the importance of this program, and we do not want any to suffer through the winter without adequate heat, and we are not going to allow that to happen.

I might also say that there are some States where an extremely hot summer also causes severe problems, and deaths occur because of excessive heat, and we are not going to allow that to happen. We are also going to provide cooling assistance for those people who are exposed to that type of temperature fluctuation.

So the gentlewoman and I, I think, are together on this; and I think both sides of the aisle are together on this, so we are more than happy to accept her motion to instruct.

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

I thank the gentleman; and I might just add that that while, in fact, the President did put in $1.1 billion, there are a number of us who also spoke not only with the majority party here, but also with the President about increasing those dollars, because of the fact that, particularly those of us who in the Northeast and some other places where we have extremely cold winters, that, in fact, what we needed to do was to see those numbers increased.

The other reason why we have moved in this direction is because, in fact, over the years, this program has been dreadfully undercut in terms of costs, and there has also been the reluctance to forward-fund to the following year, which is critically important in order for us to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank her for bringing forth this very, very important resolution.

It is no secret that in this country we are facing a major energy crisis. It is no secret that the price of home heating oil, propane, kerosene, natural gas has been increasing very, very substantially. It is also no secret that we are the richest country in the history of the world, and that it would be an absolute outrage if any senior citizen, if any low-income American went cold this winter or had to take funds from their food budget in order to pay the heating bill. This is America, and elderly people should not go cold or should not go hungry.

Last month, I authored two letters signed by over 100 Members of Congress, including 20 Republicans, and the first letter urged the President to immediately release $400 million in emergency LIHEAP funding to deal with the energy crisis we are currently facing, and I am grateful that the President did that. The second letter urged Congress to increase funding for LIHEAP by 50 percent, from $1.1 billion to $1.65 billion for both fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002, and that is what we are discussing here right now.

The issue is one of priorities. There are people in the Congress who have voted for huge tax breaks for the richest 2 percent of the population. If people are prepared to vote for tax breaks for millionaires, we should be absolutely certain that no one in America goes cold this winter. Let us substantially increase funding for LIHEAP and ease the minds of elderly and lower-income Americans that this winter will not be a brutal one.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who is chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, rise in support of the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, that provides badly needed Federal energy assistance to the poor through funds to the States, permits States to help low-income individuals pay home heating or cooling bills, and pay for the low-cost weatherization of their homes.

LIHEAP is a critical lifeline for low-income families, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens. We have worked to ensure that the lifeline is strong enough to help those who are unable to afford the costs of heating their homes through the severe winter months and the costs of cooling their homes through the sweltering summer months.

In fiscal year 1999, 3.4 million households received help with their heating bills, and 748,000 households received winter crisis aid. In addition, cooling aid was provided to an estimated 480,000 households, summer crisis aid to 194,000 households, and weatherization assistance to 87,000 households.

It is important to keep in mind that the House already voted to appropriate

$1.4 billion for 2001; and as the chairman said, the appropriators have gone well above what the President has requested. We have done our duty.

Now, it is irresponsible, however, for this administration, for 8 years, to fail to develop a coherent energy policy that would have addressed these skyrocketing costs associated with continued reliance on foreign oil. Would it not have been more appropriate for our Democrat colleagues to join with us in calling on this administration to get its collective head out of the sand on our long-term energy needs? As good as LIHEAP is in providing assistance, it is needed because fuel costs are not kept in check. Our fuel costs have not been kept in check because this administration will not come to terms with the long-term energy problems we continue to face.

So, today we have before us a short-term fix for a very long-term problem.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 15 seconds for a question for the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the gentleman's remarks, did he say included in the appropriations bill, which I understand we have not come to a vote on that bill yet, but that there was the $1.65 billion in forward-funding for the year 2002?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what I said was, and let me double-check that, we have agreed to advance-fund $1.4 billion.

Ms. DELAURO. So that it is not the $1.65 billion that would bring it up to the same level we are talking about?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. No, if the gentlewoman will again yield, it is $1.4 billion. The President requested only $1.1 billion, so we went $300 million over the President's request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are asking for 2001, and as I understand it, the gentleman said it was $1.7 billion for the year 2001. That must have been something that just happened, because it was not at that level earlier. But I am talking about the year 2002 in forward-funding, it is $1.4 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct; and this is the amount that the administration agreed to and the minority agreed to.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said $1.4 billion?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, we are asking for $1.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the gentlewoman in calling on the Congress to appropriate $1.65 billion this year and next year for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues here today can tell us, there is a winter fuel crisis looming on the horizon; and we need to act, and we need to act immediately. With energy prices rising at record levels all over the Nation, we need to ensure that our most vulnerable citizens are able to get the heating oil that they need. The LIHEAP program helps seniors, helps working low-income families heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer.

Mr. Speaker, without this assistance, many Americans would be forced to choose between heating and eating. Mr. Speaker, no one should ever have to make that choice. Because of OPEC's production cuts, our oil stocks are 30 million barrels below what they were last year, and even last year's supply was much too little.

□ 1115

It is no surprise that as a result of that low stock that the prices are as high as they are.

Before senior citizens have to choose between buying groceries and paying their utility bills and before families discover that they cannot keep their children warm enough, my Republican colleagues need to act. For these people, heating their homes is not a luxury, Mr. Speaker. It is really a matter of life and death.

It is a tremendous program. It is a very important program, but it is woefully underfunded. For the past 3 years, we have funded LIHEAP at the same flat level; and, Mr. Speaker, as anyone in Massachusetts can tell my colleagues, that level has not kept pace with either inflation or fuel costs.

As a result, for the last 3 years, fewer and fewer eligible families have received assistance. If nothing changes, about 10 percent of the people who need help will get help. It is time this Congress acted to make sure people receive the LIHEAP help that they so desperately need, and I urge congressional appropriators to recognize how important LIHEAP is by including $1.65 million in this fiscal year.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a long-time strong supporter of the LIHEAP program to support this motion. LIHEAP, indeed, has been underfunded for many, many years, and it is an important priority for this year to put more funding into LIHEAP.

Let me reiterate the point that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has already made, under the President's budget, he had proposed only to fund LIHEAP to the tune of $1.1 billion, plus $300 million for emergency funding. The position that had been worked out on our side of the aisle with some collaboration was that instead, we would put in $1.4 billion for the LIHEAP program, plus $300 million for emergency funding.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a strong case to be made for increasing beyond the $1.4 billion. But let us understand what is really at work here. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) noted, one of the real problems here is that we have a failed energy policy in this country.

We are anticipating this winter that energy costs are going to go through the roof; and that is going to have a huge impact on low-income households, seniors and others are going to be forced to choose between heating and eating, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) noted. That is because not only have we underfunded LIHEAP, but also because we have not placed regulatory policies that are antiproduction.

We need to tackle this problem from a number of different directions. Yes, let us increase LIHEAP funding; but that in, itself, is no excuse for not having an energy policy in this country.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that one of the things that often does not come out in these debates is when people just make flat-out statements about energy policy in this country. The fact of the matter is, in 1995, the Republican majority in this body cut the weatherization programs by about 50 percent. They continually underfund any kind of research and development into energy alternatives, biomass, wind, solar, et cetera; and then come out and talk about an energy policy.

These are very, very big pieces of an energy policy, and which they have continuously, continuously undercut the President's request and other Members' request for these things.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for this resolution and for yielding me the time; and her leadership on these issues are greatly important as we address them on a national stage.

The first thing I would like to address is the issue about funding. The $1.6 billion that is being discussed in this resolution and the $1.4 billion that was forward funding leaves a gap of $200 million, whether it was in the President's budget or it was in the negotiations or the discussions.

The reality is people are paying $77 more per month higher than normal bills and, on average, are going to pay $464 for the season because more people

are asking for the assistance in Maine. 50,000 Maine households, 50,000 Maine families were given the help they needed to make ends meet. So the explosion in the numbers utilized, the cap agencies that have been trying to take the applications have a waiting list as long as you can see; and we are here not funding adequately to the level that we are funding this year.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing that, on average, families are going to be paying $602 more for a heating season. In reference to an energy policy, I think it is highly ironic because every year the administration tries to raise the fuel efficiency standard in automobiles, there has always been a congressional earmark to prevent it from happening.

When we tried to establish a Northeast Heating Oil Reserve, the leadership on the other side did not support it, dragged their heels, and did not even give the President the authority to release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And I would argue, as a Northeasterner and many Northeasterners pay attention to fuel oil prices, it was almost reaching $40 a barrel when the President announced he was going to release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the prices are now $31 or $32 a barrel.

So the actions that the President and the administration have been able to take through executive action have had an impact. The amount of money that has gone for emergency assistance has been helpful. It is now Congress' part, yet again, to do its responsibility in adequately funding LIHEAP to make sure that not only forward funding but forward funding to the levels that are necessary, and anybody that does not think the prices are going to increase is just fooling themselves.

As a friend of mine used to say, they go up by telegraph but they come down by pony express; and if we do not recognize that we have to adequately fund it this year, then we are just fooling ourselves and putting it off for next year. I think together we should recognize that heating one's home, whether in Maine or anywhere else, is not a luxury.

At every level, local, State and Federal, public servants should take the steps that are necessary to ensure that not a single resident, not a single resident is left out in the cold, and we should complete our work here today on the House floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this additional time to say one of the reasons that it has taken us so much time to conclude these negotiations is they cannot take yes for an answer. We agreed to this motion to commit. I said we are at $1.4 billion, which was the request of the minority and the President; and we agreed to the $1.4 billion.

Now my colleagues are moving the goal post again. Now my colleagues are going to go to $1.6 billion. We are going to agree to the $1.6 billion. But then are my colleagues going to come back and go to $1.8 billion and $1.9 billon?

Why do we not do this all at one time and save the time for negotiation?

On gas prices, the great political move of releasing from our Strategic Petroleum Reserves was simply that, political, because, first of all, it was about worth a day and a half of our consumption in the United States.

But let me tell my colleagues what happened. The oil was sold to a company who bought the oil and then turned around with a nice big profit and sold it again before it got to the refinery and the consumer.

Now, how did that affect those of us who put gasoline in our vehicles? It did not affect me. And I do not think it affected anybody in this Chamber, because when I buy gas and the people in my neighborhood buy gas, the price of gasoline did not go down one penny since the release of the oil reserve, maybe others in other parts of the country have better news than that.

But I can tell my colleagues that my constituents did not save even a penny a gallon on the release, the political release, of that strategic fuel oil reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for affording me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate him; and I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for working in a bipartisan way to deal with what has actually provided some relief for some people who have need.

I think this is Congress doing its thing. I think we are, in fact, rescuing the administration from some bad policy consequences that have taken place. I think it is good that the American people can look and see that here we are on a Saturday focusing on these kinds of problems and responding to them in a very, very positive way especially, I would also say, in a bipartisan way.

I think that one of the things that has been addressed slightly here, and I have heard a little so far in the debate on this about the underlying problem, heating oil is not something we have just discovered and the need for it and the need for it on an affordable basis.

We have debated for a long time how we go about providing affordable heating oil. Incidentally, coming from Florida, we are interested in low-cost energy as well because we have a lot of senior citizen who need to have some climate control. When it gets very hot in the summer, we have the reverse problem. And we actually do need to provide air conditioning for some of those folks, sadly enough we have death in this country during hot spells as we all know, and providing appropriate air conditioning is an equal cost.

I come from New England, so I understand the LIHEAP problem. But I live in Florida and proudly represent the southwest coast of Florida, the lower part of it; and I understand the other problem as well. We have to provide an answer for the whole problem. That gets us to the energy policy.

I honestly believe that we do not have a comprehensive consistent energy policy that works. I am afraid that if we had an energy policy, it would have been confounded by what is now a clearly failed foreign policy in the Middle East, I am sorry to say. I am sure we are all sorry to say that.

I know that the Secretary of Energy, Secretary Richardson, who is a fine man, a former colleague of ours, has gotten up and announced that the administration was indeed caught asleep at the switch on their energy policy. I think I am using his words, maybe it was caught napping or asleep or something. But anyway, he basically said they had been inattentive. They had not done their job, and he is right.

I noticed that there was some talk about the release of the surplus and the impact on the marketplace. I think from the cards and letters and talking to the people I talk to and representing the people I represent, nobody noticed that we had any relief at the gas pump.

I think my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is right, if there was any relief, we sure did not see it. I do not know who else did.

Apparently, it did not help the people with the LIHEAP heating cost problem in New England much either. Actually, the amount of energy involved was a day and a half use, a day and a half of consumption. So that was a gesture, that was not a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is worth noting that just yesterday, Saddam Hussein manipulated the oil market price again; and that has a bigger consequence than anything that the executive branch has done so far to solve the oil crisis and the LIHEAP concerns that we are talking about here this morning.

Now, most Americans when they go out in the morning, they want to turn the key in their car; and they want their car to start. I know that the candidate of choice from our friends across the aisle is suggesting that somehow when we turn our car key that our car is going to come running into life and start and take us to work on some kind of new magic technology that has not been invented yet, so that we are not going to need oil and gas and internal combustion engines.

Well, that is fine, but I have to go to work today and tomorrow and the next

day; and that magic technology is not here. Until it is here, thank you, we need to find affordable oil.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about what happened in places like Chicago, how the regulations of the EPA confounded the price of gasoline, how the infrastructure failure and the refineries failed to be able to provide for the marketplace demand. All of these kinds of things have come together and we are not talking about that. We are talking about, there is a problem, Government handout.

I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) was on a correct path, when he suggested that if $1.4 billion is not enough, then $1.6 billion, $1.8 billion. Where does this end? This ends in providing socialized, free oil for everybody in America. Great idea.

They tried it in Russia, the most corrupt systematic problem of the Soviet command marketplace was probably the gas pump and it still is. So that is not the solution.

We need an energy policy; and I hope our friends across the aisle will help us encourage the next administration, whichever side it is on, of developing a good energy policy. I would point out I think those who are aware of the oil and gas industry might be able to do better with an energy policy, and I would suggest that America might be well served by having some people who know about energy making decisions about energy.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that is sort of curious to me is that I have heard some talk about people being in the pocket of oil and gas. Oil and gas is what we need. That is what we are out there trying to find right now.

□ 1130

If there is anybody that doubts it, do not go to the gas station when one runs out of gas. Wait for the next solution to one's car. Then see how far down the road one gets.

So I am very happy that this has come forward. I think we need to find a realistic underlying solution to energy policy. In the meantime, it is entirely appropriate that Congress, in a bipartisan way with Republican leadership, is providing relief. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this all sounds well and good, and it is very nice and a very nice speech. But let us take a look at the facts. Since the 1980s, there has been unprecedented attack on energy conservation programs by the United States Republican Party.

Reagan-Bush repeatedly proposed to zero out energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. Quite frankly, it is their legacy, shortsighted energy policy that has put the gas pump prices as high as they are today. My colleagues refused to invest in energy independence. This year alone, Republicans cut renewable energy research $106 million below the President's request in the Energy and Water bill; it was $211 million in the President's request for energy research in the Interior bill.

I mentioned before 50 percent cut in the important weatherization assistance programs. Not too long ago, 35 Republicans last year, including the major leaders of their party, wanted to cut and abolish the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

I might add that this was one of the first Republican proposals on energy policy when they took the majority was to kill the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Programs, the same families that are trying to pay for their heating bills and their cooling bills which they talk about today. They also wanted to count LIHEAP payments as income for the purposes of determining assistance on their food stamps.

They have not been for an energy policy. They have not been for the LIHEAP program. So the speeches sound nice, but the facts are there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for this motion. I want to urge my colleagues to support it.

But I want to say a few words about energy policy. I keep constantly hearing from the other side of the aisle, and I say this more in sorrow than in anger, that this country needs an energy policy. The simple fact of the matter is we have an energy policy. That energy policy is the energy policy that was crafted by Mr. Reagan, by Mr. Bush, and by a group of Republican Presidents, with the support of their Republican colleagues in this Chamber and in the other Chamber.

The simple fact of the matter is, it is a free market policy. It is one which says, let the market go to whatever levels that it will go to, to rise or to fall, without government interference. That is the energy policy of the United States.

To implement that energy policy, which I think is probably, in good part, unwise, my Republican colleagues have sought at different times to cut money for SPR, to sell off SPR. It has shown itself in budget and appropriation actions led by my Republican colleagues.

They have also opposed energy conservation measures, the use of alternative fuels and programs which would enable this country to move, not in absolute terms totally towards independence, but at least in good part.

It should be noted that it is not long back that my Republican colleagues were criticizing SPR as taking oil out of one hole in the ground and putting it in another hole in the ground.

More recently, they have come out and have criticized SPR and have tried to cut back on it. They have tried to sell it off. They reduced the amount of money which we have put into this thing. They have generally been critical of that program.

Having said this, the policy is there. It is a policy that was crafted by Reagan, by Bush, and by their Republican colleagues up here. It is a policy which does not consider the good needs and the important concerns of this country, to have a ready supply of emergency oil available through SPR. It is also a policy which does not consider the need to have conservation measures in place functioning and working.

My Republican colleagues over there have consistently sought to prevent this country from having fuel efficiency standards for appliances, for refrigerators, for water heaters, for air conditioners. The curious thing about that opposition is that it was done in opposition to the policies that were stressed by that industry, which recognizes, not only their social responsibility to have a good energy use in the appliances which they create, but also that the country needs that kind of thing because it is necessary for the conservation of energy and for the readiness of the United States in times of crisis.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join others in giving credit to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut for really, in effect, working together to see that the purpose of this resolution has been achieved. I think that everybody is clear that this particular item will come out of the conference. So our effort here today to instruct the conferees will have incredible success, Mr. Speaker, since we know that this has already been done.

But we have to be here today for some purpose as we wait for the President to come back from California, maybe in Florida next, but we are waiting for him to come back from California now. We are waiting for White House negotiators to reengage. We have to be here, so we may as well be here to talk about some issue.

I have the highest, highest regard for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). It has been an honor to be able to serve with him on the Committee on Commerce, to see his great understanding of the rules and traditions of

the House, and to try to, just by watching him, learn from some of that understanding of what we do and how we do it.

I am sure he is also aware that we have not had a Republican President for the last 8 years. So how the energy policy of the country is still reflective of that is a surprise to me.

But I was also surprised when the Department of Energy could not secure our nuclear codes. I was surprised when they could not maintain our most important and critical security information. So maybe I am just here to be surprised.

I think taxpayers, voters, people who are at the gas pump understand that a Department of Energy that cannot watch those two briefcases is likely not to have its eye very closely on the price at the gasoline pump. That is what has happened there.

While we are here, though, talking about issues that are already accomplished in terms of the additional money for LIHEAP, it is going to happen, I would like to take just a minute to talk about something that has not been done yet; and that is to encourage the President when he does return from California, and he does get the tax bill we passed this week, to sign that tax bill.

That tax bill is likely to be, I would almost bet will be the last opportunity we have in this Congress to vote on tax relief, in all likelihood the last opportunity we have to vote on Medicare adjustments. How this President could let that tax bill go unsigned and even, in fact, veto the bill would be something hard for the American people to understand.

The message we got on Tuesday, interestingly, did not use the word veto. In fact, it carefully did not use the word veto. When the bill was ready to be voted on on Wednesday, we get another letter that says, like all tax relief, it is just somehow not quite good enough. They were for all for these tax cuts in theory, but they are never for a single one of these tax cuts in practice.

I hope the President carefully rethinks that, looks at the pension modernization and things that relate to both pensions held by union members, the 415 issue, small businesses that really are hampered today in offering pension protection to their associates and employees. This bill opens the door for small business to be able to compete with big business in offering pensions.

It expands the IRA amounts in a way that begins to catch IRA contributions up with what has happened since IRAs were first enacted. In terms of Medicare, there is tremendous help for seniors in Medicare, more help for rural hospitals, more help for rural nursing homes, long-term care. Tax credits are given in this bill and should be extended to the American people. The Medicare provisions lower out-of-pocket costs. They put more doctors in emergency rooms, more ambulances in rural areas.

I hope the President reconsiders his veto threat, looks at this bill again, and gives the kind of relief and kind of Medicare assistance this bill gives.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 14 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) who was speaking, it might be interesting to note that just last year voted to abolish Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Someone who was concerned about our national security ought to be concerned about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the original intent of their instruction was to talk about LIHEAP. We have gone far afield and I am going to join the field. But I must say that it was a bipartisan coalition of us who pushed very hard to get the President of the United States to open up SPR and give up some of the reserve because those of us who live in the Northeast had gone through a very bad winter last year and this year looked bad. We had seen people have to go into shelters because they could not afford to heat their houses and pay for food. We do not want to see that happening again.

There was almost a panic starting to set in. Whatever one may think about the release, it worked, obviously he did not release enough to see us through the winter. We did not want him to. It did have the effect of making the OPEC countries reduce the price of oil. It has been beneficial, and I again thank him for doing that.

Now, with talking about the alternative fuels and lack of energy policy, I agree we surely do not have one.

I remember the golden age of exploration, under Jimmy Carter's administration, when we talked about hydropower, geothermal power, wave power, wind power, photo power, photovoltaic cells, and the grand daddy of them all, fusion. We were really intent in the United States to making sure that we would not forever be dependent on foreign oil.

But that came to a screeching halt in 1980 with Reagan, and we went back to the old way of allowing oil companies to do what they would with us and, as a previous speakers said, let market forces have their will with us.

I appreciate the bipartisan support that we have from the Northeast. I understand that in Florida they have some problems with weather. But they do not know what it is like when people are freezing.

My city of Rochester last year had more snow than any city in the Northeast of comparable size. If we want to have an energy policy in this country, we have got to get back to putting a little money in for some research and development, or we will have this debate forever.

But there is no doubt and history shows that the Reagan administration killed renewable energy resources and money for research.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this debate on Saturday is not about people freezing to death or support for or against LIHEAP. Republicans are for providing energy assistance to low-income, disabled, the poor, elderly. There is no debate about that question here today.

We are here on Saturday because the other side is in desperate straits. They are trying to bail out their failing Presidential campaign, their congressional failing campaigns across the country, because the American people have finally said that we have had enough. We have had enough of the partisanship from the other side of using this arena and putting politics before people.

This is not about low energy assistance. It is a great program. It is a program that has grown from $50 million during the energy crisis, I believe, of the 1970s to a $1 billion program. It is a little bit of difference about helping people, making certain that the program works.

Even the President of the United States, I remember, presented us with budgets that proposed some trimming, some economy in this program. But we are for providing assistance to the poor and the disabled.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Saturday because they want to put politics before people. We have HMOs closing around this country. I had a gentleman write to me and said, ''You all are debating whether I can sue an HMO. I have been dropped by my third HMO which went under.''

Nursing homes are closing around this country, and the poor and elderly are being deprived of care because they want to put politics before people.

□ 1145

It is sad, but I heard George W. Bush say the other day it is sort of a fitting end to the close of an era of contentiousness, an era of disgrace; that they, the American people, I think, want to put behind them. It is sad that we are here now, and they are

using this as a last stage putting people behind politics. It is not about LIHEAP, it is not about people freezing to death, it is about changing the direction of this country.

They had their chance. I heard the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), a Democrat, say they had 48 years, not mentioning the last 8 years, and they blew it. This is not about LIHEAP. It is about changing the direction of this country. It is about other issues at the last minute, like putting provisions in at the last minute to provide amnesty to millions of illegal aliens.

I was offended today when I heard someone say that we did not know on the Republican side about immigration. My grandparents were immigrants and they came in legally to this country, not illegally, and they worked in the factories of this country and they toiled. But if we throw in this provision to allow millions, we have cast aside our laws. What good are our laws? We might just as well tear up our laws and throw them away.

What does it mean to be an American if the President can cast aside the very basis for immigration. What made this country great is people coming here legally under the laws. So this is not about LIHEAP, this is not about low-energy assistance, it is about other greater issues.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1761. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conserve and enhance the water supplies of the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to comment that it is interesting to note it was the Republicans first proposal, when they took charge here, to kill low-income energy assistance, the LIHEAP program.

Yes, it is about LIHEAP today and people being warm in this country, particularly in those areas of the country where it is cold, like the Northeast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for this motion. I rise in strong support of this motion.

I ask my colleagues, on behalf of millions of needy families, that we maintain the current funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, better known as LIHEAP. It is of critical importance to the families in my district and across the Nation.

Although current funding for the program is low, this conference report lowers it even further. I do not believe that any of my colleagues wants to be held responsible for a family or an elderly person living in the cold because they cannot afford heating this winter, especially in this prosperous country. The Republican majority has cut this program every year. While they are warm in their own homes they slash this program with cold hearts.

The purpose of LIHEAP is to help pay the winter heating bills of our most needy low-income and elderly individuals. Two-thirds make less than $8,000 a year. They are the poorest of the poor. Last year, this program helped 4.4 million households. Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about comfort here, we are talking about the health and sometimes even the lives of some of our citizens. The Boston City Hospital reports that the number of clinically underweight children increases dramatically following the coldest months, and we all know the tragic stories each year about some elderly person dying in an unheated home.

LIHEAP is most crucial during the peak winter heating season when high energy bills eat up to 30 percent of a family's budget. And this winter, heating oil prices are expected to rise 20 to 40 percent, consuming even more of the average budget. Without LIHEAP, many low-income families and elderly people will have to choose between heating their homes and paying for food, medicine, and rent. I rise in strong support of this motion.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time that remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 7 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 9½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my friend, the gentleman from Florida who was here at the podium a few moments ago, that this issue is about energy policy and it is about people being cold and it is about people surviving this winter. That may not be true if one lives in Florida, but it is true for those living in New York or New Hampshire or Pennsylvania or Ohio or Wisconsin or Michigan. This is a critical issue for people in all those States. So it is important that we raise the level of LIHEAP funding.

I also want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because, earlier this month, I asked for a request of $8 million to fund the continued operation of the President's initiated Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, which is now funded. But I also want to say a couple of things about energy policy in this country and who is directing it at this moment, because that policy is being directed by the oil companies.

The three largest oil firms are currently reporting quarterly profits that double last year's earnings. Leading the way was Exxon-Mobil, which 3 months ago posted the largest quarterly profits ever for a U.S. corporation. It beat that record just a couple of days ago with the announcement that it had earned $4.3 billion in the third quarter. Chevron-Texaco, which announced last week that it will merge, and Conoco all reported that their profits have doubled just recently.

Exxon-Mobil's vice president is quoted as saying, ''We've got a lot of cash around here. It's coming in pretty fast. Flying through the door.'' So while Americans are struggling trying to pay their home heating bills and the gasoline bills to get back and forth to work, the energy companies are racking up records profits.

The oil companies are not using their profits to invest in new oil and gas exploration, which would ultimately lead to lower prices, decreased dependence on foreign oil, and greater stability in the market. Instead, what they are doing is using the profits to repurchase their stocks so that they can raise the stock price.

We ought to have the Committee on Commerce convene immediate hearings on the outrageous profits of the oil companies. That is a responsibility that we place on the other side of the aisle. Immediate hearings to determine what is going on.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees to provide full funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Before I make a few points, I just want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), and I would encourage the FTC to continue the investigation of the oil companies that are making record, record profits.

Secondly, with regard to points that were made by my good friends on the other side of the aisle, I think it is important that we emphasize that SPR is

just being bid this month. It is going into circulation in November, and we do expect to see decreases in oil prices. But again I encourage the FTC to continue that investigation and to complete it as expeditiously as possible.

My colleagues, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for having this motion to instruct, because we know that LIHEAP is an absolutely essential program for the poor and elderly. When energy prices go up, low-income families and people on fixed incomes are hurt the most. This winter, energy prices are expected to be higher than ever. Stocks of home heating oil are at the lowest point in years, and the natural gas supply is also expected to tighten significantly this winter. This supply shortage will put prices up to twice that of last year.

For millions of families, this massive increase in energy prices will force them to choose between heat and food. We cannot stand by and watch people have to make this choice. My colleagues, if we have to be here on a Saturday to ensure that the numbers are adequate to serve these seniors, the elderly, the poor, then I am pleased to be here, because this is a critical, critical issue. In New York alone, 1.8 million families are eligible for LIHEAP assistance.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the amount of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, some really astonishing things have been said from the other side of the aisle. For example, that nothing has happened in the last 8 years; that we cannot accomplish things.

Fortunately, we are all, as Americans, better off today than we were 8 years ago; but on our side of the aisle we are concerned about people who have been left behind. This was in bills to all people living in Chicago that says, ''Winter is coming and natural gas bills could increase 50 percent or more.'' And on the back it says, ''If you need help with your heating bill, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, can help.'' And it says to ''call LIHEAP if you can't pay your bills.'' In Chicago, unlike programs in Florida, there are a lot of people like that.

We need to make sure that there are sufficient funds in that program. That is what this motion to instruct is about, and that is why I support it.

Just one final note. The reason that our gasoline prices were too high had nothing to do with the EPA. All of our hearings determined that. And now they are lower because the FTC began an investigation into the oil companies and their colleagues in this House.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

My predecessor, as a member from the First District of Massachusetts, Silvio Conte, a member of the other party, was one of the great figures of the 20th century in this House of Representatives and one of the great champions on behalf of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I am very glad, on his behalf, to hear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has agreed with the idea of $1.6 million; maybe whatever else the gentlewoman from Connecticut might be asking for on this program.

I urge the majority to get the Labor, Health and Education bill, which we passed originally in this House back in July, back to the floor so that we can finish our work. It is 4 weeks into the new fiscal year. This is the longest session in the history of the country in an election year, and the work is not done. We have not finished the appropriation bills for the year.

I would like to speak to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) on his comments about energy policy and remind him that on energy policy the majority in this Congress has obstructed both the short-term and the long-term effort to lower our dependence on foreign oil. In the short term, they thwarted every effort to require additional efficiency in the use of vehicles when half of all our oil is used for transportation and for vehicles in transportation.

□ 1200

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. I thank my good friend from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a nonpartisan issue. This should be nonpartisan in that funding for low-income people helps not only New England but the Midwest and California and Florida. It helps not only with heating oil, it helps in the Midwest with natural gas. And it helps in a host of ways for nonpartisan concerns about the disabled, the poor and our seniors who have trouble paying these bills.

In my State of Indiana, we are already working on helping these people who are vulnerable pay what we know will be a gas bill, which cost $100 last winter, that will be $140 this winter. So getting full funding or more funding in this program will allow us in the State of Indiana to now purchase natural gas or heating oil at October prices rather than higher prices in November, December, January, and February. This makes good common sense for compassion for the poor, for the disabled, for senior citizens; and it makes good sense for our taxpayers in buying things now rather than knowing what the price we are going to pay for them later on.

I support the motion. I hope that we can work in a nonpartisan way before an election to help some of the most vulnerable people in society.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is an appropriate time for me to make this closing statement because I just listened to my friend saying that this should be a nonpartisan issue. Amen. In fact, I think about an hour ago, I suggested to the gentlewoman when she offered her motion, we accept it. We agree. We have already put in here more money than the President asked for or that her side asked for. So we agree. It ought to be a nonpartisan issue. If they would let it be a nonpartisan issue, it would be.

What I cannot figure out is why in the world can you not take yes for an answer? We have agreed to this motion.

In the little time that I have, we have heard a lot of complaint from that side of the aisle about how long it takes to get this work done. Here is a perfect example of why it takes so long. They cannot take yes for an answer. Then if you give them a yes, and they do accept it, the next time you sit down together, they move the target. They move the goal post. At one point on the advance funding, we were at one level. The administration and the minority asked for a level. We went to that level. They went another level. We went to that level. Now they have another level. I do not know where they are going to end. Maybe she will tell me in her closing remarks exactly what their top number is going to be. We have accepted her motion to instruct the conferees.

There were a lot of complaints about oil company profits, and I think they make too much profit as well, and a lot of talking about price increases to the homeowner and to the motorist. Well, who sets the oil policy of this country? It is the President of the United States and the Vice President. What is the policy? It must not be a very good policy, if there is one, if prices continue to go up and up and up. Maybe because their Secretary of Energy said, and I am quoting him, we were asleep at the switch. An administration should not be asleep at the switch when it is dealing with something that has so much effect on each individual American's economy.

There is something else, though, really got me stirred up, and I do not like to be stirred up, I would rather be calm, but one of the speakers on that side of the aisle said that the Republicans cut LIHEAP. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just not true. Republicans did not cut LIHEAP, and I am going to

give you the example and I am going to give you an exact number. In fiscal year 1996, there was a substantial amount of unobligated balances for that year and so we did rescind those, but they had not been spent. In 1997, the request was $1 billion. We as a Republican Congress appropriated $1 billion. In 1998, the request was $1 billion. The Republican Congress appropriated $1 billion. In 1999, the request was $1 billion, a very flat number coming from the administration. They never asked for these increases. But in 1999 again they asked for $1 billion. We upped it to $1.1 billion. In fiscal year 2000, they asked for $1.1 billion and, yes, we went $1.1 billion.

Now, tell me how the claim, the accusation, the political rhetoric that we cut LIHEAP has any truth or validity. It is just not true. And the American people who are the consumers ought to know this. This campaign rhetoric is okay on the campaign trail because candidates do sometimes get carried away with their facts and their figures. But in this House when we are doing the people's business, facts should be accurate. Facts should be facts. The people's business should come ahead of politics.

There again, I want to suggest, we are fighting over something that we have agreed to. Why the accusations? Why the arguments? I have pointed out how we have gone above and beyond for this year and we are supporting this motion to instruct and we stayed with the administration's request in all of the years of the Republican Congress except one where we increased it. What is the argument? Is this a political argument? If it is a political argument, it belongs out on the campaign trail. It does not belong here in the people's House where we are here to do the people's business and put their business ahead of politics.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding is that if in fact we have agreed to accept it, and there is a plea for nonpartisanship on the other side, that the nonpartisan vote would be a voice vote. But that if somebody calls for a recorded vote, that clearly could be indicated to be a partisan vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we support the motion to instruct. I would ask the Members to vote for it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is wonderful to watch a deathbed conversion, because with regard to LIHEAP, the very fact of the matter is that over and over and over again the majority party has in fact opposed LIHEAP. Not only that, they have tried to abolish the Energy Department in 1995, they proposed to abolish LIHEAP and, furthermore, what they tried to do with LIHEAP is to really, in a very Scrooge-like plan, force millions of very low-income families to make the choice between food and heat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. The very first rescission action the Republican Congress took when they took control is to try to cut LIHEAP, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut and I blocked it in the Committee on Appropriations. We beat you on that vote.

Ms. DELAURO. This is about LIHEAP today. It is about a continued activity of the majority to do in a program, to not properly fund it, not only in the year that we are, in forward-funding the money in the future. We are asking to fund this at its maximum, at $1.65 billion, because the folks who need this assistance all across this country have been sorely shortchanged by the majority.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Ms. DELAURO's motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4577 with regard to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP is one of the most important funding programs that I have the privilege to vote on, as it provides our low income constituents with one of life's basic necessities—energy. As the winter months approach, and the temperatures drop, there must not be one reported death caused by our constituent's inability to pay for their heat. This program is especially important at a time when the American people are being forced to pay outrageous costs for energy. All to often, we hear that a constituent had to choose between eating and heating their home—that is unacceptable!

Mr. Speaker, LIHEAP was created as a result of the energy crisis of the late 1970's and early 1980's. Today, the exorbitant cost of energy is beyond the reach of too many of our hard working constituents. This program has proven its effectiveness in assisting low income families to stay warm during the winter, thereby reducing the risk of exposure to hypothermia, and in the warmer climates, by reducing the numbers of those who would succumb to "heat stroke" and heart failure, but for this program.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers, while estimated, reveal that almost 40% of the LIHEAP households have elderly members; more than 30% of the households have disabled members; 27% of these households include children who are under the age of six years old, and a further 27% are comprised of the working poor who have no access to other sources of government assistance.

In addition to assisting those who are forced to pay a high proportion of their household income on the high costs of energy, LIHEAP accomplishes something else, it allows our constituents to remain in their own homes, and to do so with dignity. It is heartening when I hear stories from my hard working constituents who tell me that before the assistance provided by LIHEAP, they were sleeping with jackets, gloves and hats and in sleeping bags, in order to keep warm.

Mr. Speaker, appropriately funding the LIHEAP program is the least we can do to protect our hard working constituents from the extreme temperatures of the summer and the winter; our constituents deserve no less.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the proposal.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I support the DeLauro motion to instruct and in support of the highest possible funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) program.

This vital program helps low-income households pay for home energy costs—including home heating costs in the winter and home cooling costs in the summer.

Every year, we see seniors die from the lack of air conditioning during a heat wave, or from the severe cold weather we've seen so much of recently. This could usually be prevented, if only these seniors could have afforded the cool air or heating assistance they needed.

Approximately 4.4 million of the most vulnerable households in this country depend on the LIHEAP program each year. And in the year 2000, 1.8 million families are eligible for LIHEAP assistance in New York State alone. And a significant portion of those receiving LIHEAP assistance are the elderly.

The LIHEAP program truly saves lives—by helping the frail elderly stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer. The LIHEAP program will be especially important this winter—which is predicted to be more harsh than last winter.

The GOP-controlled Congress has failed to put forward its own energy policy over the last six years—and has continuously voted down the energy proposals of President Clinton.

Now, there is growing concern over energy supply and costs. Indeed, the American Petroleum Institute is reporting home heating oil inventories 20% lower than last winter. Experts are predicting that a 30% increase in home heating costs this winter is now unavoidable.

It was just 5 short years ago that this Republican Congress took over and voted to zero out funding for LIHEAP in the House-passed Labor-HHS bill. Thankfully, after a vigorous protest by Democrats and a presidential veto, money was restored. But this was a dangerous lesson for all of us. We simply cannot trust the Republican Congress to stand up for low income seniors.

I urge a "yes" vote on the DeLauro motion.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct.

Right now, as the autumn leaves are falling, is an excellent time to emphasize the importance of LIHEAP specifically. But we also need to focus on this country's overall energy situation.

We have all heard the statistics:

Domestic crude oil stocks are at a 24-year low, which is translating into significant price increases in propane, kerosene and other forms of heating fuels.

Natural gas prices have increased by 40-50% over the past year, and with low storage levels, increased used of natural gas for electric generation, and higher industrial use, we can only expect higher prices to come.

Meanwhile, gasoline prices remain high—a reality that constitutes to highlight our dependence on foreign oil. Today we are importing significantly more oil than we did during the energy crisis in the 1970s.

So putting enough money into funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—or LIHEAP—is critical for low-income families this winter.

In September, I urged the President to release $4 million in emergency LIHEAP funding for Colorado. Shortly after that, he did release emergency funds—something for which all Coloradans should be appreciative.

But that action by the President needs to be followed by Congressional action. We need to increase the overall LIHEAP funding for fiscal 2001. Remember, two-thirds of LIHEAP households have incomes of less than $8,000 per year and even with the assistance, the average LIHEAP family spends over 18 percent of its income on home energy costs, compared with 6.7 percent for all households.

So, in a time of higher fuel prices we need to act to make sure our low-income senior citizens and children need not be forced to be cold or to choose between heating and eating.

But beyond that, there is a broader question to consider—how can we avoid these energy crises in the future?

What should not be focused just on the short-term issue of oil prices. We also need to be addressing the core problem: our continued excessive dependence on petroleum.

We need to be actively and strongly promoting alternative energy and increasing our energy efficiency. We need to do it for the environment—and also because it promotes our national security and strengthens our economy.

By promoting these alternatives, we're making one of our most valuable investments in America's future. These investments can stimulate the private sector, and jobs, reduce our reliance on imported oil, and improve our air and water quality.

So I urge adoption of this motion, for increased support for LIHEAP, and I urge all of us to work together to strengthen our national commitment to clean energy.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 305, nays 18, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Archer
Cannon
Coble
Deal
Doolittle
Hostettler
Johnson, Sam
Largent
Linder
Miller (FL)
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Toomey

NOT VOTING—109

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Calvert
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Hulshof
Hyde
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mollohan
Morella
Neal
Owens
Pascrell
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Porter
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rush
Sawyer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Weygand
Wise
Wynn

□ 1228

Mr. GILCHREST and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. LOWEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class sizes in the early grades and for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, it is truly unfortunate that we even have to debate the importance of these issues. Members from the other side of the aisle say that education is their number one priority. Then why has it been necessary for Members from this side of the aisle to fight to preserve our investment in class size reduction and finally begin our investment in local school construction?

It has been 4 years since I conducted a survey of New York City schools and found that one in every four schools held classes in hallways, gymnasiums, bathrooms and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard building features, such as roofs, walls and floors. I repeat, this was 4 years ago; and despite the outpouring of support from both sides of the aisle, Congress has not provided even one cent to alleviate overcrowding, and improve the physical condition of our schools. In fact, 2 days ago, when we considered the tax bill, we had the opportunity to include the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson school modernization bond proposal, and we did not.

We in our local communities have an obligation to all children. We make the decisions locally and pay the taxes locally, but we as a Nation have an important role as well: to use Federal resources to encourage excellent programs, to jump start local investment, and to support national priorities.

That is why I firmly believe that Congress must join with the President to support school modernization and smaller class sizes. We know that smaller class sizes means better learning for students and less disciplinary problems for teachers. By continuing our efforts to hire more teachers in the critical early grades, we can offer 2.9 million more children the benefits of more personal instruction and will see the results in their academic performance.

We need to fix the shameful state of too many American schools. School enrollment is skyrocketing. We will need at least 2,400 new public schools by the year 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding. Our modernization needs are no less pressing. High-speed modems and the wiring to support them is no longer a luxury; yet we still have Pokemon-generation kids in classrooms straight out of Charles Dickens with their asbestos-filled ceilings and coal stoves. It would be laughable, I say to my colleagues, if it was not so disgraceful.

In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization needs in American schools total over $300 billion; and that is on top of what school districts and States are already spending. This problem is just too big for local and State officials to handle alone.

Simply stated, we need dedicated programs to help local schools reduce class size and modernize their buildings. These are national problems that demand a national response. The Federal Government has a responsibility, I say to my colleagues, to ensure that public education is more than a promise, and our students cannot learn when they are stacked on top of each other and the walls are literally crumbling around them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, I would say that we are not going to support this motion to instruct as we did the last one. Even considering the fact that we supported the last one, there was more political rhetoric that came from the other side than in most campaign meetings. So I suspect that is going to be the same this time because we are not going to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, there are major differences between the political parties. One of the big major differences is that one party believes that all of the power should be centralized in Washington, that whoever works in the bureaucracy here is smarter than anybody else in the country. That is not our party, Mr. Speaker. Not yours and not mine. That is their party.

We believe that States and local communities and the people in those States and local communities have a right to make decisions for themselves. That is one of the major differences between the two parties.

Now, when the Constitution was first written, and we have all applauded the Framers of the Constitution so many times, they originally created a Constitution that created a very powerful central government. They gave all of the power of the government to the Federal Government. But then they realized they had made a mistake and they created what? The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights that protected the people's rights as individuals, that protected the rights of the States as individual States of a union, and what we are trying to do is to maintain what the Framers intended with the Bill of Rights, and that is to protect the rights of the people in our communities to make decisions for themselves, except in those cases where the Federal Government is the only agency that is able to deal with things such as national defense, such as Social Security, such as Medicare, things of this nature.

Education has become a large issue; and believe me, we support education. In fact, in this legislation that we are debating here and negotiating, my colleagues will find that we have provided more money in that bill than the President of the United States asked for.

The major difference between us, and other speakers will go into this in more detail, but the major difference is who decides how the money is spent. Their side thinks that Washington should decide it all for people in my community, people in his community, people in others' communities; and we disagree with that. We believe that the needs are different in different parts of the country. We understand that there are some school districts where they need more schools and construction is important. We also understand that there are some places in the country where they need more teachers, or they need more special education, or they need more technology, some computers, some laboratories. We understand that the needs are different. They are not all alike in every community in this Nation. Our approach is to give those communities the opportunity to make the decisions on what they will do with the money that we will provide through the block grant.

Mr. Speaker, for years and years in this country of ours, people opposed Federal aid to education, and the reason that I heard from my constituents and many of my colleagues heard from their constituents, is that they were not opposed to the Federal Government being interested in education, but they did not want the Federal strings that came from Washington. They did not want the strings that came with Federal aid. They preferred to go it on their own, which they do 95 percent of the time anyway, with local and State funds.

However, now we are talking about more involvement on the part of the Federal Government from the standpoint of centralized education from their side than from the standpoint of a block grant as far as we are concerned. We think we are on the right side, and that is the position that we have taken; and that is the position we are going to stand by, and that is the position we are going to support today by opposing this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to respond to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, the chairman of the committee, to make it very clear that our position is that this Congress builds highways, bridges, and responds to emergencies.

When I began with this issue in 1996, we had a $112 billion emergency. It is

now a $300 billion emergency. We believe that we can assist local governments by lowering their property taxes and responding to these emergencies, and then support the Rangel-Johnson bipartisan bill that will also help local governments, because they make the decisions, we help with the financing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good colleague and my friend on the committee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership in championing this issue over the years, the issue of school construction.

Anyone who is a parent or anyone who has been a child, so that includes all of us, is familiar with the expression, the children are listening. Indeed, the children do listen. They hear us telling them that education is key to their personal fulfillment and their success in life, that they must apply themselves in school so that they can succeed; and yet we send these same children a different message when we send them to schools that are dilapidated, that are not even capable of being wired for the future and are very, very unconducive to study.

What do children think if we say this is a value, it is very important that you get a good education and by the way, we are placing a very low value on it when it comes to the place in which we want you to study. We spend money, the taxpayers' money here on research that we all herald as important, and that research tells us that children do better in smaller classes and indeed, that they do better in smaller schools, Mr. Speaker.

The distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has documented the need very clearly, a growing need, more than doubled since 1996 for these improvements, these modernizations, or these replacements of these schools. How can the Republican majority ignore the scientific basis, which we fund and support and praise, about children needing smaller classes and doing much better in those circumstances, by not insisting that the funds that we put aside for school construction and modernization, for smaller classes, not be used for that purpose?

So I commend the gentlewoman for her motion, and I urge my colleagues to support it, because, Mr. Speaker, the children are listening. Let us not send them a confused message.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Representative LOWEY'S Motion to Instruct the Labor-HHS Appropriations Conferees to support the Democratic initiative on school construction. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has continually refused to support vital funding to help local communities reduce class size at public schools.

America's schools are teaching more students than ever before and generally, our schools work for most students. However, we can improve our public schools by focusing our efforts on underperforming schools and low-income areas with ongoing problems. We can overcome this significant problem—the infrastructure and facilities at our schools require modernization and investment.

WHAT IS THE NEED?

Today, school enrollments are higher than ever, with a record 53.2 million children enrolled in our schools. By 2008, another million students will be in America's schools.

By 2003, to meet rising student enrollments, America will need another 2,400 new schools.

The average American public school is 42 years old. After 40 years, school buildings begin to deteriorate rapidly and repair costs soon exceed the costs to construct new schools.

According to the GAO report "School Facilities: The Condition of America's Schools", one-third of all schools need extensive repairs or replacement.

WHAT WOULD IT COST TO ADDRESS THESE CONDITIONS?

According to a 1996 GAO report, it would cost $112 billion to repair our schools. According to a 2000 National Education Association report, it would cost $322 billion to repair our schools.

WOULD IT HELP?

Smaller class sizes are important because studies demonstrate that reduced class size leads to more individual attention and increased accountability.

We know that this investment in school construction would benefit our schools, our teachers, and most importantly our children. I have heard personal stories about: teachers teaching in converted bathrooms; students eating lunch in shifts starting at 9:45 due to overcrowding; leaky roofs and exposed lead paint leading to health and safety hazards.

These conditions are intolerable, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Motion to Instruct and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to stay within our time limits that we were assigned.

I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who is not only an educator in his own right, but is chairman of the committee responsible for authorizing educational issues.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a very curious motion to instruct. In fact, it is the most curious motion to instruct I have seen in 26 years.

Why? Well, first of all, it was originally drafted and submitted to this body on September 19. That is right, September 19, 5 weeks ago. At that time we had not begun the negotiations with the White House or our friends in the minority party on what the final appropriations agreement would include or not include. At this point, to instruct the House and Senate conferees in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bills on issues that have already been thoroughly discussed and tentatively agreed to, and in other instances totally agreed to, just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is irrelevant given the status of our negotiations; and as such, I oppose the gentlewoman's motion, as should anyone who is working in good faith to successfully conclude work on the bill.

I want to thank Members of both parties and the White House representatives for working tirelessly the last 9 days, including last Saturday and Sunday, day and night, to fashion an agreement in which Members from both parties can take pride. It is my hope that when our work is complete, we will continue funding to assist schools in their efforts to reduce class size with qualified teachers.

As I tried to point out to the President when he came up with this idea, which was political more than anything else, 100,000 teachers for 15,000 school districts and 1 million classrooms; and I said, if we do not have quality people to put in there, it will not matter. I do not care how we reduce the teacher-student ratio. And guess what? The first 30 percent that were hired, the first 30 percent that were hired under this new program were not qualified.

□ 1245

Where did they go? They went to the same school districts that already had 30, 40, and 50 percent of unqualified teachers already where they needed the very best teachers.

Again, I tried to point out unless we put the horse before the cart, that is what is going to happen.

Last year we negotiated it, and I think it came out well, because what we said last year was that 25 percent of the money could be used to improve the quality of the teachers they presently have. Now, does not that make sense? Why would I hire someone who is not qualified, rather than train someone who is already in the system who shows great potential?

We said 25 percent of the money can be used for that purpose, but we said if we have 10 percent or more of unqualified teachers, and at the time we were negotiating I was using a city not too far from Pennsylvania, where they had 50 percent unqualified teachers, we said you can use 100 percent of your money to improve the teachers that you presently have. That was agreed upon. That makes sense.

I am pleased to say that we have been able to reach that same agreement this particular year, and all schools with a high priority of teachers that are not qualified will have the flexibility to use that 100 percent to improve the existing teachers.

Now, it has taken the administration to realize the fallacy of reducing class size by ignoring teacher quality all of this time. I am so pleased, as I told the negotiators as soon as we started, I am so glad that here for the last year and a half down Pennsylvania Avenue the

word is quality, quality, quality, quality, because people on the committee, of which I chair, the Committee on Education and the Workforce are tired of hearing that word, too, I am sure.

That is the most important part about class-size reduction, having a quality teacher, the most important element as to whether a child succeeds or not is that classroom teacher next to the parent.

We have made some progress on the issue of school construction. As I said, we have met for 9 straight days and nights. I made it clear to the administration that State and local flexibility must be a component of Federal funding for classroom modernization and renovation. It is important to see a significant portion of the funding available for other pressing needs.

Again, who knows better? We or the local district? I believe it is the local district. Again, I go back and point out that had we stepped up to the plate with the 40 percent that we said would come with special ed, 40 percent of the per pupil cost throughout this country that we would send, Los Angeles alone would have received more than $90 million extra every year.

Multiple that by 25, that sounds like a good bit of maintenance money to me to prevent schools from crumbling. New York City would have gotten $160 million extra every year. But we never meet those needs, we just say we will go on and create something new, some other mandate, and forget about what it was we promised to these very people.

What happened? They had to use their money. They had to use State money, and they had to use local money to meet our mandate. So they could not do the kinds of things they needed to do in school maintenance. The primary responsibility for construction, certainly, remains at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again that this motion to instruct conferees at this particular time is irrelevant and it certainly is not constructive when we had the kind of negotiations that are going on at the present time that I hope will be completed in the very near future.

Let the conferees do their job. They are making real headway.

Let me point out one other thing. I think it is very important. Education technology, they have already indicated they will provide $2 million more than the President asked for.

Education for the disadvantaged they have said, you will get $50 million more than the President asked for.

Impact aid, you will get $258 million more than the President asked for.

Special ed, you will get $1 billion more than the President asked for.

Education for homeless children, you will get $2.3 million more than the President asked for.

Rehabilitation services, you will get $20 million more than the President asked for.

Vocational and adult education, you will get $5 million more than the President asked for.

Student financial aid, you will get $300 million more than the President asked for.

Historically black colleges, you will get $60 million more than the President asked for.

The Hispanic-serving institutions, you get $6 million more than the President asked for.

TRIO, so important in higher ed, you will get $35 million more than the President asked for.

Higher Ed, you will get $20 million more than the President asked for.

Department of Education, $600 million.

In a bipartisan fashion, I believe they have done a good job, and I believe they are continuing to do that. I certainly do not believe my colleagues should interfere at this particular time and try to instruct conferees, who in a bipartisan fashion with the help of the White House are doing a pretty fine job in bringing this to a final positive goal that both sides will be very pleased with.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic communication devices are prohibited on the Floor of the House. Members are to disable wireless telephones before entering the Chamber.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), my friend, who has served so well in education, that I would hope that the leadership would fund the teacher quality initiative, because I know of our mutual interest in training our teachers.

I would like to acknowledge to the group that the President's reduction in class-size initiative has reduced the average size of a class by five, which has made a real difference in teaching young people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my good friend.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what kind of message do we send our children when their community and when this Nation boasts new, elegant shopping malls and new expensive sports stadiums while our kids are forced to learn in overcrowded, crumbling schools?

I support the Lowey motion to instruct because we cannot expect our children to get a first-rate education in second-rate and third-rate school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, a recent GAO study found that 60 percent of our Nation's schools need at least one major repair or they need replacement. It is time to show our children that their school is equally as important as a new mall or a new stadium. It is time to show our children that they are important.

We must vote for the Lowey motion. It is a vote that makes our children, 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future, our highest priority.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a distinguished leader in education, a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague, for bringing this issue.

I live on Long Island, and everybody thinks everyone on Long Island is rich. Let me tell my colleagues all of my schools are over 50 years old. A lot of my schools have boilers that are over 100 years old. What does that have to do with it?

We are sending a message to our children that we do not care about them to modernize our schools. I bring it as a health care issue. I have high rates of asthma among my young children because of the conditions of our schools. We here in Congress have to make a full commitment all the way around.

We have to make sure our schools are the best schools for our children to be in. I have been in schools where they are teaching our children with disabilities out in the hallway.

I can tell my colleagues personally, if you have learning disabilities, you have to have a quiet setting, not somewhere where you are hearing everything out in the background. People with hearing problems are being taught in hallways and closets. The bathrooms, I am telling my colleagues, it is horrible.

This is what we are supposed to be doing. This is the money that we should be giving to our children. Mr. Speaker, I wish everyone will vote for this motion. We have to take education seriously.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), my colleague who is a distinguished leader on education.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lowey motion to instruct. School construction is an issue with broad bipartisan support.

This week, we had the opportunity to pass the President's school construction bill. It would reduce class sizes in early grades, hire 20,000 new teachers, raise student achievement and make urgent safety and help repairs in 5,000 schools in low-income areas. Instead, Republicans did their own version, a watered-down version, that postponed any school construction for up to 4

years and did little for our needed schools.

I want to remind my colleagues, it is one thing to play games with sham legislation here in Congress. It is another thing to send a child to school in the boiler room or a broom closet or the hallway of a broken-down school, like we in New York and too many any other communities Nationwide. Too often, those affected are at-risk children living in minority neighborhoods.

This is not the way to treat our most precious resource, the young people who will follow in our footsteps in this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I support and I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's work and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our education chairman.

I have the greatest respect for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and for the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and I want to take two comments they made and try and bring this to fact and reality.

First of all, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the children of America are listening. Well, I doubt if many of them are right now, but I hope they all are and I hope their parents are as well because Mrs. LOWEY made one statement of fact that is absolutely correct and then bundled around it the delusions that many are trying to portray on this floor as a lack of commitment on one side or the other to education when, in fact, I would submit to my colleagues that both sides are committed to it.

The gentlewoman's fact that was correct was that there is an unfunded need in America of $303 billion for classroom construction; that is absolutely the exact number published in the report she cited. What she did not tell my colleagues is that the President's proposal to solve that is $1.3 million in the appropriations act, which is three-tenths of 1 percent and would take 35 years of annual appropriations just to meet today's need, if there was no other need in the future.

The fact of the matter is, our difference is let us do something that is meaningful and within our scope. Let us not try and lead an illusion that we are going to fix every stairwell or replace every school. The negotiators right now have said, let us agree on school construction, let us agree on it to do those Federally mandated things, such as IDEA, asbestos removal, health safety and welfare of our children. That is what they are negotiating right there.

We are not talking about building and replacing every school in America. We are talking about an illusion in this motion that we would do that when we cannot.

The reason I say illusion is because the distinguished lady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) said this would give property tax relief to her constituents. Property taxes are what schools are built upon in the local level. If we ever pass the false hope that we can build the schools America needs, the demand of which is greater than our surplus today, then there would never be a local bond issue passed, and American education would be a travesty.

Second, on school size and classroom size. Last year, the Republicans and the Democrats agreed on classroom size reduction. It is in the budget now. It just simply says that we must also have trained teachers in the classroom, not just teachers in the classroom.

On this Wednesday, Secretary Riley and our committee and many Members on the floor on the other side heard it. When asked the question, are there 100,000 trained and certified unemployed teachers to be hired; well, no, there are not. There are many that need training to be brought up to date, which is why last year's agreement was to be able to use the funds to hire new teachers or to train teachers that exist at the local level who are not certified.

□ 1300

We are on the cusp, the negotiators are right now. We are on the cusp right now. We agreed basically on classroom size reduction that was done last year and redone this year. We are now about to agree on what is meaningful in construction but also doable in construction.

If the children are listening and the parents are listening, Democrats and Republicans are this close to making a real solution and a meaningful contribution to education.

But this motion portends that we can do what they know we cannot, that we would make a false promise to the American people; and that would be wrong for us to do in a motion, just as well as it would be wrong for us lead people to believe we could do it in a budget.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks in the House are to be directed to the Chair, and not to other persons outside the Chamber.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly respond to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). We are talking about an emergency $1.3 billion to respond to the emergency that is out there because this Congress has not acted in spite of the crumbling schools. Then we would like to pass the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson bill that would provide tax relief for the local government, which is a tax bill that would provide for the tax on the bonds that will be issued by the local government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the remarks made initially by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). Both spoke very rationally. They spoke to the point. I wish we could have more of that kind of debate.

But there is a difference, I tell the gentleman from Georgia, and it is a significant difference. It is a substantive difference. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), when he made his presentation, said that the difference between us is that we want Washington to decide and they want the LEAs to decide, the local education agencies to decide. Because it is their proposition, effectively, that the money that they have included in is not targeted for school construction, indeed, not targeted, per se, for teachers, but is a revenue-sharing program. That is essentially the flexibility. I am sorry that you grimace.

But the fact of the matter is the rhetoric on their side has continually been that the locals can decide. Some people may need classrooms. Some may need additional teachers. But some may need computers. Some may need recreational facilities. They will have the flexibility.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that he is correct that this amendment will not solve the classroom shortage in America. No amendment could do that. No bill in one year could do that.

What this amendment, however, seeks to say, I tell the gentleman, is that we at the Federal level have identified two very significant critical problems. One, we do not have sufficient classrooms in America to house the swelling number of students in America. Two, we do not have sufficient teachers, quality teachers to teach those children.

There are other problems in America. But as we do on so many of the educational programs that my colleagues referenced and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in particular referenced, we say there is a problem here. We are going to put some dollars. LEA, if one wants to solve the problem here, are the dollars to do it.

That is the difference between us. We do not want to turn this $1.5 billion into simply a grab bag. It is for emergencies that exist in school construction and safety.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is exactly correct. The

gentleman ignored the tax component of this, which spends $5 billion or $6 billion to leverage five times that or 500 percent times that, five times that to $25 billion in bonds that can be issued by local governments.

Now, who decides to hire the teachers? The local government. Who decides whether to build the schools? The local government. The Federal Government does not make that selection, nor does it demand that the local governments do that.

To that extent, I suggest to my colleagues that, when they represent that we want government at the Federal level to decide, that is a misrepresentation and not useful for this debate. The issue really is whether or not we have a targeted sum or we have a general sum. The general sum clearly, I tell the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), will not solve the school construction problem or the teacher problem.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for helping me make the case that I set out to make a few minutes ago, partially helping make that case I would say.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his support for quality public education in the United States of America.

As I was sitting here, Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate and hearing the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) of the Committee on Education and the Workforce speaking, it occurred to me that he has worked an entire lifetime for education in the United States of America. This may be one of the last speeches that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) will be able to make on the floor of the House with regard to education.

I salute him for an entire career devoted to quality public education, flexibility at the local level, and the absence of Federal mandates. That is really the difference in philosophy that we are talking about here on the floor of this House on this Saturday afternoon.

I have two children in public schools in Mississippi. I support public education. I have a record of supporting public education, not only in this Congress, but also when I was a State legislator. We all support quality public education, and there is not a Member within the sound of my voice this afternoon in the House of Representatives or in the other body that does not support better school facilities and better school construction. We would all like to have better school buildings all across the United States of America.

The question is, how can we as a Nation get the job done. This points out the difference in philosophy. Regardless of what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the previous speaker, said, there is a strong difference in the way we would approach this bill.

Now, my friends on the Democratic side see a need somewhere in the United States of America, and they immediately see a Washington, DC Federal solution to the problem. We on the other hand, particularly when it comes to education, when we see an education problem, we try to find out how best to solve that problem at the local level and how to provide the flexibility and authority to local governments to solve those problems.

Now, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) pointed out, and as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) pointed out, there are over $300 billion in school construction needs right now. Those needs, undoubtedly, will go up. She terms them an emergency. The President's proposal would fund only a very, very small percentage of those problems.

But what if we start out this year at $1.5 billion, Mr. Speaker? What will that program look like with all the Federal bureaucracy and all of the regulations that it will entail, what will it look like in 5 years? I say we can expect a Federal program of about $15 billion in 5 years. A few years later, we might have a program of $150 billion. That is the way it always works.

I implore my colleagues to vote against this motion today. If there is any notion left of local control over school construction decisions, we will oppose this motion. Let us provide more flexibility for education at the local level.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), someone who really knows about this issue because he was the former superintendent of schools in North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, as I listen to the debate today, this is the same debate that I heard over 4 years ago when I decided to run for this body, because I was so disgusted as a State superintendent at a Republican leadership that was going to abolish the Department of Education, reduce school lunches, and the list is long. That would have directly impacted in the most negative of ways the children of this country.

Now we are saying we do not really need to put in school construction. We will do this; we will do that. Let me explain to my colleagues very quickly, if I may, because the Republican leadership's tactic, in my opinion, may have changed. But their cynical game is the same. Back then, the revolutionaries wanted to do all the things I have talked about.

Today they continue to play politics by blocking what I think is a bipartisan piece of legislation to build schools. Bottom line, $25 billion will build schools. Local units will determine where it is. All we do is pay the interest.

Let me tell my colleagues what one of the House leadership Members said yesterday. We are winning the education debate. That is not my words. They are published in today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear. Our children are too important to fall victim to partisan politics. Bottom line, the quality of education that we provide our children today will literally determine the future of the kind of Nation that we are going to have in the 21st century. This is not a game.

Despite the cynical politics the Republican leadership is talking about, this is about our children. The stakes are high. I say let us pass it. I support this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lowey motion. It is long past time for this Congress to do the right thing on school construction. Four years ago, I sought this office because I was sick and tired of watching Republican politicians in Washington playing politics with our children's future. The Republican leadership's tactics may have changed, but their cynical game is still the same. Back then, the Republican revolutionaries were trying to cut school lunches, slash student loans and shut down the entire Education Department. Today, they continue to play politics by blocking our bipartisan school construction bill because their goal is partisan politics. The House Republican Leader yesterday said, "we are winning the education debate."

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear: our children are too important to fall victim to partisan politics. The quality of the education we provide our children today will literally determine the kind of nation we will become in the 21st century. This is not a game, despite the cynical politics of the Republican leaders. This is about what kind of future our children are going to have in this country. The stakes could not be higher. Right now, we have a crisis in this country. Throughout America children are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms, trapped in run-down schools and stuck in makeshift trailers. We in this Congress have an opportunity and a responsibility about this crisis by passing meaningful school construction legislation for our children. I call on the Republican leadership to call off their partisan tactics and pass the bipartisan school construction bill—now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say we are not talking about construction, we are talking about maintenance and renovation. It would really be a joke if we were talking about construction at $1.3 billion.

I also want to compliment North Carolina in the last 4 years. In the last 4 years, North Carolina has made dramatic steps forward in their public education system. In the last 4 years, they did not come to Washington and ask them to do it for them or tell them how to do it either.

But I would hope that we start thinking more in terms of quality and not quantity. I would hope we would start thinking in terms of results and not process.

My colleagues talk about flexibility and the whole idea of pupil-teacher ratio. Let me give my colleagues one example how something that looked good went awry. In the very next school district to my school district, they got two teachers federally financed. Their ability to finance their own system is much greater than the one that I live in, which I pay $4,000 school tax. So I do not mind paying my income tax to help the city of York. But it does not make sense that I am buying two teachers when I am already paying in my own district far more school tax then they are paying in the district where they are more affluent.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) use her time. I think she has considerably more time left than I do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our gracious chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Johnson-Rangel bill. It is a bipartisan bill that provides a tax credit to deal with the school districts we have been discussing this morning and the school construction problem. It is a bill that preserves local control to school districts to decide how to spend the money.

Now, we all say we are for aid with school construction, with money which is the subject of the motion to instruct, and the tax credit. But we need to get serious about this because the devil is now in the details.

What I want to highlight to my colleagues is the fear I have that, in the final appropriations bill, there either will be nothing on school construction for tax credits, or there will be the language that we voted on the other day, which I find extremely unacceptable because it does two things that I think insult the intelligence of anyone that supports school construction aid.

The first thing is the arbitrage issue, which says to a school district that, if they borrow money to build schools and they hold that money for 3 or 4 years, they get a benefit in a tax credit. No school district is going to borrow money to build schools and let it sit there 3 or 4 years.

The second is, we have created a brand-new program called Private Activity Bonds for School Districts. In my district, building schools is a public responsibility, not a private activity. We need to do it the right way through the Johnson-Rangel bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for class size reduction and school renovation.

The school classroom size reduction program is helping the schools in my home State of New Mexico. Of the $9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers.

These are dollars that are targeted and managed at the local level. This is not about Washington versus local control. This program supports local school districts to hire teachers. The locals do the hiring.

□ 1315

The locals do the hiring. We are for the locals and for local control and local control management of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlelady from New York to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for Class Size Reduction and School Renovation.

The Classroom Size Reduction Program is helping the schools in my home state of New Mexico.

The amount awarded to my state for the 1999-2000 school year was $9.6 million.

Depending on the amount of funds received by the school district, funds could be used to recruit, hire, and train certified teachers and be used for professional development.

Of the $9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers. These are dollars targeted and managed at the local level.

As you can see Mr. Speaker the Class Size Reduction program has had a huge amount of success in my state and district—as I'm sure it has in my fellow colleagues' states and districts.

In the area of School Construction in my State: 69% of schools report at least one inadequate building feature (e.g., roof, plumbing, electrical, etc.) 75% of schools report at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor (e.g., air quality, heating, lighting, etc.)

Enrollment in New Mexico increased 12.3% over the last decade. And current estimates indicate that my state faces a $1.8 billion cost for school modernization, including $1.4 billion for infrastructure and $340 million for technology needs.

By supporting the President's request for $1.3 billion for grants and loans for emergency renovations—Schools in New Mexico and across the country would be able to compete for funds allocated to the state to assist them in their school construction needs.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about education we need not think of the politics which divides this chamber and polarizes our work. When we talk about education we need to think about our teachers who teach in over crowded classrooms.

We need to think about our students who are being taught in crumbling classrooms and schools.

We need to think about these current problems—And we need to act now, and act today by supporting the President's education agenda and supporting our nation's teachers and students. Our students and their families, and our country cannot afford anything less.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, in Greenfield, Massachusetts, a town of 20,000 people, the middle school was closed because walls were literally crumbling, threatening the safety of students. Now the middle school students are crammed into the town's overcrowded high school which has leaking roofs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the majority passed a bill that assigned $2.5 billion over 5 years for school construction bonds to build and repair schools. In the very same bill they assigned $18 billion, seven times as much, in business tax cuts over the same 5 years. Those business tax cuts included increasing the business tax deduction for meals from 50 to 70 percent and repealing several taxes on producers and marketers of alcoholic beverages. Remember, the three-martini lunches? That is a very clear picture of wrong priorities.

This is October 28. We are 4 weeks into the fiscal year, CR number eight, and our work is not done. This is the longest session in the history of the Nation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a leader on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who I have served with for the last several years, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

I rise in support of a partnership between the Federal level and our local communities to help on reducing class size, to help with discipline in the classroom, to help with parental involvement, to help with quality teachers.

Something that I have worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) on and with several Democrats and Republicans is to try to move and transition to teaching people with math and science and technological experience from mid-career positions into the classroom. That transition to teaching, to provide those people with expertise from Main Street into the classrooms, will help us in our local communities decide what to do about the challenges of educating all of our children. It is local accountability, it is local flexibility, but it is putting emphasis on quality teaching. I hope that this Congress will act in a bipartisan way on that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for this initiative; and, frankly, I think the Baltimore Sun is right, this is a Republican gridlock. Because any parent in America who can say to me that they have not seen crumbling school buildings or overcrowded school buildings are probably not looking at the Nation's schools in the last 10 to 15 years.

What we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a crisis, similar to the Marshall Plan after World War II. We need to confront schools on a national level to rebuild them. What we are trying to say is that this budget and appropriation bills that have been put forward by the Republicans do not address the crisis and the emergency.

This is not a game. This is a serious effort to ensure that we leave here with local communities having tax credits and incentives to put the money directly on rebuilding the schools. It is plain and simple. That is why we are here on Saturday. That is why we will be here on Sunday. And that is why we will be here throughout the time, because we need to do the right thing.

I want to see children in safe, secure, well-heated and proper schools. Mr. Speaker, let us do the right thing together.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have heard all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, tout some of the successes of the committee. I serve on that committee and am glad to serve under his leadership, but I might add that some of the successes that we tout we have not seen them signed into law. I think the chairman would admit that he has had difficulty with some of these even on his side.

I heard the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) talk about how close we are and how sad it is that we cannot close that gap. He mentions that we are perhaps promoting something false on this side. There is nothing false about kids learning in closets, there is nothing false about children learning in bathrooms, there is nothing false about children learning in trailers connected to their schools.

If we can find $.25 trillion a year to help build roads and highways and bridges; if we can find Federal dollars to build prisons, then we ought to be able to find some dollars to build schools for children. The only quota that my friends on the other side of the aisle support, and I have many friends on that side of the aisle and do not mean to cast aspersions, is the quota to raise the number of foreign workers we allow into our nation to hold down jobs which we cannot produce enough people in our country to do that.

Let us pass this motion and do right by our children. I look forward to working with both chairmen to get this done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to advise my dear friend from New York that I will be yielding to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) in just a minute, and then I will reserve the balance of my time so I can have a closing statement prior to the time the gentlewoman makes her statement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the chairman and to advise him that I believe I have two more brief speeches.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), but I just wanted the gentlewoman to know in advance what my plan was.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I have listened with great interest and with, sadly, some misgivings to the tone of this debate. Let me start with a point of agreement. My friend from North Carolina and my neighbor from New Mexico said this is not a game. They are exactly right. How sad it is, then, that such partisan invective is brought into this debate.

As the father of two children in the Cave Creek Unified School District in Arizona, I have a firsthand knowledge of the challenges teachers face in the classroom, of the special challenges of growth in that school district, of the bond issue that will be on the ballot in a few short days. I heard the litany of challenges outlined on this side. I would not take issue with the reality of the need that is there. But I am compelled to point out the fact to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that just 2 days ago we empowered local districts with over $16 billion to deal with a variety of projects.

My friend from Pennsylvania, under his leadership, we have moved for the full Federal component of funding for children with special needs, a promise made nearly a quarter century ago that was left unfulfilled.

There reaches a point, my colleagues, when we must put people before politics. Join with us in the broad goals of empowering local districts, parents in the homes, teachers in the classroom, leaders in the communities, and give them the latitude they need.

Sadly, I must ask my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct and deal with the reality and come together in an agreement that is good for every child in this country.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, in the City of Cleveland, at a high school called East High School, the roof fell in. I called the Department of Education and said, ''Is there emergency money at the Federal level to assist my public school in a situation like this?'' Sadly, it was reported that there was none.

In Ohio, the Supreme Court has determined that the way in which schools are funded throughout Ohio is unconstitutional. It is done by way of property tax. So that means that in one city in Ohio $2,000 is spent on education per capita, but in another city in Ohio $15,000 is spent on each child per capita.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct because our schools need funding and assistance.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in support of this very important motion to instruct. Over the last year, I have taken the opportunity to visit every school in my district, and I have seen students trying to learn in hallways, in bathrooms, in closets, and cafeterias. It is time to do something to help our local school districts.

This is not about the Federal Government stepping in and telling local school districts what to do, it is about working in partnership with our school districts all over the country, whether they be in rural or urban or suburban or fast-growing districts.

I urge this body to support the motion to instruct. There is nothing more important we can do for our future and for our children.

I rise today in support of the School Construction Motion to Instruct Conferees, because I believe the last days of this Congress present us with a clear choice. We can help

communities hire 100,000 new teachers, reduce class size, and modernize schools or we can pass block grants that don't ensure that a single new teacher will be hired or a single classroom built.

My district, the Second Congressional District of Colorado, is a microcosm of the American West. It is urban, suburban and rural, high growth and unspoiled mountain communities. For all of my districts diversity of terrain and community size, it is a district of crumbling schools.

Since coming to Congress last year, I have traveled to every high school in my district. I can tell you there are far too many kids crammed in classrooms of 30 or more and far too many students trying to work in modular or temporary spaces like trailers. One High School I visited (one of the newer schools) is already surpassing its growth projections. High Schools built in the 1970s and designed for graduating classes of 200–300 students, now face numbers that are two and three times that.

I am not happy to be here on a Saturday morning, nearly a month into the fiscal year, to encourage the Majority to make good on their stated goal of improving education. I would rather be at home with my family, among my constituents, but I am here because a firm commitment to school modernization and construction is needed nationwide. With this vote we can send a message to the Majority that it is time to target funds to build much needed new schools and to rebuild our crumbling schools.

While time is running short, I believe there is still time to do right by our nation's children.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, my good friend, for yielding me this time. We represent similar areas in New York, Bronx County, Westchester County; and we know there are problems with schools in those counties.

We need to hire 100,000 new teachers. We want to get our schools' classes down in size so there are no more than 18 students per class. We will need to build new schools, hire 100,000 teachers and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

I am the father of three children. I am a former teacher; my wife is a former teacher, I was a guidance counselor. There is nothing more important to the future of this Nation than to get our class sizes down. Any parent knows that the less children there are in a classroom the more the children can learn and get personalized attention.

So I support this instruction for conferees. I think we should move in a bipartisan fashion to fund our schools, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this.

Again, we need 100,000 teachers, we need to build new schools, and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One point I would like to make to the gentlewoman that said there was no money for her schools is that the Department of Education's books have been unauditable. In one year, one year, they have over $100 million of student loans they cannot even account for. All of the agencies need to be digitalized so that they can at least track the funds.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for bringing up this issue because this is a good debate. We need to be discussing this issue.

I heard some things on that side that I agreed with. In fact, I heard one of my colleagues on the other side say that this should be a partnership. Mr. Speaker, I agree, this should be a partnership. That is where both partners have equal enjoyment of the authority and the jurisdiction. But under the motion to instruct, I just have the feeling and I am really convinced that this would be a one-sided partnership with the Federal Government being by far the most senior partner.

Now, that really disturbs me, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) just made the case that the Department of Education could not account for $100 million worth of student loans last year and could not audit their accounts. Now, I do not think I want that educational department running the school districts in Pinellas County, Florida, where I have the privilege of representing the teachers and the students and the parents. But we will soon vote on this issue, and we are going to decide whether or not we want the Federal Government and Federal aid with all kinds of strings on it to our local systems.

But I want to make this as a closing argument. We believe strongly in education, and the money that we have already agreed to provide is in excess of what the President requested.

□ 1330

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. The money that we are agreeing to provide as we speak today is in excess of what the President of the United States asked for. As we negotiate the final agreement on this appropriations bill, I am convinced that that number will be even higher. So we are not arguing about the dollars. What we are arguing about is who controls the dollars. Our position is that the dollars should be controlled by the people in the school districts, where they know what their needs are far better than the Department of Education or some other bureaucracy here in Washington, DC.

And then I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. I have spent a lot of my time in the Congress, my assignment being national defense, national security, intelligence, and I am proud of the fact that we have a tremendous military capability. We have the best kids serving in our uniforms. They are all not kids but the vast majority of them are. I have visited with almost every one of the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* who were injured. I visited with them as they came home, I visited with them in the hospital, I even visited with some of them in their ambulances. They are kids. But they provide a strong national defense.

We do not have the largest Army by a long shot. There are five or six other countries with a much larger army than we have. In Desert Storm we had 18 divisions. Today we only have 10. That is a tremendous downsizing which I do not agree with. But we have a technological advantage. We have created superior technology, superior weapons systems, and we have smart young people who are able to handle these defense systems. That is important, because without a strong national security, most of these other things we argue about would not even be arguable. In fact, without a strong national security, this Congress probably would not even be here; we would not exist. Some dictator would be running this country.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that without a good, strong, effective educational system, we could not develop the technology that we have developed, that is super, that is better than any other in the world. There are still others out there that have nuclear weapons and have all kinds of threats they could pose to the United States. But we have the great technology, and we have the young men and women who are able to handle, to manage, to administer that technology. If we do not maintain and continue to improve our educational systems, the ability to defend this country deteriorates as we allow our educational systems to deteriorate.

We believe in a strong education. We are determined to provide for a strong and effective education. But we understand that when we are dealing with K–12 and local educational communities and local schools and local teachers, that the decisions on whether they need new schools or whether they need more new teachers or whether they need special education, whether they need more books, whether they need computers, those needs should be determined in the school district, by the people who know what their needs are, not by the Department of Education in Washington, D.C. who cannot even account for $100 million worth of student loans this last year.

I hope we reject this motion to instruct the conferees. Let the conferees continue on the track that we are on now, which is providing more money for education but guaranteeing that

local people, local teachers, local taxpayers, local parents will have control over how that money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unanswered the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the chairman about the Department of Education, who, when they had some difficulty in one of their audits, responded more quickly than any other agency I can remember in righting that ship.

It is amazing for people that do not want to get partisan, they neglect to note the fact that the Department of Defense financial statements for 1998 were less timely than ever and a record $1.7 trillion of unsupported adjustments were identified by auditors. The same was true roughly in the following year. They do not ask for the Department of Defense to be closed down, but both the Texas platform of the Republican Party and this party on the other side of the aisle is in favor of closing the Department of Education. They should be ashamed of raising an issue like that.

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

My good friend and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been doing a lot of talking during this campaign about education. We hear about how important education is. Yet they want to close down the Department of Education. I want to make it very clear. I have visited schools all over this country. I have seen young people who have to work in the shiny corporations because they do not have computers at their desk. There are wires hanging out of windows. Vandals will cut them at night. There are youngsters who have to run from one side of the building to the other side of the building because it is raining. The schools are crumbling.

In 1996, the problem was $112 billion. Now it is $300 billion. If we can build roads, bridges, highways, prisons, then while we are assisting our local governments, we can provide the emergency aid to rebuild our schools. Our children deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair reminds all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 150, nays 159, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—150

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Gilman
Gonzalez
Hall (OH)
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu

NAYS—159

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Knollenberg
Largent
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Shadegg
Sherwood
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—123

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Calvert
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Hulshof
Hyde
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Owens
Pascrell
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Porter
Portman
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Wynn

□ 1356

Messrs. DEMINT, GILCHREST and GEKAS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 572. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Additionally, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 573. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 570, 571, 572 and 573, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

WHAT WE DO IN WASHINGTON DOES MATTER AND MATTERS A LOT

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great fiscal debate going on in this country and I felt I would use these 5 minutes to address some of the key points in that debate.

The governor from Texas has come up with a novel and dangerous argument, and that is that fiscal responsibility does not matter; that what goes on in Washington has had nothing to do with the prosperity that we currently enjoy.

Now I can understand why someone running against Washington would want to say that what we have done here over the last 8 years has nothing to do with the prosperity enjoyed in this country and the prosperity we hope to enjoy in the future, but that argument, however politically appealing, is a dangerous one, because once one argues that what goes on in Washington has nothing to do with the economy of the country then one grants a license to Democrats and Republicans to be fiscally irresponsible.

The fact is that what we do in Washington does matter, and matters a lot.

□ 1400

True, the lion's share of the credit belongs to hard-working men and women around this country who, through industry and innovation, have built this economy. But our people were hard-working in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, and yet we suffered with high unemployment in an unsuccessful economy, because we had huge deficits. It is the fiscal responsibility that the President has brought to our Federal Government that has added the one additional element which, with the hard work of the American people, has led to our prosperity.

The second fallacy that we have heard from the Governor of Texas is his statement over and over again that his plan will provide tax relief to all Americans who pay taxes. The facts are otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, some 15 million Americans pay Federal FICA tax that is pulled out of their wages every time, every paycheck; and yet they will receive no, no tax relief under Governor Bush's proposal. Those 15 million Americans who pay FICA taxes to the Federal Government, but do not owe income tax because they are earning the minimum wage, because they are not earning very much, because they are trying to support a family on incomes of $15,000 and $20,000 a year, these low-income taxpayers get nothing from the Governor of Texas. Yet, he does provide 43 percent of his tax benefit to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

This leads me to the third fallacy, and that is his statement that he will provide only $223 billion, only $223 billion to the richest 1 percent of Americans. The problem here is fuzzy fiscal figures, because that $223 billion leaves out the effect of the repeal of the estate tax. The Governor will often talk about how he wants to eliminate the estate tax, but will leave out from his budget the fiscal effect of that repeal. The estate tax will be bringing in $50 billion a year, $500 billion over 10 years, and so the governor's tax reduction for those in the wealthiest 1 percent is not $223 billion over 10 years, but over $700 billion over 10 years.

That is why it is true when we point out that the governor would provide more tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans than everything he proposes to spend to improve our health care system, strengthen Medicare, strengthen our military, and improve education combined.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. On one hand, we can have fiscal responsibility, economic expansion, reduction and eventual elimination of the national debt, and moderate tax cuts for working families, all combined with important investments in education, Medicare, military preparedness, and our health care system. On the other hand, we could choose to provide $700 billion of tax relief over the next 10 years to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the choice before America could never be more stark.

SHALLOW RHETORIC UNDERMINES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I did not get over in time to speak on the motion to instruct conferees, but I think it is time for a reality check with the other side.

We heard a lot of rhetoric, unfortunately, about the education debate on our plan versus the President's plan and how Republicans do not care about the condition of our schools. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that I am one of the few who actually is a classroom teacher in this body. In fact, I spent 7 years teaching in the inner city schools in and around Philadelphia. In fact, I helped to run a chapter 1 program for 3 of those years.

I want to remind my friends on the other side that for the 7 years that I taught, I taught in a portable classroom; two trailers bolted together without adequate heat, without adequate air-conditioning, 32 children in a self-contained environment, in a portable classroom. Guess who was in charge of the government when I taught? It was a Democrat President, a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate. Where was the concern for those of us who were teaching in portable classrooms in inner cities back then when my colleagues controlled the whole ballgame? Where were their efforts to deal with school modernization? Where were their efforts to increase funds for school construction? I was there on the front line teaching in that portable classroom with 32 kids that were challenged in an environment that was very difficult.

Now, I will remind my colleagues on the other side of one further fact. The first 2 years that President Clinton was in office, the Democrats controlled the House and they controlled the Senate. They could have passed any bill they wanted, and we could not stop it. They had all of the votes. We could not have stopped any issue that they wanted to address for the American people.

I find it a little questionable that in the first 2 years of Clinton's administration, when the Democrats controlled the entire ball game, there was

no bill for school construction. There was no rhetoric down here on the floor about the need to deal with kids. There was no concern about the people teaching in portable classrooms like I did for 7 years. There was no concern about falling ceilings. What are they telling us? All that occurred within the last 5 years?

The fact is, this is nothing more than political rhetoric. The first 2 years that the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House when they could have done anything they wanted, they did not even propose a bill to deal with school construction. This Congress has. With a bipartisan piece of legislation that we are going to pass, and hopefully this President will sign, we will do what a responsible Congress could have done 7 years ago, and that is deal with the issue of the need for modernization of our schools.

So I bring up this reality check, Mr. Speaker, because unlike most of my friends who are attorneys who never taught in the classroom, I taught in the classroom for 7 years. I know what it is like to teach in a portable classroom with 2 trailers bolted together, with kids who cannot go outside because when you open the door, the cold is right there. My point is I think a lot of what we heard today is nothing more than shallow rhetoric.

DEMOCRATS DEMONSTRATE SERIOUS COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to address this issue earlier today, but I came over and after the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) spoke just a minute ago, I felt it incumbent to do so. I too was a classroom teacher. I taught for 9 years, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 2 more than he did, and I have lived in those classrooms and even had the experiences of the roof falling in, only this was not a roof, it was only a blind that fell and cut my face. We had to evacuate students from classrooms in my building because the walls leaked so badly that the kids could not sit in there because there was so much water.

Granted, that was a couple of decades back. I thought we had pretty much addressed all of that stuff.

Interestingly enough, my daughter today teaches sixth grade math, in Beaumont, Texas, the same school district in which I taught. She has children who do not have chairs in her classroom. They will fix it. They are in portable buildings right now. They are making the repairs in the regular school building.

The problem is that so many school districts do not have the ability to take care of these problems today, and it is incumbent upon this United States House of Representatives to try to help create the type of innovative financing to help school districts take care of themselves at home. In our State, there is a limit on how much one can raise in property taxes from a property taxpayer.

I was a county school tax assessor collector also for a while following the time that I taught, and I know that they have difficulty raising those dollars. I know what it is like to be a taxpayer, a property taxpayer at home and not be able to pay or afford to pay all of the taxes that we have to try to accomplish the many things that we have to do within our schools to keep our children learning and give them the opportunity to be good productive citizens and not end up either victimizing somebody or being victims themselves or going to jail.

Mr. Speaker, we have not made the right commitment, and that is what this debate is all about. Obviously, we all want to see our schools better. When are we going to make it the priority and do it? Our colleagues on the Republican side clearly have not done that.

Our own State of Texas has a plan in the Republican platform for its State to abolish the U.S. Department of Education. That to me does not speak to a commitment to make education better in this country.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too listened to the other speaker and I too am I classroom teacher. I taught for 9 years, middle school math, in a very poor, rural area.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, that is what my daughter teaches.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too worked in one of those places that nobody wants to talk about, those portables. But I say to the gentleman, I am tired of hearing on this floor about how we controlled the House and we controlled the Senate for those first 2 years with the presidency. We were paying down a debt. There was no money. There could be no discussion about these issues. And on top of that, we had our States, because at that time I was in the State Senate in the 1980s, and this country was going through a recession. There was no money in the States to deal with these problems. So these things just went up and up and up.

Now, they want to come and say well, you did not do anything about it. Well, this is the first time we have had any surpluses to even be able to talk about it, and now what we are trying to talk about is $25 billion to do school construction, and the rest of the K through 3 program where we have been putting teachers.

I am also tired of hearing about how we are taking this away from the local level, it is their issue, they ought to be able to control it. Ask them to go look in their State legislatures. How many of them have adopted the goal to make K through 3 education top priority in reducing class size? How many States in this country are doing after-school programs? How many of these? In fact, just 2 years ago, when this whole school construction came up, our State legislature was having to call a special session to deal with the issue of school construction.

Yes, we are talking about it now because we have an opportunity to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the gentlewoman's comments.

It is clear, there is a difference in commitment to this issue. The Democrats indeed want to attempt to make a real difference, and I hope that instead of asking, as the gentlewoman well stated, instead of asking the question, where were you while we were in control, well, why has there not been some commitment, some effort to truly explain what the Republican commitment is while they have been in control of this House of Representatives in the last several years. I think we are doing so, and we are doing so in a responsible manner; and I hope that with our continued push that we will achieve that.

IMPROVING HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Democratic colleagues who have joined me on the floor today for this Special Order hour. We are here this afternoon on a beautiful fall day, here in this House Chamber, trying to urge this Congress not to adjourn for the year until we finish the job of meeting the health care needs of America's families.

Democrats in the House have worked for the entire 2-year session of this Congress to give America's families a strong Patients' Bill of Rights to ensure that you and your family make your health care along with your doctor, rather than having some insurance clerk who has never had a day of medical training, decide the treatment that you need. We have worked to make sure that when you are ill and when you are fighting for your life,

that you do not have to also fight your insurance company to get the help that you need.

Democrats in this Congress have been united also in the fight to give a prescription drug benefit to our senior citizens. We have worked for an optional part D under Medicare to guarantee that our seniors will never again have to make the choice between buying groceries and paying the rent or filling their prescriptions. And the Democrats in this Congress are united in our efforts to protect Americans' access to quality health care. We are fighting as we speak during the ongoing negotiations in the closing days of this Congress to answer the pleas from our hospitals, from our home health care providers, from our nursing homes and our other health care providers that we must strengthen Medicare, because many of us know that we have Medicare-dependent hospitals that will close their doors if Congress fails to get this job done.

□ 1415

Home health agencies have already closed by the thousands and our teaching hospitals are no longer able to pursue teachers, research, and indigent care due to lack of funding.

The American people have a right to know where this Republican-controlled Congress has failed to lead and failed to solve these pressing problems that confront every American family.

They have a right to know who is on their side, and they have a right to know who is fighting for them. The answer is all too clear. The Republican-controlled Congress has become the special-interest-controlled Congress. The powerful special interests are in the driver's seat, and the public interests are in the backseat.

On these three critical issues, patient protection, prescription drugs and protecting Medicare, the Republicans have danced to the tune of the big insurance companies and the big prescription drug manufacturers.

On patient protection, the powerful insurance industry has fought in every State legislature and in this Congress to defeat meaningful patient rights. I carried the first patient protection legislation in the country when I was a State senator in Texas. The State Senate there and the State House voted almost unanimously in favor of a bipartisan patient protection bill. That bill was vetoed by Governor Bush, and he vetoed it after the legislature had adjourned when we had no opportunity to override.

Fortunately, the legislature came back in the next session 2 years later and passed almost the identical package in four parts, and Governor Bush signed three, but let the fourth, regarding accountability of HMOs, become law without his signature.

Fortunately, we have patient protection in many of our States, but we know that we must also pass a Federal bill to be sure that all patients under all plans are covered with these protections.

Early in this session of Congress, this House passed a strong patients' bill of rights with near unanimous support from Democrats and the courageous support of Republican Members, like the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), only to see the bill watered down in the Senate and now languish in a conference committee with no action.

I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you? On prescription drugs, Democrats have united in support of a voluntary universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare, but our Republican friends have joined with the pharmaceutical industry to defeat our plan.

The pharmaceutical industry created a front group called Citizens for Better Medicare, if you can imagine, and spent millions of dollars in advertising across this country to say to the American people that private insurance can take care of the problem of prescription drugs for our seniors.

We know that Medicare is the system that our seniors trust, and we know that the big pharmaceutical manufacturers do not want a prescription drug benefit under Medicare because they know if Medicare is in the business of helping our seniors get prescription drugs, Medicare is not going to pay the same high prices that our seniors are having to pay every day when they walk in their local retail pharmacies.

Our Republican friends even introduced and passed a bill on the floor of this House authorizing insurance companies to offer prescription drug-only plans to seniors when even the president of Blue Cross and Blue Shield testified to this Congress that the plan was neither workable nor affordable for our senior citizens.

Well, that plan backed by the Republican leadership and by the big pharmaceutical companies never has become the law fortunately; but still we have been unable to pass a prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Democrats want to update Medicare to make it consistent with the times, because we know that prescription drugs are now a big part of all of our health care costs.

It is time to end the pharmaceutical manufacturers' practice of charging America's seniors the highest prices paid anywhere in the world for prescription drugs. I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you?

Finally, when we look at what is happening today, this week, in this Congress, when we are fighting to increase funding for Medicare to save our hospitals and our health care providers, the Republicans put forth a bill and passed it on the floor of this House, which the President has pledged, fortunately, to veto, that dedicates 40 percent of the increase in funding directly to the insurance company HMOs with no guarantee that any of that money will ever get to our hospitals, our health care providers, or our senior citizens on Medicare.

Why with only 15 percent of America's seniors living in an area where they even have access to a Medicare HMO plan would the Republican leadership give 40 percent of the increase in funding to the insurance industry? I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you?

We, Democrats, have gathered on the floor today to talk about these issues, and it is a pleasure for me to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), one of the best and hardest working Members of this Congress. The gentlewoman has worked on prescription drugs for seniors as long as any of us, and I am proud to yield time to her to discuss these important issues.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those words from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), but I would dare say that the gentleman and other Members of this Congress feel passionately about this health care issue as the gentleman so eloquently described in your opening remarks.

I think the gentleman is right, we are on their side.

I just want to go over some things, because the gentleman mentioned about a piece of legislation that potentially is going to be vetoed, if it ever gets to the President, I understand we may not get it there, but the fact of the matter is, two things I would say to the gentleman. I just received a letter October 20 from a gentleman, and he has also sent me some additional information on what is happening with his Medicare choice program, but it is very interesting. In the middle of his letter he says the medication providers made it tough to live up to these standards and something must be done to save the senior citizen, as well as the poor and middle-class citizens who cannot afford these high prices of medication.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say, when I was in the Marine Corps in World War II, we were taught how to survive. But what is happening to us now with this health care system and prescriptions does not afford or teach us the liberty of surviving.

What I think caused him to send this letter to me was the letter that he just received from his Medicare choice program. Now, remembering the gentleman just said what was just passed was about $8 billion or more that will go to these Medicare choice programs, even one of them getting about a 3 percent increase, before this bill was even voted on, before they even knew what potentially would be the outcome, this

is what they wrote to him, the name of the plan is changing in 2001 as shown in the table below. So-and-so's premium will no longer be offered in 2001. You will be automatically enrolled in this particular plan instead. I am not going to mention names. If after reviewing the benefit changes, you decide that this plan is not acceptable, you may wish to receive information about a valued plan available in your area.

This is how it goes. They have a chart. I would have blown up this chart, because I think it is very interesting. It is these kinds of phone calls and letters I am getting.

Benefit, monthly plan premium, 2000, $19; 2001, $179, from $19 to $179. Outpatient, physician specialist services, $10 office visit copayment; $15 office visit copayment, 2001. Outpatient hospital, $20 in 2000; $35 in 2001. Inpatient, no copayment; $1,000, 2001, $200 per day, limit 3 copayments per year. Inpatient hospital care, nonnetwork facility, no copayment; 2001, $500 copayment per admission. Mental health, no copayment; 2001, $200 per day, limit 3 copayment per year. Prescription drug, $1,000 on outpatient prescription drug benefit, maximum benefit $1,000, annual maximum for brand name drugs, the amount applied towards the benefit maximum was calculated as follows, the usual and customary price of the medication or the average wholesale price, whatever is less, plus the dispensing fee, minus your copayment. That is what happens in 2000. 2001, $50 monthly maximum for brand name drugs, the amount applied to the benefit maximum is the amount that this company pays for the drugs.

Now, they are going to get a 3 percent, only covering about 15 percent by the way of the entire population, which is 40 percent of this entire package, and they are already sending out these notices saying that they are going to go from $19 to $179 and every other expense they have is also out of pocket expense going up. That is what I received.

Now, have we addressed this? We tried to address this. It was not going to make any difference. This is what they already said. By the way, on the back page, it says if you want to know you can opt out of this. I mean, these people are not going to have any place to go.

At a rare moment of this year in a political debate that I have actually made on a Sunday afternoon, I was handed, not by the same person, but by another person a monthly statement of what their medicines would cost. This is what really struck me. At the end of it, it said previous balance, $649.59, charges this month $2,322.56.

We have stood on this floor, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) have stood here and talked about at least one thing that we could have done that would have cost the Federal Government nothing. We are missing the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), our friend.

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), we have offered it in the committee. We said put it under the Federal supply system. Use the Federal Government's buying power by buying the medicines at a reduced price. Use us just like we do in the VA system, just imagine this one alone would have been cut by almost $1,200, just that one. Not even a benefit that we are fighting about right now. Just cut this in half. Let us be the buyer of this.

We buy bulk paper. We buy the hammers. We buy the highways. We buy the bridges. We do all of those things. We use our buying power for those purposes. Why can we not use that for these folks? Why are we saddling not only with the prescription drug costs that are outrageous and expensive and certainly not going for research, and I am sure somebody could jump up and talk about that, as we all could, but the fact of the matter is it is lining somebody's pocket. And on top of that, we have the increased costs.

My colleagues know what my solution is. I think we ought to get rid of Medicare choice. I think we ought to get rid of MSAs. I think we ought to get rid of all of that. I think we ought to look at a Medicare program that gives the safety net for every senior and not discriminate because they live in an area where they can get a Medicare choice or not.

We ought to be making sure that these things are covered under Medicare, become a Medicare benefit, and that would solve an awful lot of problems for a lot of people and would give us a health care system that is stabilized and not so off and on again and pulling people in and out of these programs, but something they can count on, which is what they always thought they were going to have when they had Medicare.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), and I appreciate her hard work on these issues. Her work in committee as well as on the floor has meant much to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), one of the most effective younger Members of this Congress, another Member who has worked with us very closely on these very critical issues.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and I appreciate his great leadership on this very important issue before Congress.

I think it is instructive to those that are listening today on a Saturday afternoon that we are here continuing to press this vitally important issue. We are here for the people that Tom Brokaw appropriately recognized as the greatest generation ever, those people who persevered through the great Depression, who won the Second World War, who came home and rebuilt this great country of ours, provided for interstate commerce and made sure that we had school systems that were second to none so that we have risen today to be the preeminent military, economic, cultural and social force in the world.

□ 1430

All they are asking for is to live out their final days in dignity. I can say it no better than the woman who was on 60 Minutes who said, ''I feel like I am a refugee from my own health care system, a refugee from my own health care system because I have to travel to Canada to get the prescription drugs that my doctor has recommended I take because I cannot afford them here in my own country.''

That is why we need the legislation that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) has sponsored, that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) spoke about. That is why it is so important, as it should have been in 1965, that we follow the President's lead and the Vice President's lead in making sure that we make prescription drugs part of Medicare.

As the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) has pointed out as well, also following along the lines of the Allen bill which so many of us have supported here as well, that makes nothing short of common sense, that will not cost one new dollar in terms of adding onto bureaucracy, no new tax dollars, but just using the Federal Government as a resource, and pulling those Medicare recipients along with those Federal employees that already receive a discount, thus driving down the cost of prescription drugs for our elderly.

Everywhere I go across my district I can think of no more poignant issue where people have been calling upon Congress to put down their partisan differences. Instead, we get a charade. We get a charade of proposals claiming to have been for or have passed something akin to prescription drug relief.

The Republican proposal I have aptly named the Marie Antoinette plan. My colleagues all recall when those in Paris were starving and the then Queen said, ''They are without bread. Let them eat cake.''

The seniors of this country have come to the capital, have plead with us to give them prescription drug relief, and our Republican counterparts are saying, ''They are in need of prescription drugs. Let them buy insurance.''

That is not the way to make sure that we protect and provide for the greatest generation ever, those individuals that have sacrificed so much for

this Nation of ours. Let us get behind the American plan, not Democrat, not Republican, but the plan that allows people to live out their final days in dignity and provides them the access to prescription drugs, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) pointed out, that will not have them faced with the decision of choosing between the food they put on their table, the monies they need to heat their home, or the drugs that their doctors have recommended that they take to survive. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for putting forward this very important issue at this critical time.

We have got a governor out there who is cawing how he can bring people together. I have a suggestion, call the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), call the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), two of his fellow Texans, tell them to pull this Congress together in the waning days and pass on to those seniors. This is not a bipartisan issue, this is an issue of survival, this is a moral obligation on the part of this Congress to make sure that those seniors, those citizens that have given so much need these drugs to survivor. Let us get together and make it happen. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his leadership.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I know we all agree with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) completely. I appreciate his conviction on the issue.

Another Member who has worked tirelessly on this effort to bring fairness in prescription drug prices and a prescription drug benefit under Medicare to our seniors is the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) on this subject.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his leadership on this, and my colleagues who are here to speak to this.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come to the health care issue as a new Member of Congress because it polled well. I came to Congress as a member of the health care profession because we have a health care crisis.

For 23 years before serving in this body, I worked with patients. I was a clinical psychologist. I worked with cancer patients, with head injury patients, with folks with severe mental illness. I can tell my colleagues that, when we talk about 44 million uninsured Americans, 11 million uninsured children, those are not just numbers, those translate into real human lives.

I have worked with patients who put off needed health care. By the time they came to us, their disease had progressed so far, there was nothing more we could do. I have been by their bedside as they died. This is not a political issue. It is not something for rhetorical flourish. It is a day-to-day matter of life and death for American people.

This Congress has named post offices. This Congress has passed resolutions on this and that. But this Congress has yet to pass a real Patients' Bill of Rights, a Patients' Bill of Rights that lets one choose one's health care provider, puts medical decisions in the hands of medical professionals, and holds insurance companies accountable when they deny one care.

This Congress has not passed that bill. Part of the reason we have not passed that bill is we have also not passed campaign finance reform. We have had a chance, but it has been held up again, two critical bills that could have passed.

The reason we cannot pass the Patients' Bill of Rights is the special interests who do not want to see that pass, who make money off other people suffering, have so heavily invested in certain campaigns that we will not even bring it to a serious discussion in the conference committee.

This Congress has not addressed pharmaceutical costs. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) talked about the Republican plan as the Marie Antoinette plan, very apt prescription. I call it the placebo plan. Placebos, as my colleagues know, are medications or pseudo-medications designed to make one feel better if one believes they work, but they have no real effect. They are sugar pills.

Congress should not be passing sugar pills. The American people deserve better than placebos. The only bill we have managed to bring up is a placebo bill that resulted from polling that said the following: you have got to do something because the American people think there is a need for pharmaceutical benefits. But it does not matter what you do, so long as you say you care.

Saying you care and showing you care are different things. This body is in session still. We have set a record, I understand, one of the longest sessions of Congress in an election year. But in that time we have taken, that extended time, we have passed no Patients' Bill of Rights, no real pharmaceutical benefits. We have not done anything substantive to reduce the numbers of uninsured children and uninsured seniors in this country.

Our rural hospitals, Mr. Speaker, are suffering. There is a little bitty hospital named Morton General in a little mountain town, a timber town that has been pretty hard hit over the years. The winter weather is hitting Washington State right now up in the Cascades.

That town is an hour away from any trauma center. If a woman has a complicated pregnancy, or a logger sustains a serious ailment, that is the only hospital within an hour they can get to. With that winter weather, one is not going to be able to get a life flight up there.

This week we passed a bill before this Congress that will not do what we need to do to protect our rural hospitals. It will not do what we need to do to protect our urban and suburban hospitals. It will not do what we need to do to protect our home health agencies. We passed it for the same reason we passed the placebo prescription medication bill, for political purposes, not for health care purposes. That, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

We are in the richest country in the history of the world, the richest country in the history of the world; and 44 million Americans, 11 million children have no health insurance. Senior citizens choose every week whether or not to take their medication or pay their rent. Doctors are leaving our suburban and rural hospitals because they cannot afford to pay back their student loans. It is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, almost every weekend for the past 2 years, I have flown home to be with my constituents. I have had 103 town meetings. At every one of those, someone has brought me their prescription medication bill and said, please help us with this.

I would like to be home in my district right now, not so much because there is an election, but because I would like to be home and listen to my constituents.

But if we are here, for goodness sakes let us do something that matters. Let us do something that matters. We are not going to do that. We are going to pass CR after CR after CR. We are not going to do it. It is a shame. The 106th Congress is going to go down as the longest Congress to have done the least in American history.

I applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). I applaud my Democratic colleagues who have tried to do something really substantive for the American people.

I would appeal to this body, in the few days left, let us take a chance and work together and solve at least some of these problems, a Patients' Bill of Rights, a pharmaceutical benefit, real help for our rural hospitals, not a giveback to HMOs, but real help for our hospitals.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) certainly brought the issues right down to home by the examples that he gave. I think many times people feel like we are down here debating some high-minded set of issues. But the truth is these issues make a difference to America's families. They make a difference to our hospitals and our districts. They make a difference to those health care providers that are out there trying to take care of the needs of the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

LAMPSON), one of my Texas colleagues who has also worked very hard on these issues, who comes from a background where he has firsthand familiarity with the home health care industry, an individual who has fought hard on behalf of the people of his district and of Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly not near as hard as what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) has. The leadership that he has taken and put forth, both in the Texas legislature as a member of the Texas Senate, and then up here following through has been most appreciated. Without the effort that the gentleman has made, many of our colleagues would not have had the benefit of the knowledge, nor the encouragement to have played much of the role that we have. So we commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and we thank him very much for that.

Mr. Speaker, I was involved in the home health care business. I went to graduate school in hospital administration following college. Then after, I taught school for a number of years. I have basically done three things. I was a schoolteacher. I was involved in local politics. Then I, when I was very much involved with the area agency on aging for southeast Texas, became involved with home health care.

I was a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging in 1995. One of our colleagues spoke a few minutes ago of our elderly seeking the opportunity to live out their years in dignity. Well, at that White House Conference on Aging in 1995, there were basically three goals that were set. They were to save social security, save Medicare, and save the Older Americans Act.

It was felt that, through the 5,000 people or so that participated in that conference, through the many, many, many meetings that took place over 6 or 8 days that we were there, that the primary goal was to give people the opportunity to live in dignity and to be independent in their last years of their lives.

That is what I want to talk about today. I guess it is the state of this Nation's health care that concerns me so greatly, all of us so greatly.

We saw recently, after we passed H.R. 2614, that the Republican leadership combined five bills into a conference report, even though much of what was in those conference reports had not been even considered by the Senate.

Some of the key components, like the Medicare provisions and even the, going back to education for a second, the school construction tax subsidized bonds, none of those were considered by either the House or the Senate.

It is the Democrats who have taken the lead in proposing a balanced package of Medicare and Medicaid restorations. This package ignores the efforts of the President and congressional Democrats to get Republicans to the table to craft such bills.

Instead, Republicans unilaterally put forward this partisan package. It truly bothers me. I am bothered by the Medicare, the Medicaid and the State CHIP provisions in this bill. This portion of the bill has never been acted on by either the House or the Senate.

There are increases of some $31 billion over 5 years for Medicare, Medicaid and State CHIP providers. Of this, 41 percent goes to HMOs with no real guarantee that they will pass the funds on to beneficiaries in the form of enhanced benefits. In fact, there is not even a guarantee that they will have to stay in the communities that they now serve.

So much of the money in this bill is spent on HMOs that there is not enough for hospitals or nursing homes or home health care agencies or hospices or even community mental health centers. Only about 7 percent of the net increase in Medicare spending in the bill will directly benefit Medicare beneficiaries.

□ 1445

While I have my colleague's ear, and while I have the opportunity to visit for a few minutes up here, I would like to make a comment about prescription drugs. It was about a month ago, I think, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, sent a letter to the President outlining a number of health care issues that could be resolved before Congress adjourns. And the President wrote back, and his response said, ''I am extremely disappointed by your determination that it is impossible to pass a voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit this year. I simply disagree. There is indeed time to act, and I urge you to use the final weeks of this Congress to get this important work done. It is the only way we can ensure rapid, substantial, and much-needed relief from the prescription drug costs for all seniors and people with disabilities, including low-income beneficiaries.'' That is what the President said.

Similarly, I signed on to a letter to Speaker HASTERT expressing my concern to learn that he had sent a letter to the President declaring his unwillingness to adopt a real Medicare prescription drug benefit before Congress adjourns this year. I disagreed that it is too late to pass real prescription drug legislation. I urged the Republican leadership to schedule for consideration legislation to improve meaningful drug coverage for all seniors. And has that been done yet? Is it on the schedule? No.

The Republicans' low-income-only prescription drug plan is an empty promise to seniors because it is not a Medicare plan. It would exclude 25 million Medicare beneficiaries from coverage. It includes no real protections or guaranteed benefits. It would provide no help to a majority of even those who would be eligible. It would take years before its coverage provisions would be implemented. And even State officials, who would be responsible for implementing the program, said that they cannot do it. Well, this proposal is really no help at all to seniors who desperately need prescription drug coverage.

We have a responsibility to the American people to act on important issues facing this Nation. It is time to listen to the thousands upon thousands of seniors who have deluged our offices, certainly mine, with heart-wrenching letters of outrageously expensive prescription bills; to hear the stories like that from my own constituent, a widower, of a lady who taught school and died because her insurance company would not pay for the treatment that she needed to save her life from breast cancer.

It is this call for leadership that this Congress has so far refused to answer, and it is time to put the people's interests ahead of the special interests and pass a universal voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit.

One of the things that stuck out in my mind, and it has been a few years now, obviously; but back in that last Presidential campaign, Bob Dole made a comment at some point that in 1965 he voted against Medicare. I think that that was indicative to me of the difference in commitment to honoring the goals that were set by those seniors in the 1995 White House Conference on Aging. The gentleman asked the question properly a few minutes ago: Who is it that is going to be on the side of America and make these things reality for our Nation as we have enjoyed them over the last several decades; those things that have expanded our life-span; that has given us a quality of life to be able to enjoy the last years? It is going to be the Democrats and the Democratic proposals.

I guess the final thing that I can say is that the work that we have done has been done in a manner and a way that families in southeast Texas make decisions, with common sense and fairness. That is what I think we represent, and what our efforts are trying to be. And I thank again and commend the gentleman for his efforts that he has made and the work of all my colleagues in trying to make this become a reality for the United States of America.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a clinical psychologist; we have heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), who has experience in home health care; in a minute I am allowing that we will hear from the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who has a background in pharmacy. But now I want to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS),

an outstanding Member who brings to this body her experience as a registered nurse.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas and appreciate my fellow Members of Congress for the time that we can have to discuss this important topic. We are in the final hours of this 106th Congress. We have passed some spending bills, but there remains still a few more.

When I think of my communities in the district that I represent and the concerns of the people that I represent, and I am so honored to represent them, I know that they look to me and to all of us in the area of health care as the most significant contribution that we can make to their lives here within the Federal Government, whether it is addressing the crisis of the number of uninsured Americans, people who face every day in terror that they will have health care needs that they have no resources to meet, or whether it is the people that I can call up in my mind, those seniors who live in my district who have to choose each day whether to fill their prescriptions, lifesaving prescriptions, or to put food on their table. These are people living on fixed incomes. They are not poverty stricken, but middle-class seniors.

These are issues that we really need to be addressing here. We need to put an affordable voluntary prescription drug opportunity for all seniors within Medicare. We need to address the issues of the uninsured.

I also want to use the minutes that the gentleman has given me to talk about another issue that people in my district have said we should do something about. They want us to do something about those HMOs that are making health care decisions in the place of their doctors.

We have had, we have still, a great opportunity to enact a bipartisan bill that passed here in the House, the Norwood-Dingell patient's bill of rights, 68 Republicans and an overwhelming number of Democrats. A good bill, yet it languishes. This is something we can still do in these last few hours of this session of Congress. It contains critical provisions which, I believe, are key to quality patient care and which come directly from the experiences of people in my district and around this country with their managed care providers and with their insurance companies.

They tell me in my district that they want to be able, as a patient, to choose their own doctors, their own hospital, to see specialists when it is appropriate. They do not appreciate having these decisions being made by insurance clerks and having the doctors told what they cannot and can do. The bill we enacted right in this House would protect medical privacy, guarantee emergency room care, and ensure that health plans cannot interfere when patients enrolled in clinical trials. Most importantly, this bill we passed holds HMOs accountable when they make medical decisions that harm patients.

And this is a sticking point, and this is why there is such tremendous opposition to it right now. But we hold physicians accountable for malpractice. And when insurance companies practice medicine in a way that is not in the interests of the patients, they should be held accountable as well.

I am from California, where HMOs got started; and I have seen for myself in my own experience and those of the people with whom I worked so many years as a school nurse that HMOs have done some wonderful things, such as spreading the availability of preventive care. But over the past decade or so in my district, the power has swung too far into the corner of HMOs and insurance companies making health care decisions and into the area of pursuing profits over patient care. Patients are being cut out of the decision making process of their own health care. Doctors, nurses, other health care professionals are overruled by bean counters and profit takers. The bottom line is what is being intruded into health care, and our health care system is eroded today by mistrust and by anger.

This legislation that we passed here, the model that we could still enact into law, is supported by virtually every major health care organization in this country. As I mentioned, this House passed it by nearly a two-to-one margin last year. The American people support it overwhelmingly. We have no excuse that we cannot afford to do something about this. We have examples of the gentleman's own State where a patient's bill of rights has been in place and where it has worked effectively. It has not cost people more than a dollar or two more in their premiums.

The fear about everything going to the courts has not, in fact, turned that way. A very small number of lawsuits have actually resulted. When we have the example of Texas' patient's bill of rights being put into place, there is absolutely no reason why we should not be addressing this in this session of Congress before we adjourn. Our constituents at home are asking us to do this, and I am urging the leadership in this House and in the Senate and in that conference committee to deal with this before we adjourn.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate so much the experience the gentlewoman brings to this body with her background in nursing. It gives us a unique perspective.

I want to yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY). He was one of the original cosponsors of the Prescription Drug Fairness Act. He comes to this body with a background of training in pharmacy, and I think he brings not only the expertise of pharmacy to bear on these issues but I have found him to bring the common sense of rural Arkansas to bear on these issues, and for that I have been very appreciative. So I am honored to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), my great friend; and I want to commend him for his leadership on health care matters in this Congress and in the time that he has been here. It is nice to be here with my Democratic colleagues today that have all worked so hard to try to improve the health care system in this country.

One of the previous speakers on the Republican side earlier today said it is time for a reality check. I could not agree more. Let us check the reality of the situation we are dealing with today. We are at the end of the session. We are here on a Saturday afternoon and would be proud to be here if we were just taking up the legitimate business of the American people. We have no patient's bill of rights. We have no prescription drug coverage for our senior citizens. That is the reality. We have not made provisions for more reimbursements for our hospitals to keep them in business. They are going broke every day. That is the reality. We have made no provisions to keep our home health care providers in business. That is the reality. Nor to keep our ambulance services in business. That is the reality. We have not made provisions for school bonds, smaller classrooms, after-school classes, teacher training, or any of the education programs that our children so desperately need. That is reality.

Let us talk about what we have done. We passed a patient's bill of rights in a bipartisan way in this House, and the leadership in the House and the Senate killed it in the Senate and in conference in a disgusting way. They should be ashamed of themselves.

They raised, and the Democrats voted against it, I voted against it, but the Republicans raised their own budget. They raised their own spending caps just a few days ago so that they could give an $11.5 billion Christmas present to the HMOs, not to correct these problems I just talked about, not to help our seniors with a prescription drug benefit, not to provide a patient's bill of rights, not to help our hospitals or our health care providers, but to give a Christmas present, granted it would be early, but it would be a nice Christmas present to the insurance companies that have poured money, in an unprecedented way, into their campaigns. That is reality.

□ 1500

Governor Bush stands before the American people and proclaims his great concern for our senior citizens not having prescription medicines. He claims that he almost single-handedly passed a Patients' Bill of Rights in

Texas, which we all know is not right. And he also proclaims that he has this great ability to work in a bipartisan way.

I would suggest to you today, the Democrats are here. We are on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and we are ready to go. We are ready to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. We are ready to pass a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. We are ready to pass increased Medicare reimbursements to keep our hospitals and nursing homes and all of our other health care providers in business, not to enrich them, just keep them in business so that our seniors and our citizens in this country have decent health care in the greatest Nation that has ever been.

And he claims to have this great bipartisan ability. He will not even need bipartisan ability. We are ready to go. The Democrats are here. We are ready to do business. He has got to work on the Republicans. I would suggest, maybe he should call the Speaker Hastert. Maybe he should call the majority leader in the Senate and tell them, ''I am for this.'' That is what he says. He says, I want to help America's seniors. I want to be sure every American that buys health insurance has the opportunity to make their own health care decisions along with their health care professionals. That is what he says. Maybe he should give the majority leader in the House a call. Maybe he should call the whip on the Republican side and say, ''I'm ready to go. Let's just go ahead and do this this fall. It will be great for the campaign. We can say we don't even have to get elected. We have already gotten it done.'' But the reality is they only talk about it.

This is the greatest attempt to deceive a Nation that has ever been. The pharmaceutical manufacturers in this country have poured tens of millions of dollars into this campaign in an attempt to deceive the American people. Any time the American people see this tag line, Citizens for Better Medicare, look out. What they mean is citizens for more profit for the pharmaceutical industry, and we are supporting this candidate because we think they will support us when the time comes, and we think they will protect our outrageous profits at the expense of the wonderful senior citizens in this country. And it has already been mentioned, they are the greatest generation.

It is unbelievable that we are here today and have been fighting this battle for over 2 years. Yet even though we are here on Saturday afternoon, the Democrats virtually alone in their effort to move these issues forward, and it still has not happened. The President is ready to do these; he knows it is the right thing to do. The Republicans claim they are. It is absolutely amazing that we have not been able to get this done. That is the reality check. I thank the gentleman from Texas once again for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY). He has a unique way of bringing it right down to home in good common sense terms. As I asked in my opening remarks for this Special Order hour of the American people, who is on your side, who is fighting for you, I think it is clear that you and the other Democrats in this Congress are working hard to provide the prescription drug benefit, the Patients' Bill of Rights, and funding for the Medicare program that the American people want.

It is almost amazing as I heard you express it when you talked about the issue, when you try to identify who is against these things, who would want this Congress to fail to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights, who would want this Congress to fail to pass a prescription drug benefit for seniors. There are only two groups, the insurance industry and the big pharmaceutical manufacturers. Everybody else would say, ''Let's move on and get the job done.'' As you said, we are here and we are ready to go to work and get it done before this Congress ends.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) brought experience as a pharmacist. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) brought his experience as a clinical psychologist. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) brought her experience as a nurse. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) brought his experience to the table from home health care. It is now an honor and a privilege to yield time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), a medical doctor.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for spending part of your Saturday afternoon with us today.

I had lunch today at a Chinese restaurant. I got the little fortune cookie. I was walking, eating my cookie on the way over here. It said, ''Laughter is the best medicine.'' My experience as a family doctor is the best medicine often causes hysterical laughter because when people get the bills and see what they are paying for these drugs, it is a shocker for them.

My experience as a family physician, and it is a sad experience, is that the patient comes into the doctor, you write out the prescription that you think is the right thing to do and you think this can help that person and they come back a week or two later. I bet the gentlewoman from California has had this experience, the gentleman from Washington has had this experience.

''How are you doing?''

''About the same.''

Well, I wonder what happened. You talk and talk and talk. You finally find out, I went to the pharmacist to get that medicine and they filled it for me, they gave me the bill and I could not afford it, and I decided not to take the medicine. That is the experience in Arkansas, as over a third of our seniors have no drug benefit at all. Also, those are the same group of people, I think it is over 60 percent of our seniors, their only source of income is Social Security. So this problem of not having a prescription drug benefit is a real one.

I was very optimistic when we began this Congress almost 2 years ago that we would do something in Medicare to modernize it. That is all we are asking for. We have a Medicare program. People talk about those bureaucrats in Washington. This is Medicare. They talk about the one-size-fits-all. This is Medicare. It is the Medicare program that my mother relies on, our parents all rely on; but it needs to be updated, and it needs to be updated with a drug program. Here we are on a Saturday afternoon, hoping that somehow in the next week before we finally adjourn that something will occur in this area; but I suspect most of us are not very optimistic that will happen.

The Patients' Bill of Rights. Let me relate another anecdote from my experience as a physician. I think that to me the worst thing I had to do that illustrates why I am a supporter of the Patients' Bill of Rights was I have had several occasions as a family doctor in recent years where if a patient came to see me and they were depressed, they had some mental health problem and I may or may not give them a prescription or do whatever I can do as a family doctor, but I thought they needed counseling and they had an insurance program. I would have to take them in, this is the way their plan worked, I would take them into a room and say, ''Here's the telephone. Here is an 800 phone number; dial this number. You're going to get a complete stranger at the end of that line who will tell you, number one, do you get any counseling, number two, what kind of person will give you that counseling and, number three, how often and for how long a period you will get that counseling.''

Well, that is that person. That is the patient's insurance company. They have made that decision, with their employer perhaps, to choose that insurance company. But my opinion as a health care provider, as a family doctor, if that clerk at the end of that phone is going to make health care decisions, then they should be just as liable as I am if something goes wrong. I see my fellow health care professionals over here also nodding their heads. That is what the most controversial part of the Patients' Bill of Rights is about, that if a health insurance program is going to practice medicine, they should be responsible legally like the rest of us that practice medicine for real. I do not know why that seems to be so controversial, but it is.

A third issue I want to touch on is this issue we have had come up just recently in the last few days with the vote on what was called this tax bill and the Medicare give-back provisions. That deals with the problem that our hospitals are struggling with around the country. A lot of us, I had promised my folks back home, yes, before we are out of here we are going to have some additional money for rural hospitals and health care providers. Lo and behold, I said, it is not going to be a problem because it is bipartisan; there is great support for it.

What happened? Instead of getting the kind of bill we all thought we were going to get, we are getting a bill that gives far too much money to managed care organizations, to HMOs, and not enough to hospitals. It is really difficult to understand at this late hour why on something like that we are here today, why that cannot be worked out so that we can give our health care providers back home some relief.

The last point I would like to make is on campaign finance reform. I think that sadly a lot of us have concluded, we would like these issues to be decided on what is the best policy. Unfortunately, a lot of these issues are being decided by who gives the most money to which party to help their particular position. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is trained as a pharmacist. He actually made most of his money now as a farmer, but he understands these drug issues so well, made mention of Citizens for Better Medicare and the reason that he and I talk about it is that they are now spending a ton of money in the Little Rock media market trying to influence this congressional race we have in South Arkansas.

It is not the race that he and I are involved in in our two districts, but it is in the same media market. The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette had a report come out about a week ago. Citizens for Better Medicare, which is financed by drug company money, these are pharmaceutical companies, has now spent close to $800,000, if not more by this week, to impact that one race. They are opposing the proposals that we all support to include a drug benefit in Medicare.

I do not deny anyone their right to run an ad. I do not deny anyone the right to support whatever candidate they want, but when they call themselves Citizens for Better Medicare, people need to understand and the folks in south Arkansas and in my district also need to understand that Citizens for Better Medicare is drug company money trying to block a drug benefit for Medicare, and that is wrong.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his work today and I thank the Speaker again for being here.

Mr. TURNER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER). I know all of us have been confronted with that front group called Citizens for Better Medicare, which there is no citizens there. It is just the big drug companies pouring money into these issues, trying to influence the outcome of elections, and it is wrong and I hope the American people understand who is on their side and who is fighting for them.

We have only a minute or two left. I want to yield to the gentleman from Washington because he wanted to share some of his thoughts about the unfairness of pouring the lion's share of the money into the HMOs for the Medicare+Choice side instead of giving it to our rural hospitals and other health care providers.

Mr. BAIRD. I will be fairly briefly. Most Americans do not realize it, but there is a tremendous inequity in Medicare compensation in our country today and it works like this: all Americans pay the exact same amount of money into Medicare as a percentage of their salary. But not all Americans receive the same benefit. Depending on where you live in this country, you may receive pharmaceutical benefits, eyeglasses, hearing aids in one part of the country under Medicare, but in another part of the country you may receive none of those benefits and pay a supplemental premium and have to pay copays. This inequity, more than anything else I believe is what we should be correcting in these so-called BBA fixes that we have been trying to pass in the last week, but this bill that came before us this week did not adequately address it. It was painful for many of us who know the desperate straits of our hospitals, who know the desperate straits of our rural health care communities and who also would like to see a minimum wage increase passed to have to vote against that bill because it did not do enough to restore fundamental fairness and equity to the Medicare compensation system. Neither did it do enough to protect our home health agencies, nor did it protect and promise that the money that went to the HMOs would actually get to our hospitals.

I applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) in raising these issues and thank him for his efforts and leadership on this.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD). I appreciate his participation along with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) as we have tried to lay out before the American people the issues to let them have the choice and the decision as to deciding who is on your side on these critical issues. We are going to continue to work to get the job done for the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to spend a few minutes this afternoon discussing the situation we face ourselves today in terms of dealing with the homestretch of the year 2000 election. There is, I understand why we have seen in many expressions of public attitude, a sense of confusion. We have heard the Republican candidate for President, Governor Bush, talk about his concern about the gridlock and partisan bickering here in Washington, D.C., trying to make it some aspect of his campaign, that somehow this would be an advantage of his candidacy, somehow either not knowing, caring or not being honest with the fact that it is his party that is not dealing with allowing partisan solutions to come forward.

As is known to every Member of this Chamber, there was a bipartisan solution to the issue of a Patients' Bill of Rights that was passed with overwhelming Democratic support and a number of Republican supporters as well, a significant majority of this Chamber. But unfortunately the Republican leadership refused to allow a fair and honest discussion of this proposal to move forward and decided to appoint members of the conference committee who actually disagreed with the overwhelming sentiment, the overwhelming bipartisan sentiment of this Chamber.

□ 1515

In the area of efforts to reduce gun violence, we had an historic opportunity last year when finally there was a little glimmer in the United States Senate where there were some provisions that were passed that would have been small steps towards reducing gun violence, a huge concern for people around the country.

One of those, the gun show loophole, for instance, had bipartisan Senate support, would have had an opportunity for passage here, but this legislation has been bottled up in a conference committee by the Republican leadership that will not meet with the Republican Senate leadership and bring legislation to the floor of this Chamber. That juvenile justice conference committee has not met since last summer; not the summer of the year 2000 but since August of 1999, losing an opportunity to have a bipartisan solution towards reducing the epidemic of gun violence.

Perhaps nowhere is the stark differences between the candidates more clear than dealing with the area of the environment, and I wanted to take the opportunity today to have an opportunity to discuss these issues.

I notice that I am joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a senior member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a senior member of the Committee on Resources, someone who has been involved with the issues of the environment since he and I served together as local officials in Oregon more than a decade ago. I am pleased to yield to him at this time for some comments about the environment, the year 2000 election, and the issues that are facing us.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the area of the environment is perhaps where we find the most stark contrast both between the parties here in the House and between the Presidential candidates. For a minute I would like to turn to energy policy because this is very much on the minds of my constituents.

In the West, where there are long distances between towns and many of my constituents live in rural areas, there are no mass transit alternatives and the high price of gasoline is a real problem for my rural communities. Here back, here in the East, where we are stuck today, people are very concerned about projected heating oil shortages, huge run-ups in prices of heating oil and, of course, the energy industry not being particularly competitive. The natural gas folks have taken the opportunity to quickly jack up the price of natural gas to follow that of oil. So even if adequate supplies are available for people in the East to heat their homes during this coming cold winter, the prices are going to be considerably higher than last year.

So I believe it is worth examining, particularly, the two candidates for President on the issue of the future of energy policy and how we got here. How did we get into this pickle? Did we not learn back with the gas crunch, back in the 1970s, when people had to stand in line and they had what, the red and the green flags? And people got in fights in lines for gas stations, and you would have to get up two hours before you went to work to go sit in line to buy gasoline for your car. It seemed initially that the U.S. learned a lesson.

In the Carter administration, we began a very aggressive policy of development of alternative fuels, conservation, renewable resources; but it all came to a screeching halt with the election of Ronald Reagan. And unfortunately, although the Clinton administration has tried to restore funding in those areas, we have to remember that for the last 6 years, 6 years, Governor Bush likes to talk about well, why has the Vice President not delivered on this or that or that? Why has he not done more on conservation renewable resources, because he has been confronted with a Republican majority who is in thrall to the oil companies. That is why. They do not want conservation renewables. They do not want alternative energy development, and it is really clear. If we just look at this year's budget, we would see that as of this date, the Republicans have cut renewable energy resource $106 million below the President's request in the energy and water bill, and passed a $211 million cut in the President's request for energy research in the Interior bill.

What is their solution? Well, we are not quite sure. I mean, Governor Bush and a number of prominent Republicans have talked about drilling in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

Now let us set aside the issues of that spectacular and distant place and the potential for environmental degradation. Just look at the practicality of what they propose. It is laughable. The pipeline today, which is coming from Prudhoe Bay, and I have been to this area, is full. It is full. And it is pumping oil as quickly as it can to the coast, where it is being loaded as quickly as they can on tankers. Now, that should be of some help to us, particularly in the West. But guess what? The Republicans passed legislation at the request of two oil companies in 1996 to export all of Alaska's oil.

They have a short memory. We made a promise to the American people. The American people paid for that pipeline, and they were promised none of that oil will go overseas. Guess what? Every single drop is going to Japan and China, where they are paying a lower wholesale price than the same oil companies are charging their refineries on the West Coast for oil which they obtained elsewhere, but profits are up 300 percent. So their solution is we should drill in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, I guess so we can export oil more quickly to Japan and China.

I am not quite certain how that helps, but that is the one thing that Governor Bush has been able to say about this.

It is clear he cannot say much more, nor can the Republicans over there if we look at the campaign and expenditure reports: Massive contributions from the oil industry. I mean, it is pennies to the oil industry. Their profits are up 300 percent; seven billion dollars in the last quarter, an absolute record. They do not want anybody to rain on their parade, and raining on their parade means we do serious things in this country for energy independence, for conservation, renewable resources, fuel economy standards, mass transit. And time and time and time again our colleagues on that side of the aisle try and kill mass transit. They are engaged right now in trying to kill off Amtrak, becoming the only major industrial nation on Earth without a passenger railroad.

They have sat back and delayed better fuel economy standards. Do you really believe Detroit cannot make more economical automobiles? I really think they could; but if they are not forced to do it, well, why should they? And our colleagues on that side of the aisle have been very willingly working with the oil companies and a few of the automobile companies to set back those standards. They do not want to save oil. They do not want to save gas. In fact, former Representative Cheney, the Vice Presidential candidate, felt that his job as the CEO of the Haliburton Company, an oil exploration company, was to drive up the price of oil and he was engaged, as CEO of that company, in colluding with the OPEC countries and advising them to restrict production to drive up the price.

Of course, it helped his stock options when he left the company. He said very proudly in the debate with Senator LIEBERMAN that he had not made his dollars in the public sector; he made them in the private sector. Well, guess what? He was playing golf 5 years ago as a lobbyist, a former Member of Congress, with the CEO of Haliburton who took a real liking to him. They had a great time, a good round. He said, I think you ought to take my job, Dick. I am retiring. And he did. So he went from a guy with a lot less than a million bucks to a guy with many millions by working for this oil company.

So we have to wonder, who is going to dictate oil policy in the coming administration?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I too was struck by that comment about having made his money in the private sector, not sullying himself with government. But is it not true that the company for which he went to work and some of the performance bonuses that he has earned have been a result of massive government contracts, for example, with the military?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, if the gentleman would yield back, in fact, yes, Haliburton had very large government contracts; and I am certain being a former Defense Secretary may have helped a little bit there, but there is also now some question being raised about whether or not in carrying out those contracts that there was some impropriety. And, in fact, there are investigations ongoing on whether or not the taxpayers were defrauded.

So not only was the gentleman given a job which took him from being worth not very much to being a multimillionaire in a very short period of time, in conducting that job, his company was doing business with the Defense Department, where he formerly was head of the Defense Department, and is now under investigation for impropriety. And, thirdly, of course, one way they did raise their profits was by laying off lots of American workers. So this is really a record to brag about.

All that leads back to the point that I was trying to make earlier, which is

the Governor of Texas came up through the oil industry, has received massive campaign contributions from the oil industry. His Vice President worked in an oil services industry and has become a multimillionaire by dint of a very short stint there and some very generous stock options and other pensions and things. And their public articulations are ridiculous on the issue of energy independence or getting down the cost of fuel in this country, conservation or renewables.

They are proposing things that are absurd. Drill ANWR to ship more oil, which they support, to Japan and China, I guess. Yeah, they need oil and gas in Japan and China. I grant you that. So I really have got to wonder what the future would look like for Americans if we find that Exxon, Mobile, BP, Amoco and whatever the name of the one giant oil company is these days is sitting right there in the White House. I do not think that that is going to be a very pleasant future for American consumers and people certainly need to think about that.

Not only is there an environmental threat from not dealing with energy efficiency and conservation and renewable resources, which is very large and goes to the issues of global warming which they do not believe in, but there is also an immediate threat to the American public and to the American consumers from the outrageous and extortionate prices that they are being charged by the oil cartels under the excuse of restrictions with the OPEC countries which Vice Presidential nominee Cheney advised the OPEC countries to do. But perhaps since he gave them that advice when he was an oil executive, if he becomes Vice President he will give them different advice and tell them to raise production and lower prices. We can only hope that he will be more generous and enlightened if he achieves office.

I would be happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman referencing the issues that we are facing regarding energy and global warming. These are part and parcel of the critical elements that we are facing here in the year 2000 election. I do not think it has been given quite the currency that one would have liked. But just again today on the editorial page of The New York Times, there was a reference to a new report that is coming forward, the third report from the group that was set up after the Kyoto Accords to try and monitor this, with over 50 recognized experts now finding not only is the consensus of scientific opinion stronger than ever that we have, in fact, contributed to the impacts of global warming that, in fact, it is accelerating but that it may be actually worse than we thought over the course of the next 100 years; that the increase in temperature may be over 10 degrees Fahrenheit over the course of the next century. And in that context we are faced with a Republican ticket that does not have a program or a proposal dealing with global warming.

In fact, George Bush, Sr., derided Vice President GORE for his interest, his concern and his leadership about this issue. You may recall him being dismissed as the ozone man in the 1992 elections.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would yield on that a second, we might note that this spring the depletion of the ozone layer over Antarctica is the worst in recorded history and extends well up above parts of New Zealand and Australia, and last summer for the first time we had significant ozone problems over the North Pole. So it is extraordinary that anybody would have derided someone for raising that very serious issue, both of global warming and ozone depletion, which is so detrimental to the future of our planet.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would just take just one brief pause here, reclaiming my time, because I think it does touch on another central issue of the year 2000 election, and that is the incredible claim that is being made by some that there is basically no difference between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush in terms of which of these gentlemen would be elected to be President.

□ 1530

In fact, I found it interesting that there are some who are claiming, first among them Ralph Nader, a gentleman who for years I have watched, and I have admired some of his work; just right out of college, one of my first opportunities for public service was at a local university where I had a chance to play a small role in helping facilitate the Student Interest Research Group in Oregon. I admired Mr. Nader and some of the Raiders. But somehow, to hear Mr. Nader suggest that people should vote for him because there is no difference between the two candidates strikes me as outrageous. I think there will be an opportunity in the course of our conversation here to point out some of those differences.

I note with interest that the Republican Party is now starting to use some of the words of Ralph Nader. They are putting on in effect ads for Nader, because they are hopeful that they can use this to undermine the support for the Vice President. I guess it is something that one has come to expect from the Republican campaign; and sadly, I am hearing from Mr. Nader that they cannot quite distinguish the difference. They are unaware of the difference between, or they are not willing to admit the difference between the two gentlemen on issues of reproductive freedom, which has inspired the National Organization for Reproductive Rights, NARAL, to have to take out ads pointing out the threat that would be posed to women's right to choose her reproductive health options. Governor Bush does not support a woman's right to choose, versus the President in the form of AL GORE who does, and the impact that this would have on the decisions for people that would be appointed to the Supreme Court.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, sometimes we have to find a little humor in dire circumstances. I did see a cartoon which is very illustrative of the difference between Governor Bush and Vice President GORE on appointments on the Supreme Court. It was a cartoon which showed a Supreme Court made up entirely of Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas. Of course, Governor Bush has said, and remember, his father thought that Mr. Thomas was the most qualified person for the job, and now, of course, his son has said that he thinks that Thomas, being loyal to his dad, I guess, and Scalia are the shining lights on the Supreme Court and he wants to replicate them on the Supreme Court. His appointments would be more Scalias and Thomases.

Well, we can throw out a woman's right to choice with the first appointment of a Scalia or Thomas clone. With the second appointment of a Scalia or Thomas clone, we can throw out the Civil Rights Act and a whole lot of other very important Federal laws that are based on Supreme Court decisions that would be revisited by a very radical right-wing court, and that is inevitable under his stewardship as President.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, just reclaiming my time briefly, it is interesting that people are talking about the fluid political situation that this Presidential election, it seems that each poll shows jockeying around the country and there are people looking at whether or not they are ahead in the electoral college or not, but clearly it is a fluid situation and I think most commentators believe in the next 10 days it could go either way. Certainly we have watched the struggle for control of the House of Representatives. Most pundits feel the House is very much in play. Some even think that it is possible that the Senate may change hands, but certainly there is a momentum toward the Democratic side over there.

One thing that we have not talked about is how much in play the third branch of government is, the Supreme Court, and I appreciate the gentleman's reference to the close nature of many sensitive decisions. The Washington Post recently had an analysis of the recently concluded term of the Supreme Court, where they analyzed 19 key decisions, and eight of the 19 decisions were 5–4 decisions that could turn

on the appointment of, as the gentleman says, one or two justices.

We have recently completed the longest period in 177 years without an appointment to the Supreme Court; 177 years have passed since we had this period of over 6 years before an appointment. We have three over the age of 70 who are on the Supreme Court; we have some who are cancer survivors. There is, in all likelihood, significant changes that are going to take place, and whether it is dealing with the environment, a woman's right to choose, civil rights, as the gentleman mentioned, or the balance between the Federal and State governments, there are huge issues that hang in the balance, and perhaps at no time in our Nation's history for the last 40 or 50 years has the Supreme Court been so in potential of having a dramatic shift.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, a lot of the public does not focus on this on a daily basis, and neither do I. I mean, the Supreme Court is that building over there somewhere. But that is the bulwark we have against bad legislation, bad laws in this country. It is the bulwark we have for our Bill of Rights, our precious individual liberties. Just recently, snuck through the Congress in the intelligence bill is an Official Secrets Act for the United States of America.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I beg your pardon?

Mr. DEFAZIO. An Official Secrets Act. It was made part of the intelligence bill which, of course, we cannot read before we vote on it, and it was put in it before anyone knew it was there. They do have a special room where you can go and read it if you want, but you cannot talk about it, so I do not go and read it. But they put in a clause which would establish an Official Secrets Act in the United States of America. Not even just for national defense purposes, but for anything that any government bureaucrat who is anywhere in the government who has a stamp that says, classified, they can stamp anything on their desk ''classified,'' and anybody who discloses it or second- or third-hand prints it in the newspaper or talks about it, even a Member of Congress, would be subject to criminal penalties.

Now, would we ever know about the problems created at the Department of Defense in acquisition or the problems in other parts of the government if all of the States could just be simply classified? So we are going to be turning to the next Supreme Court unless we can get this bill vetoed by the President and sent back down here to strip out the new Official Secrets Act. We will be turning to the next Supreme Court to see whether or not our precious liberties maintain any sort of modicum of control over the government. I mean that is extraordinary. Just think about it. It is not just the woman's right to choice. It is civil liberties, it is States' rights, and in this case, it is free speech. And these things are all important.

Mr. Speaker, our current obscene system of campaign finance came from a bad Supreme Court decision. The American people are pretty sick of what is going on with the just unbelievable millions and billions of dollars this year, more than $1 billion, being spent on the campaigns for elected office, and that is a result of a well thought-out reform adopted after the Watergate scandal being thrown out in a bad Supreme Court decision. They affect our everyday lives. It is important. And to have Governor Bush say he wants to have Scalia, Thomas, Scalia, Thomas, Scalia, Thomas as the Supreme Court, and we look at their decisions. It is going to be a very grim day if we care about any of those things.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, briefly reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and I think we ought to note at this point that it actually goes, of course, far beyond the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is the ultimate law of the land. It does symbolically capture our attention; it is something we can focus on. But, of course, as the gentleman well knows, we rely heavily, in terms of our work in the Federal Government, in enforcement of rights from environment to choice to consumer protection; it is a rare decision that gets to the Supreme Court.

Day in, day out, these are decisions that are made in the Federal district courts and circuit courts where there has been a log jam that has been created, and again, because the Republicans in the Senate have refused to move forward in a bipartisan way for an appointment to lower-court positions. Oftentimes, these are incredibly well-qualified people, where there is bipartisan support back home. But there is a backlog now, and the floodgates are going to be loose for the next administration, and there will be hundreds of judicial appointments that will seize and control the character of the judiciary for a generation to come.

I would note that we have been joined by our colleague from the State of Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), and I am happy to yield to her if she wishes to continue the colloquy.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we look at this election and look at what it means to people, I think sometimes as we talk about in this Congress, we have actually stopped a lot of environmental riders. Well, what are riders? What does that mean? What does really affect people in their everyday lives? All I have to do is look back at the time when in 1994, 6 short years ago, when Gingrich and gang took over and some of the policies that they tried to put into effect. I mean whether it was doing away with our clean drinking water amendments or our clean air provisions and laws, and what does that mean to real people.

Well, first of all, when we do not have clean air and we have any kind of a lung problem or one has asthma, I mean, this is devastating to someone if they do not have clean air to breath. Look at the Bush record and look at what has happened in Texas, and they have some of the worst air pollution in the world. Well, if I have any kind of a respiratory problem, I do not want to live there. I want to make sure our State and our Nation has clean air to breathe. If we look at people's everyday health and how it relates to water, would it not be a shame if one went to the faucet, took a glass, filled it full of water and said well, I really cannot drink that. I have to buy bottled water and the cost of that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time briefly, I appreciate the gentlewoman's references to the issue of clean air, because this is something research is showing is not just a transitory problem. We have just had published a report in Southern California, which is now no longer the smog capital of the United States.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. It used to be.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. That honor, that distinction has been claimed by Houston during the course of Governor Bush's term of office, that losing this lung function over the course of a few years becomes permanent. They have been able to identify that the smog in Southern California reduces the growth of lung capacity 10 percent and makes people more likely for a lifetime to be hospitalized, for example, for asthma attacks. When we look at the record of Governor Bush in Texas, the smog problems in Texas cities have actually increased in the 6 years that he has been governor.

Mr. Speaker, Texas ranks first in the Nation in toxic air emissions from industrial facilities, discharging over 100 million pounds of cancer-causing pollutants and other contaminants in the air annually. Of the 50 largest industrial companies in Texas, 28 violate the Clean Air Act. Currently, the areas of Houston, Galveston, Dallas, Fort Worth, El Paso, Beaumont, Port Arthur are in violation of Federal clean air standards for ozone pollution. As I mentioned, for the second year in a row, Houston is the smog capital of the United States, surpassing Los Angeles.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman talks about that, again, we have to say well, so what, it is the smoggiest place; but how does it affect people? Well, asthma is now the number one reason that children miss school, the number one reason for absenteeism in our schools today. That is directly related to what the gentleman was just talking about; it is our air and

whether or not it is clean air or dirty air.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that if Governor Bush was concerned about that environmental threat, we would have seen some manifestation of it, some energy, some passion.

□ 1545

Mr. BLUMENAUER. As Governor-elect, Bush opposed new vehicle emissions testing programs that had been designed and contracted by the State to implement the 1990 Clean Air Act. He called it onerous and inconvenient. As Governor in 1995, he worked out a deal with his legislature to overturn the centralized inspections, because it was too inconvenient. Instead, the decentralized system, similar to the old system except it costs more, the tests were less accurate, and it was easier to evade.

Now we are in a situation. Dallas, for instance, is in noncompliance. His response in the case of Dallas was to argue with EPA to change how they were testing the methodology, not clean it up.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, that is the interesting way to deal with air pollution, of course, would be to the change the standards. I think we can actually expect in a Bush Presidency, if there should continue to be a Republican Congress, that that would happen.

I remember the bad old days before we had a Federal Clean Air Act, and as a concerned graduate student at the University of Oregon, went to a meeting with people concerned about pollution from a local company. And this was before we had a Federal law and the representative of this rather large company that is now known and advertises widely for being environmentally responsible was to say, that is the smell of jobs, and if you do not like it, we will move to Idaho, because they do not care.

Mr. Speaker, that is what happens if you dismantle strong Federal standards, which is exactly what we know would happen under a Bush-Cheney Presidency, if they had a compliant Congress.

Let me just turn for a second for clean water. We take it for granted. Water is going to become one of the most precious commodities in this century. Wars will be fought over water according to the CIA. In fact, we are close to that in some parts of the world. We are running out of potable water. We take a lot for granted.

At the height of the Republican revolution here, I sat on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, we had a markup that went on for 5 days. We were working on a piece of legislation to reauthorize the expired Clean Water Act. We went through amendment after amendment, trying to fix the problems with the law and lock step, 100 percent of the Republicans voted against us, the Democrats in the minority, and that bill went through the House.

And if Bill Clinton, if we had not had a President downtown saying if that bill gets near my desk, I will veto it, shred it and destroy it, that probably would have become the law of the land, and it would have taken us back actually to the days when any industry anywhere could dump.

This bill actually embodied a new principle, and this is free market economics. Anybody who wants to can dump whatever they want in the water, and the bill said the public would be obligated if they wanted to use the water for something other than a sewer to clean it back up. It would have taken us back to the 1950s and early 1960s when we had rivers here in the eastern United States that actually caught fire. A lot of people are too young to remember that today. That actually happened, the Cuyahoga River and other rivers, they caught fire, they were so polluted, they were so dead.

The Willamette River in our own State was an open cesspool, and it is only because of Federal laws that many of these rivers have begun, begun to restore their health.

We are not yet done with that journey, and it is going to come to a screeching halt if not turning back the clock with a Bush Presidency.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If I may just reclaim my time briefly, I want to just follow up on one of the gentleman's points, because today many people take for granted the protections of the Clean Water Act. They take for granted some of the progress that came, as the gentleman mentioned, at the expense of a lot of time, money, energy and struggle.

One of the members of the ticket, Secretary Cheney, who has a record that he compiled as a Member of this Chamber, and when we look back at what his work is there, it gives us some sense, perhaps, of his values and what it brings to the Republican ticket.

Mr. DEFAZIO. A voting record is a very good way to understand someone's future conduct.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we look at the voting record of then-Representative Cheney, he voted seven times against authorizing clean water programs, often as one of a small minority who voted against authorization.

In 1986, he was one of only 21 Members who voted against the override of President Reagan of the appropriations to carry out the Clean Water Act, one of only 26 Members to vote against overriding the veto of the Clean Water Act, a lifetime record, according to the League of Conservation Voters of 13 percent, one of the worst of that generation.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am going to go back to clean air for just a minute. I know we have been talking about clean water. I want to go back to clean air for just a minute.

The gentleman was talking about the voting record of Governor Bush or the State he presides over, and the gentleman talked about when the pollution went up in Dallas, not wanting to do emission tests because it was inconvenient and it was costly.

I had the privilege, I guess, of going to school in Southern California for a couple of years, and the first 2 months I was at school, September and October, I was sick the entire time. I did not know what was wrong with me.

Finally, I went to a doctor, then I went to another doctor, because I had no idea why I felt so lousy. And then one day, I woke up, and there were mountains behind the college. I said, where did they come from? A miracle has happened. There are mountains back here. We finally discovered it was the air pollution that had made me sick for 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, in our State, where we do have mandatory vehicle emissions, I go have those. And, yes, it is a little bit inconvenient. It costs me some money, but having had that experience of what happens when you have dirty air, I now gladly go and get my car tested to make sure that I am driving a car that does not pollute.

I just think that is what happens to people every single stinking day that you have that kind of air pollution. People become sick, and it may be inconvenient to go and get your car tested, but let me tell my colleagues, it is a lot more inconvenient to be sick, it is a lot more inconvenient to be in the hospital, and when you look at the number of students that miss school every single year because of their asthma problems, I will tell my colleagues it is well worth it. I cannot imagine having a President who would not care about our clean air.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The comments the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is making in terms of her personal commitment to the environment, actually, we know from survey research that the American public is willing to pay a little bit for clean air. They are willing to pay a little bit for clean water.

They know that investing in the long run in the environment is something that is important for their future and their children's future. That is why as we look at the two candidates and compare their performances, compare their platforms and their ideals, looking at the performance in the State of Texas is so unnerving for me. Texas ranks near the bottom of all the States in the union in the investments that they make to try and clean up the environment.

One would think that a large State with such huge environmental problems would be maybe working a little harder. But the State of Texas ranks 44th out of all the States in per capita spending on environmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, they are the third worst in the country for toxic water pollution. When we look at areas, for instance, like open space and public lands, the Bush-Cheney ticket has responded that maybe they would like to undo some of the monument designations that we have seen this administration step forward, but looking at what they have done in the State of Texas. Texas ranks 49th out of the States in the amount of money it spends on its State parks.

Governor Bush appointed a commission to look at those problems. I will say that this is an area that has had bipartisan support around the country. Republicans and Democrats in our State support public space, open space, parks.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. They have done it with their dollars, by the way.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. They have stepped up, they approved local initiatives. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is on the Committee on Resources that has been working with the interesting leadership of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to craft CARA, which is currently dead in the Senate, because the Republican leadership will not allow it to be voted on, that passed here overwhelmingly with bipartisan support; but in Texas, the governor appointed a commission to look at it and then would not support that commission's efforts to solve the problems.

They wanted to remove a cap on the sporting goods tax to increase their revenues. He did not support the proposal. The measure died.

He created this task force and ignored the request for additional funding. A year ago on the campaign trail, Governor Bush did not even know how to respond to a question about the CARA legislation. He did not know whether he supported it or not. He certainly has not added his voice to try and break the partisan gridlock on the part of the Republicans in the Senate right now so he could get CARA through this Chamber.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would yield on that, there may be two reasons for Governor Bush opposing this wonderful new program that would not have cost the American taxpayers a penny to better take care of our public lands, to enhance open space, acquire park lands from willing sellers with great private property protections in the bill.

I think perhaps it goes back to where we started our discussion, because this thread runs through everything. Dirty air down in Texas is principally due to pollution by the oil industry.

The money for the CARA bill is money that comes from lease charges offshore oil and gas drilling. These are public lands. These are public resources. We exact a modest royalty when the oil companies do not defraud the taxpayers, for the extraction of that oil and gas. And the law has said for more than 20 years that that money is supposed to flow to the acquisition of open space, conservation, and park lands. And it has not.

Finally, in a bipartisan basis, this Congress came together and said enough is enough. We are going to take that money that is being paid by those oil and gas companies, and we are going to use it for the purpose for which it is intended. We are not going to steal it, and spend it on some other part of the Federal Government or the Pentagon or anything else.

Perhaps Governor Bush's concerns come back to the oil industry again, since he made his fortune drilling rather unsuccessfully for oil, but that is not a prerequisite to making money in that industry. Or Vice Presidential nominee Cheney, who headed up an oil services company that consulted with the OPEC countries and got them to successfully constrain production to drive up the prices, also did well in the industry.

If I could just reference one thing from yesterday that many people might have missed on the floor, we had a debate over something called POGO, not the comic strip; but POGO is the scandal, where a number of oil companies defrauded the Federal Government. That is, the taxpayers of the United States, from paying their lawful fees for the extraction of oil and gas from Federal lands, from lands that were owned by all the people of the United States.

They essentially plea bargained to a one half of a $1 billion settlement. We do not know really how much they stole; but they plea bargained to that. But this Republican Congress has spent all of its time trying to investigate the people who blew the whistle, not the oil company executives who defrauded the American people of hundreds of millions of dollars. But let us find and get and harass those whistleblowers in the Federal Government who exposed this.

□ 1600

Do we think that those whistleblowers would be able to keep their jobs in a Bush-Cheney oil company administration? I do not believe so.

So to say there is no difference between the candidates for President is absurd, and particularly on all these strains that can come back to the tentacles of the oil industry which has had the largest profits and the largest increase in profits in its history in this last quarter, gouging the Americans every day at the pump, and is responsible for many of the problems we have talked about. Now we are going to put their folks in the White House. I hope not.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, going back to talk about CARA for a minute and, again, a program that really provides open space, provides public lands, makes sure that we take care of our coastline and our coastal resources, and, again, it does not cost the taxpayers money because it comes from the drilling offshore. I believe that program, not only was supported in a huge way here, in a bipartisan way, but supported by most of the Governors in the states.

Now, I do not know, and maybe one of the gentlemen know, whether Bush supported that as Governor of Texas. I am asking my colleagues that because he keeps talking about, ''well, I want to work in a bipartisan way, and I can get the job done.'' I cannot tell my colleagues how many times I have heard ''I can get the job done. I can go work in a bipartisan way. I will get results.''

I wish he would pick up the phone and make a call to the Senate President and the Speaker of the House if he cares about that issue or any other issue that we have been dealing with here. I mean, we can go into real Patients' Bill of Rights. He says he supports that, even though he did not.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, he vetoed it.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. He vetoed it, right.

Mr. DEFAZIO. It came along without his signature.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. But he says he supports it. But I am just saying he keeps talking about how he can get this done in a bipartisan way. I wished he would pick up the phone and call some of these people.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that sentiment.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know if he supported CARA?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that he is now supportive.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Oh, he did not know about it. That is right, he did not know about it. When all the other governors supported it, he did not know about it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Yes. In response to a direct question, he was unable to indicate whether or not he supported it. He just did not know how to answer that question, according to the San Antonio Express News of June 15, 1999.

But having attempted to do something in Texas, falling short of the mark, not supporting them, it would seem this would be a classic opportunity if he now supports it, if it is ''free money from the Federal Government'', and if he opposes ''partisan bickering'', maybe he can intervene

and say something to the Republican leadership so all it has to do is be voted on. Because we all know, if it were brought to a vote on the floor of the Senate, it would pass overwhelmingly because it is supported by the American public. It just makes too much sense.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, do we need to give him the phone numbers of those people?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is a concern. But it seems to me that we take a step back and we look at the approach that has been offered up.

We have talked a little bit about air quality problems in the State of Texas, which are substantial, and they are getting worse as it relates to other parts of the country. Governor Bush has touted his voluntary program to deal with over 700 factories that are not meeting the air quality standards. Many of these have been grandfathered in.

The approach that was touted by Governor Bush under legislation in Texas over a year ago, Senate bill, S. 767, was basically voluntary compliance. Well, in the face of this voluntary compliance, the Texas Air Crisis Campaign has gone back and looked at what has actually happened in the State of Texas.

Of these over 700 factories, only a small number have stepped forward and done anything. The total amount of harmful air pollution from these few dozen plants that are doing anything at all has reduced harmful air pollution by less than one-third of 1 percent. It is an approach that I think is something that most people would not be very excited about applied on the Federal level.

But if we are going to have appointees that are drawn from the ranks of the people that are supposed to be regulated, if we are going to have a judiciary that is populated with people who are hostile to the notion of government regulation, we may be forced to rely on this approach. I think the report is such that it would be a sad one in terms of actually producing results.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I could not find this earlier in my notes. I know we have covered a lot of ground here, but there is so much to talk about that the conventional press is not talking about.

He mentioned the ties of Vice Presidential nominee, former Representative, former Secretary of Defense, former Halliburton Company executive, Mr. Cheney. Mr. Cheney, again, was chief executive for a short 4 or 5 years of this oil services company. During that time, and he says, again, if we recall, nothing to do with the public the fact that they gifted him with $30 million for his tenure there, 5 years.

Well, their government contracts during that time period doubled to $2.3 billion. Their two largest customers were, surprise, the United States Department of Defense. Former Secretary Cheney of the revolving door managed to get them contracts with the agency which he headed until just a year or two before that. They also had a contract from the British Defense Ministry.

Then they raked in another $1.5 billion in government loans from the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, up from $100 million before Mr. Cheney took over.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But it had nothing to do with the government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the private sector making money off the government. But that is his proud record. I think that causes some grave concern. I mean, not only as chief executive was he involved in colluding with the oil ministers of the OPEC countries and urging them to drive up the price of oil, and he succeeded in that effort, but, then after he finished raising the price of our oil and gas by colluding with OPEC, he then turned to the Federal taxpayers to greatly enrich his company, and then to provide him with a huge payoff as he left.

But, remember, he did take some tough steps while he was there. He did lay off several thousand American workers. So he certainly deserved that $30 million golden parachute when he left. We can certainly understand that.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is probably a very small amount of money compared to all the money he brought in off of government.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are reaching the last 4, 5 minutes of our discussion here today. I did want to accord the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) some time if she had some concluding thoughts about the impact of the 2000 election, the environment and the choices that we are faced.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think this is, and people have said it before, this is probably one of the most important elections we will ever have. It is interesting. I turned on the news last night when I got home, and I watched them talking to many people who were undecided. One of the things they said over and over again was, well, there is not much difference between the two of them. Well, we like one. We know he does not know much, but we do not like his personality much. So those were the kinds of information that they were talking to the press about. Or I do not know whether I am going to vote.

I guess I want people to keep a couple of things in mind as this election comes up. First of all, one of the things that makes this country so great is that people participate. So voting is absolutely critical. It is really all about democracy. If we want to keep this democracy going, then people really need to participate, and they need to do that by voting.

Then I think they have to really think through what a President does. I mean, a President deals with the Congress. They deal with policy that affects everyday people's lives, day in and day out, whether it is if they can go and afford their prescription drugs, whether there is a safety net for them with Social Security so that, when they retire, if they do not have much money, like my mom did. I mean, she had $72 a month in her retirement plan. She could not have survived without Social Security.

It is the roads we built. It is making sure that we keep our Nation free. It is how they deal with foreign policy. It is who appoints the Supreme Court. It is who sets the policy, and are they looking out for just a few people, or are they looking out for all of us.

I want them to think very, very carefully about this election. I want them to vote. But this decision is in their hands about who is it that they want for President, to think through the kind of person they want as President and the skills that person has to help each person in this country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, just on the theme of voting, I hear many of the same things that the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) heard on television last night from some of my own constituents. The government is not relevant to me. What you are doing is not relevant to me.

Well, a lot of times it is not. They are right. The fact that we investigate whistleblowers and not oil price company fixing or stealing money from the American taxpayers, it is right, the government is not relevant to their concerns. It is not relevant, because they did not vote. If one does not vote, the government is going to be run by the special interests who are funding many of the campaigns. People must vote. They have to go out and vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an appropriate tenor on which to close our discussion, because there are opportunities from coast to coast for people to make a difference in this election, because it is so close.

It seems to me that it is important. It is one of the things I could not disagree with Mr. Nader more strongly. There is a huge difference between the record of the most environmentally sensitive Vice President since Teddy Roosevelt, an administration that has done an excellent job with the environment, not everything, maybe, that some of us would want, but as my colleagues have pointed out, having to actually hold back the tide from an antienvironmental Congress led by Republicans who were not sympathetic.

It seems to me that this is an opportunity for Americans to look very

clearly at what they want in terms of an administration that is going to govern, not just for 4 years, but is going to determine a judiciary for a generation.

I would hope that people would, in fact, focus on the difference between performance and make a difference, not pretend to send a message, but to really take that vote in a way that will make a difference in terms of the President, in terms of the Congress, in terms of providing the type of political representation they want.

It seems to me that, when we have the most competitive Presidential race in 40 years, the most competitive Congressional race in half a century, and a situation, as I mentioned, we have not seen with the Supreme Court in 177 years, and all of them converge at the same time in this election, it is critical for people to cast that vote carefully because it is going to make a huge difference for them, their children, and for generations to come.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 29 on account of business in the district.

Mr. GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 11:00 a.m. on account of personal reasons.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, today and October 29.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1761. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conserve and enhance the water supplies of the Lower Rio Grande Valley; to the Committee on Resources.

S. Con. Res. 138. concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a day of peace and sharing should be established at the beginning of each year; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2780. An act to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults.

H.R. 2884. An act to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 4404. An act to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4957. An act to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the legislative authority for the Black Patriots Foundation to establish a commemorative work.

H.R. 5083. An act to extend the authority of the Los Angeles Unified School District to use certain park lands in the City of South Gate, California, which were acquired with amounts provided from the land and water conservation fund, for elementary school purposes.

H.R. 5157. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure preservation of the records of the Freedmen's Bureau.

H.R. 5314. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the adoption of retired military dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs.

H.R. 5331. An act to authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass.

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 614. An act to provide for regulatory reform in order to encourage investment, business, and economic development with respect to activities conducted on Indian lands.

S. 835. An act to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1586. An act to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2719. An act to provide for business development and trade promotion for Native Americans, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site in the State of Colorado.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, October 29, 2000, at 6 p.m.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1689. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 2580. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4548. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4585. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4725. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4857. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REYES:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of locating a national immigration museum in El Paso, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H. Res. 661. A resolution supporting youth civic literacy in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1275: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 1512: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3842: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 5185: Mr. PAYNE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2000

HON. JOHN B. LARSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my bill, the Energy Independence Act, designed to ensure the energy self-sufficiency of the United States by the year 2010 through targeted investments in an emerging green energy technology called fuel cells.

We have before us, for the first time in human history, the technology to provide clean, reliable energy for every person, home, business, and vehicle in America. With this technology, we have the opportunity to end once and for all America's reliance on foreign energy sources while at the same time creating quality jobs for the next century in a new and expanding technological field.

The technology I refer to is called a fuel cell. This technology has been with us since it was first used to power the Gemini and Apollo spacecraft, and is still powering NASA's fleet of space shuttles. It has finally matured to a point where stationary power plants are providing reliable commercial power today and is prepared to demonstrate its advantages to the general public in clean, quiet, and efficient residential, bus, and car applications.

Current stationary fuel cell demonstrations within the Department of Defense have showed an energy cost savings of over $3 million, and another unit in service at South County Hospital in Rhode Island is saving an estimated $60,000 to $90,000 in energy costs per year. Perhaps the most important attribute of stationary fuel cell power generators in the new, high tech economy is that they nearly eliminate brownouts and other power outages that disrupt the sophisticated and critical systems operating many businesses today. For example, at the First National Bank of Omaha in Nebraska, where milliseconds without power can mean millions of dollars in lost revenues, the stationary fuel cell installed as the major component of an integrated assured power system is helping to provide power at 99.9999 percent reliability, which is equal to a power interruption of one minute every six years.

The environmental benefits of this new technology are also astounding. For example, the PC25 stationary power plant, which is the only commercially available until today, has been installed at 29 Department of Defense facilities throughout the United States since 1995. These fuel cells are estimated to have eliminated 399 tons of SO_x, 159 tons of NO_x, and over 20,000 tons of CO_2. Compared to a typical combustion-based generator, each individual fuel cell unit eliminates more than 40,000 pounds of air pollutants, including NO_x and SO_x, as well as two million pounds of CO_2 emissions per year. Finally, fuel cells have the capability to cleanly process methane emissions from landfills and anaerobic digester gases from wastewater treatment facilities into energy, thereby preventing these harmful emissions from degrading the environment.

This technology presents us with an extraordinary opportunity, at a critical time in this country's development. As you are aware, the United States imported an average of nearly 11 million barrels of oil per day last year from foreign countries to meet our domestic energy needs, totaling nearly 4 billion barrels during all of 1999. Even at last year's comparatively modest average price of $15 per barrel, that adds up to more than $60 billion spent on foreign oil. With the average price of crude oil at about $24 per barrel for just the first 5 months of 2000, Americans have already spent more than $48 billion on imported oil, roughly 80 percent of what Americans paid during all of 1999. We must break this cycle of dependency, and strengthen our economy by turning this level of spending back to domestic sources.

The current oil crisis has served to remind us, after nearly two decades of complacency, how fragile the relationship is between our energy sources, the vitality of our economy, and the livelihood of every man, woman, and child in this country. The price of a barrel of crude oil reaches into every corner of our society, from affecting the cost of transporting food from our farms and ranches to the dinner table, to affecting the cost of each one of us traveling to and from work, to affecting our very survival at home during cold winter and hot summer months.

We stand now on a fundamental crossroad in this country. We have the ability to provide for the economic and national security of the nation by integrating this new technology into our economy. The elimination of noxious chemical emissions into our environment and the freedom of not being bound to existing energy producing monopolies represent a potential impact on our society in the next century as profound as any of the achievements of the 20th century, from the elimination of small pox and polio, to the development of the Internet, to human's first flights in space through which this technology was born. However, bold action is needed, with courage and vision to lead the way.

Over the next five years, my legislation would invest approximately 1/60 of the nation's total yearly expenditures on foreign oil to develop and demonstrate fuel cell technology that can power our homes, businesses, and vehicles. My bill calls for a $1 billion 5-year investment that should eliminate our reliance on foreign energy sources by 2010 and improve world environmental conditions by reducing overall consumption of fossil fuels and the harmful chemical emissions they produce. Specifically, the Energy Independence Act:

Directs the Secretary of Energy to transmit to Congress within one year a strategic plan to ensure the United States is energy self sufficient by the year 2010. Authorizes up to $20 million for completion of this plan.

Authorizes a total of $140 million over 3 years to establish a federal pilot program to purchase up to 100 commercially available 200 kW fuel cell power plants or up to 20 mW of power generated from commercially available fuel cell power plants for use at federally owned or operated facilities.

Gives site selection priority to sites that (1) are classified as non-attainment areas under Title I of the Clean Air Act; (2) have computer or electronic operations that are sensitive to power supply disruptions; (3) need a reliable uninterrupted power supply; (4) are in a remote location or have other factors requiring off-grid power generation; or (5) need to maintain critical manufacturing or other activities that support national security efforts.

Authorizes a total of $140 million over 3 years to establish a program for the demonstration of fuel cell proton exchange membrane (PEM) technology in commercial, residential, and transportation applications.

Authorizes a total of $150 over 3 years to establish a comprehensive Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell Bus Demonstration Program to address hydrogen production, storage, and use in transit bus applications.

Promotes the application of technology developments and improved manufacturing production and processes for proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cell technology.

Directs the various agencies of the federal government that maintain fleets of federal vehicles to develop plans to transition the fleets to incorporate fuel cell technology by 2010.

Directs that any life-cycle cost benefit analysis undertaken by a Federal agency with respect to investments in products, services, construction, and other projects shall include an analysis of environmental and power reliability factors.

Authorizes $110 million per year for five years to establish a grant program for state and local governments (requiring a 10 percent non-federal funding match) to make investments for the use of fuel cell technology in meeting their energy requirements, including the fueling as a source of power for motor vehicles.

Just as steam power generated the first real industrial revolution in the 19th century, and power from fossil fuels generated the tremendous technological growth seen in the 20th century, fuel cells are ready to power the country and the world in the 21st century and beyond. This legislation is an important step in this process, and the government must play a role in this transition for several reasons. First and foremost, it will provide for the security of the country in both economic and military terms by eliminating our reliance on foreign energy sources. Second, we have a long-term responsibility to our seniors and to other people living on fixed incomes to see that they will

one day have an opportunity to live within their means without being forced to choose between putting food on their tables, gas in their cars, or buying oil to heat their homes. Third, there is the opportunity within the government's infrastructure to most easily begin a widespread integration of this technology. Fourth, the spread and use of this technology has the opportunity to create a contribution in economic growth and in job creation every bit as significant as the development of the high tech industry during the last decade. Finally, as government regulations increasingly call for stricter clean air and other pollution limits, fuel cells can provide an effective way for states and communities to meet these new environmental challenges.

Specifically, the federal government can take a leadership role in transitioning and commercializing this technology by using the powerful leverage of large volume government purchases of fuel cells to power government facilities, including federal housing facilities, as well as its fleets of vehicles. Further, given the significant amount of federal assistance to states and local communities for public transportation, the federal government can play an important role in helping communities meet their transportation needs and meet clean air requirements at the same time. State and local governments and organizations can take the lead on this as well, by integrating this new technology in community planning efforts and municipal transportation programs, and I have included a significant grant program to help local governments interested in participating in this endeavor.

We have the opportunity to provide leadership, solutions, and opportunities at this critical juncture in our nation's history that can profoundly improve the security and independence of every American, providing a safer, more secure, more productive, and cleaner environment for generations to come. We must not allow this opportunity to be lost.

IN HONOR OF DR. PAUL GREENGARD, 2000 NOBEL PRIZE WINNER IN MEDICINE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically honor today Dr. Paul Greengard, the 2000 Nobel Prize winner in medicine, who resides and teaches in my district. Dr. Greengard received the Nobel Prize for his discovery of how dopamine—a human neurotransmitter that controls one's movements, emotional responses, and ability to experience pleasure and pain—affects the central nervous system. His advancements in the field of neuroscience have greatly increased our understanding of the relationships between neurobiological chemicals and some of the world's most widespread neurological disorders, such as Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's Disease, and Schizophrenia. Such an achievement is one I hold in tremendous regard and I truly hope my colleagues recognize the importance of Dr. Greengard's groundbreaking discovery.

Neurological diseases touch most every human being in some way. As the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Working Group on Parkinson's Disease, I am especially spirited by Dr. Greengard's research. I sincerely hope that medical and academic professionals, buoyed by Dr. Greengard's achievements, continue their pursuit of uncovering the causes of the most pressing neurological disorders.

Dr. Greengard is a genuinely fascinating individual. He currently serves as the head of the Laboratory of Molecular and Cellular Neuroscience at The Rockefeller University in new York City and is the director of the Zachary and Elizabeth M. Fisher Center for Research on Alzheimer's Disease, also at Rockefeller. The Fisher Center, where I serve as a member of the Board of Trustees alongside Fisher CEO Michael Stern, is an extraordinarily valuable research center where Dr. Greengard has made pioneering discoveries in neuroscience which provide a more conceptual understanding of how the nervous system functions at the molecular level. His research into the abnormalities associated with Dopamine serves as a window through which scientists can examine the effects that Dopamine has on psychiatric disorders of human beings, such as substance abuse and Attention Deficit Disorder.

Dr. Greengard has dedicated his life to scientific exploration. Since 1953, when he received his Ph.D. in biophysics from Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Greengard has worked as a scientific professional in every sense of the word. From his days as a scholar at Cambridge University in London, and years as a professor of pharmacology at Yale University, Dr. Greengard has possessed a passion for knowledge into the scientific basis of human existence. His life is nothing short of an admirable testament to the joy of scholarship and the rewards of knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I am immeasurably proud to have such an esteemed American living and working within my district. Dr. Greengard's Nobel Prize is a well-deserved honor and a tremendous reward for his dedication and tireless pursuit of scientific truth.

MYRTLE HILL CEMETERY AND THE TOMB OF THE KNOWN SOLDIER, ROME, GEORGIA

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful cemeteries in the nation sits atop Myrtle Hill in Rome, Georgia, where the Etowah and Oostanaula rivers come together. The cemetery was opened in 1857 and is a National Register site. It is the resting place for more than 20,000 people who have shaped Georgia's history. The hill was purchased from Shorter College founder Alfred Shorter. The historic significance of the cemetery, combined with its beauty, makes it one of the most unique in the world.

In one corner of the cemetery is a monument to General John Sevier, a Revolutionary War hero. During the Civil War almost 400 men were buried in the cemetery. Their graves, at the base of the hill near the entrance, are a silent tribute to the men, both Union and Confederate, who made the ultimate sacrifice. In 1901, the Xavier Chapter of the Daughters of American Revolution erected a monument in honor of General Sevier, and the marker is located in the southwest corner of the cemetery. A Confederate monument atop Myrtle Hill was erected by the Women of Rome as a memorial to the soldiers from Floyd County who lost their lives in defense of the Confederate States of America. A monument erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy to the memory of General Nathan Forest for his bravery and valor in protecting the city from a siege by the Yankees also stands in the cemetery. There are 377 confederate soldiers, both from the north and south, who lost their lives while here or who were originally from Rome.

Ellen Axon Wilson, first wife of President Woodrow Wilson, and who was a native of Rome is buried at Myrtle Hill. She is the only First Lady to be buried in the State of Georgia.

After the First World War, Charles Graves, an infantryman from Rome, in the American Expeditionary Force, was killed near the French-German border. On October 15, 1918, he was given military honors and buried in France. I March 1922, his remains were returned to U.S. soil. The American people thought something should be done to prevent wars, and the notion of honoring an Unknown Soldier and a Known Soldier, was developed. An Unknown Soldier was selected in France, and his body was enshrined in Arlington National Cemetery in Washington in 1932.

It was decided that one of the bodies from the final troopship would be selected as the Known Soldier. A sailor was blindfolded, asked to run his hand down a long roster of names and when his finger stopped on one name, that one would become America's Known Soldier of the World War. The moving finger stopped on the name of Charles W. Graves of Rome, Georgia. However, his mother preferred to have his remains brought home to Rome, rather than be interred at Arlington. Charles Graves' coffin was taken from the troopship with special care, covered with the American flag, and carefully placed on a special carriage drawn by six white horses. An honor guard, made up of U.S. Army generals, accompanied his coffin down the streets of New York City. Admirals of the Navy, Generals of the Marines, Governors from various U.S. States, five U.S. Senators, four Representatives of Congress, the Secretary of War, and the Mayor of New York, all watched as thousands of soldiers, veterans, dignitaries, and Gold Star mothers descended upon the city. When the coffin finally stopped, President Warren G. Harding spoke about Charles Graves and all the others who had paid the ultimate price for freedom.

When the ceremonies were complete, the body of Charles Graves was loaded onto a southbound train and a day later it pulled into Rome. He was buried in a small cemetery outside of Rome. After his mother's death, the body was moved to Myrtle Hill Cemetery; where it has been to this day. Thirty-four magnolia trees were planted around the grave to

represent the 34 Floyd County residents who died during World War I.

Every year since, the patriotic spirit of the citizens of Rome and Floyd County is displayed when families, loved ones, friends, and military veterans, make their ways to Myrtle Hill Cemetery on November 11th to honor America's fallen war heroes. This tradition has been passed from one generation to the next, and parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles are proud to bring young family members to Myrtle Hill, and to tell them the stories of the Known Soldier, Charles W. Graves, and those of others who fought for the freedom, and peace, we should cherish each and every day.

VILNIUS INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON HOLOCAUST-ERA LOOTED CULTURAL ASSETS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the four-day Vilnius International Forum on Holocaust-Era Looted Cultural Assets, which was held in Vilnius, Lithuania, earlier this month. Representatives of 37 countries, the Council of Europe, and 17 non-governmental organizations participated in this important conference. The United States was very ably represented by our Deputy Secretary of Treasury, Stuart E. Eizenstat, who is our Government's representative on Holocaust restitution issues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Government of Lithuania for hosting this important conference. I also want to pay particular tribute to my dear friend Emanuelis Zingeris, a former member of the Lithuanian Seimas (Parliament), who conceived and organized this outstanding Vilnius Forum, and served as the Chairman of the Forum Organizing Committee. Zingeris' parents were among the few members of Lithuania's once-flourishing Jewish community who survived the Holocaust. An estimated 95 percent of Lithuania's Jewish community were killed by Nazi murderers during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the Vilnius Forum was the result of a resolution on ''looted Jewish Cultural Property,'' which was prepared by Emanuelis Zingeris and adopted last year by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. It called for the organization of a European conference to follow up on the Washington Conference on Holocaust Era Assets and give special attention to the return of cultural property and relevant legislative reform.

In an outstanding address opening the gathering, Mr. Zingeris expressed the importance of the conference internationally and for Lithuania in particular: ''As long as a society fails to perceive the need to seek justice, it may not be called a civic society. The moves taken here in Lithuania like the Vilnius International Forum, are a significant contribution to the development of our civic society. These processes, including the Forum, are our ticket back to Europe.''

The purposes of the Vilnius Forum, which it admirably met, were to review progress on the implementation of the statement of principles that was adopted at the Washington Conference, to provide a forum for the discussion of the process of compiling an inventory of cultural assets looted during the Holocaust and their restitution to their rightful owners, and to establish legislative and other guidelines for the implementation of a process for the return of such Holocaust-Era assets. In particular, the Forum focused discussion on the legal, historical, archival, and museum-related problems related to the search, identification, and restitution of plundered cultural property. The declaration issued at the conclusion of the Forum called upon governments to work together to achieve these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that important progress was made at the Vilnius Forum. The Lithuanian Seimas (Parliament), on the eve of the opening of the conference, voted to turn over 370 Torah scrolls to Jewish groups in a gesture consistent with the objectives of the Forum. These scrolls, which have been kept in the Lithuanian state library, will be turned over to Jewish organizations and Jewish synagogues within Lithuania.

A second important result of the conference, Mr. Speaker, was the breakthrough agreement reached by the governments of the United States and Russia on opening Russian archives to assist in the recovery of art and cultural treasures looted by the Nazis during the World War II. The agreement includes the establishment of a U.S.-based foundation which will help identify plundered cultural assets by creating a register of such cultural items. Christie's Auction House in the United States secured an initial $500,000 contribution from my dear friends Ronald Lauder, the President of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, and Edgar Bronfman, President of the World Jewish Congress, to establish this register.

Mr. Speaker, access to Russian archives has long been a crucial concern of Jewish communities and others concerned about the restitution of art and other property stolen from Holocaust victims by the Nazis. This new agreement is an important step forward with the effort to catalogue seized property in Russian museums, and it follows the adoption of legislation by the Russian Duma last May establishing the legal right of Nazi victims to claim assets removed to the Soviet Union at the end of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in expressing gratitude and appreciation to the Government of Lithuania for hosting the highly successful Vilnius Forum, to Stuart Eizenstat for his outstanding efforts in representing the position of the United States at this conference, and particularly to Emanuelis Zingeris for his enthusiastic leadership in bringing this important event together.

ALASKA LANDS EXCHANGE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to provide this clarification of legislative intent to Section 761 of H.R. 1000, the FAA Reauthorization bill, P.L. 106–181, enacted earlier this year.

Section 761 provides a process for land exchanges to facilitate a railroad track realignment and straightening project through Elmendorf AFB and Fort Richardson, Alaska. Track is to be relocated further away from the runway landing clear zone, ammunition storage areas, and other military facilities. It will also provide safety and operational benefits for the combined passenger and freight rail line. The small land parcel segments that need to be exchanged on a nearly acre-for-acre basis will be between the state-owned Alaska Railroad on the one part, and the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretaries of the Army, Air Force, or such other federal agencies as may be necessary, on the other part.

Of course, it is the intent of Section 761 that matters needed to facilitate these land exchanges between the federal agencies and the state railroad, as well as the overall purposes of this project, are necessarily implied therein. For example, it will obviously be necessary on a temporary basis during surveying, preliminary engineering, and construction, for one or more of these entities to be present simultaneously on each others' parcels of land, regardless of the exact dates legal title may be transferred. The railroad may, by necessary implication, locate and construct its new track facility without the need for a separate fee or use permit being processed under the usual federal land management statutes. Section 761 already authorizes the applicable Secretary to impose additional terms on the railroad as appropriate to protect the U.S. interests.

Further, while Section 761 did not directly amend The Alaska Railroad Transfer Act of 1982, under which the federally-owned railroad was sold to the state, once again, it is logically and necessarily implied that the reversionary provisions of the 1982 Act will not apply to land segments given up by the railroad to facilitate this project. Instead, the reversionary provisions will transfer and apply to the new land acquired by the railroad from the federal entities in the exchange.

Finally, Section 761 had no intent to imply any derogation of the permanent withdrawal and agreement under Section 1425 of ANILCA, P.L. 86–487, as to any of the lands being exchanged. It is the intent of Section 761 that the lands received by each grantee, either the railroad or the federal entities, shall have in its hands the same status with respect to Section 1425 of ANILCA and the agreement as did the lands granted in exchange by each such grantee. Further, it is intended that any land or interest reconveyed by the railroad to a federal agency will be automatically considered a part of the surrounding public land withdrawal without need for further administrative action respecting those lands.

ICCVAM AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4281, the ICCVAM (Interagency Coordinating Committee for the Validation of Alternative Methods) Authorization Act. This commonsense piece of legislation has received overwhelming support from all interested parties, including endorsements from 72 bipartisan cosponsors, the animal rights community, a coalition of chemical and product manufacturers, and the administration.

ICCVAM was established by the director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in 1994 and is still in operation today. Thus, the bill does not create a new Federal bureaucracy. Rather, it improves upon an existing interagency committee and streamlines the regulatory process without eliminating discretion by any Federal agency. H.R. 4281 simply gives ICCVAM statutory authority to continue establishing guidelines and recommendations that promote the regulatory acceptance of scientifically valid, new, revised or alternative test methods, thereby eliminating duplicative, time-consuming and costly test method validation at several other government agencies. In addition, because ICCVAM already exists, passage of H.R. 4281 will not require any additional budget expenditures.

In conclusion, I would like to say that H.R. 4281 provides a win-win situation for all groups and individuals involved with toxicology testing. For chemical and product manufacturers, who are required to test their products for safety before bringing them to the market, the bill offers them a centralized body to ensure that new test methods are scientifically valid and acceptable for regulatory use before they spend large sums of money on conducting the tests for government approval. For animal protection organizations, this legislation promotes an improved forum in which alternatives to animal testing can be scientifically validated for regulatory use. From a broader standpoint, the tests approved by ICCVAM will provide Federal agencies with adequate data to protect human and environmental health and safety, a development which benefits all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in supporting H.R. 4281. Let us ensure that ICCVAM continues its important work on behalf of the Federal Government, animal rights activists, and regulated industries across the United States.

SALUTE TO THE KANSAS CITY WIZARDS

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the Kansas City Wizards and owner Lamar Hunt for their 1–0 win over the Chicago Fire in Major League Soccer's 2000 championship game on Sunday, October 15. The Wizards are a testament to the perseverance of hard work and determination in athletics. Their drive and resolve produced the best season in the Kansas City Wizard's six year history.

Goalkeeper Tony Meola and veteran players Uche Okafor, Mo Johnston, and Preki capped their stellar season with Major League Soccer's ultimate glory, giving loyal Kansas City fans their first Major League Soccer title. The Wizards' fluid teamwork and appreciation for the game were best exemplified by the unselfish style of play that spearheaded their drive towards the trophy. By foregoing individual statistics, the players came together under one common goal and achieved it in championship fashion.

In addition to their Major League Soccer championship trophy, seven proud Wizards players were selected to join the U.S. National team for an October 25 exhibition match against Mexico Rookie defender Nick Garcia joined fellow defender Brandon Prideaux, midfielders Kerry Zavagnin, Matt McKeon, Chris Henderson and Chris Klein, and goalkeeper Tony Meola in Los Angeles to lead the United States to a 2–0 win over the Mexican national team. Congratulations to the Wizard Members and to the entire U.S. national team for an inspiring victory.

The MLS trophy has special meaning for Wizards' owner Lamar Hunt, who has long been a champion of soccer in the United States. Major League Soccer is now the fastest growing American sport, and its popularity in Kansas City is a credit to Mr. Hunt and his commitment to its success. Mr. Hunt's great admiration for his players was noted after the game when he stated proudly that, "These are pages of a memory book that these players will never forget."

The Wizards weekly youth programs have given thousands of children in the Kansas City area the opportunity to meet and interact with the athletes they admire. Young athletes receive fundamental training by a member of the Wizards. These programs provide positive reinforcement for youth on and off the field. Since the inception of these programs in 1995, Kansas City youth soccer has doubled in player participation among our youth.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting the Kansas City Wizards for the winning example they've provided to the young athletes of Kansas City, and for their inspired Major League Soccer championship season and U.S. National Team success. The Wizards embody the principles of teamwork essential for success. I ask the House to join me in Congratulating the Kansas City Wizards, Major League Soccer's 2000 champions and their owner, Mr. Lamar Hunt.

CONGRATULATIONS, GLORIA JEAN OLIVER A WOMAN OF INFLUENCE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives the accomplishments of a person who has truly made a difference in her community, Ms. Gloria Jean Oliver. Retired as a captain from the East Orange Police Department, Ms. Oliver has been selected as one of the recipients of the presitigous YWCA "Women of Influence" awards. She will be honored at a special luncheon in New Jersey on November 4, 2000.

Born in Glenridge and educated in the East Orange school system, Ms. Oliver attended Upsala College and received a bachelor of arts degree in Social Science.

In 1969, she distinguished herself by becoming the first female to be hired by the East Orange Police Department after placing first on the New Jersey Civil Service exam. After breaking this barrier, she spent her first decade as a detective in the Juvenile Aide Bureau while also taking on an assignment in the rape squad. She continued to be a pioneer in her field, becoming a founding member of the Afro-American police organization with the formation of the East Orange Kinsmen, Inc. She was the first recording secretary of the organization, which was dedicated to serving the local community.

After a promotion to sergeant in 1979, Ms. Oliver supervised the robbery squad. In 1986, while assigned to the Patrol Division, Gloria was promoted to lieutenant and was in charge of the "Safe Neighborhoods Division." She commanded the 4 p.m. until midnight tour of the Patrol Division, was the Record's Bureau supervisor and was in charge of the Communications Division. In 1998, she was promoted to acting captain, where she served ten months as the commander in charge of the 4 p.m. until midnight tour before her retirement in September of 1999.

Among the hobbies she enjoys are reading, traveling and writing poetry. A true family person, she is devoted to her eighty-eight year old father and takes great pride in her two nieces, Shelly and Krystal, and her great nieces and nephews. Ms. Oliver is now enjoying a well-deserved retirement where she continues to be active as a member of the Board of Directors of the North End Nursery.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in commending Ms. Oliver for her outstanding professional achievements and her service to the community. Let us extend our congratulations as she receives the Women of influence Award and our very best wishes for continued health and happiness.

IN HONOR OF THE VASCULAR ANOMALIES PROGRAM AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER ON VASCULAR ANOMALIES FAMILY DAY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Vascular Anomalies Program at New York University Medical Center which will celebrate Vascular Anomalies Family Day on October 29, 2000. The Vascular

Anomalies Program at NYU is an exceptional medical program that serves a notable role assisting my constituents with their medical needs.

The Vascular Anomalies Program began at NYU in the 1980s as a subsidiary of the Institute for Reconstructive Plastic Surgery at NYU Medical Center in order to better assist patients with vascular anomalies such as hemangiomas, lymphatic malformations, venous vascular malformations, and arteriovenous malformations. The medical team assembled to serve in the Vascular Anomalies Program consists of physicians specializing in plastic surgery dermatology, radiology, hematology, psychology, ophthalmology, otolaryngology, and gynecology.

With the skills and guidance of these medical professionals, the NYU Vascular Anomalies program addresses the numerous medical and psychological issues confronting its patients. The needs of its patients sometimes require the program to coordinate the participation of numerous physicians in order to implement a successful plan of care.

The physicians in the Vascular Anomalies Program meet twice every month with patients to discuss their concerns. the program which is funded by the National Foundation for Facial Reconstruction, recently met with federal elected officials involved in health care issues to discuss facial deformities in children.

This week, the Vascular Anomalies Program will celebrate Vascular Anomalies Family Day to salute the network for parents who support each other through the challenges of raising a child with a facial deformity. I congratulate the NYU Vascular Anomalies Program on this special day and applaud the valuable work of this exceptional program.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to know that the NYU Vascular Anomalies Program offers such as instrumental service to my constituents. The work of this program is greatly beneficial to the residents of my district and I wish the NYU Vascular Anomalies Program all the best in the continuation of its vital services.

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the World War II Veterans who will be receiving their High School Diplomas at the West Hartford Board of Education on the evening of November 8, 2000, more than 55 years after they originally were supposed to have graduated.

These men all left high school early in order to serve their country in the midst of World War II. They are graduating under the terms and conditions of a recently enacted Connecticut law that allows people who left high school to join the military to be given their official diplomas. As such they have now become certified high school graduates.

These Veterans represent what Tom Brokaw has called ''America's Greatest Generation''. Raised in the Great Depression, some the children of immigrants, they endured hardship at home but rallied to the causes of patriotism and helped the United States defeat the threat posed by the Axis nations. Upon coming home from the war, they led productive and useful lives. They became skilled workers and businessmen who worked hard in raising their children and providing support to their communities, churches and synagogues. They served their country both in time of war, as well as peace, and we are all better off because of their sacrifices.

Several of them will be joined by their wives, children and grandchildren and other family members and friends for this happy event. While more applications for diplomas are still being processed, the following people have already been certified as High School Graduates under the Connecticut program: Albert Lefkin, Herbert Anderson, Donald J. DesRoches, Robert Douglas Soule, Kenneth William Bassett, Anthony N. Cardillo, Otto D. Vincenzi, Joseph J. Viscounti, Edward H. Friedman, and John Robert Clutz.

Others will be honored posthumously and I know that their families will also take delight and comfort over the recognition of their achievements. They are: Agostino Guzzo and William A. Zambrello.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend the appreciation of the American people to the fine men who contributed so greatly to the preservation of our freedoms. They deserve our praise and honor. Many of them have participated in the high school and college graduations of their children and grandchildren over the years. However, their own accomplishments are unique and I hope that these self-effacing men will allow themselves and their loved ones to rejoice in the celebration of their own lives. I would like to urge my colleagues in the House to join me in saluting and thanking the World War II Veterans and official high school graduates. The nation and community has learned and benefited much from you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be here yesterday due to my father's precarious health situation, and missed Recorded Votes #541 (Providing for the consideration of H.R. 4656, Lake Tahoe Basin School Site Land Conveyance Act), #542 (Motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Con. Res. 414: Relating to the Reestablishment of Representative Government in Afghanistan), and #543 (Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4271: The National Science Education Act) on October 24, 2000, and Recorded Vote #545 (On ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 647: providing for consideration of H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report, FY2001) on October 25, 2000.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on all of the above motions.

DR. SPENCER FOREMAN AND ANGELA HOUSE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Angela House is a small transitional residence providing homeless women and their young children with support and training in a supporting, home-like setting. A primary goal is to break the cycle of homelessness and to achieve self-sufficiency for these families.

This year Angela House is celebrating its first Award Dinner to raise money to buy permanent quarters for this fine organization. Dr. Spencer Foreman, the President of Montefiore Hospital, is being honored for his work in getting Angela House a building for use as a residence until Angela House can get its own building.

Dr. Foreman has been a health systems executive for nearly 30 years and I can personally attest to the good work he is doing in the Bronx as President of Montefiore Medical Center. Currently he is in the midst of building an up to the minute pediatric hospital to treat the children of the Bronx and nearby Westchester County.

He is a member and past Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Greater New York Hospital Association and the Board of Directors of the League of Voluntary Hospitals.

Under Dr. Foreman Montefiore generously donated a three-story building for use by Angela House in the work it is doing for young women in need. Angela House is one of the many organizations making a concerted effort to solve the problem of homelessness in New York City. It also makes a crucial difference in the future of the children it serves by strengthening the family unit.

Dr. Foreman and Angela House are well matched. Both are doing good work for the Bronx in helping people who are in need. They both contribute so much to making the Bronx a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

COLONEL THOMAS R. FRIERS TO RETIRE FROM THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ON 31 DECEMBER 2000.

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Friers' twenty-eight years of service to our nation culminate with his assignment as Commander of the Department of Defense Manned Space Flight Support Office. Prior to entering the service, he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering from Clarkson University, New York. He later received a Master of Science degree in Management from Central Missouri State University.

During the course of his Air Force Career, Colonel Friers rose to the level of command

pilot accumulating more than 4000 hours of flying time in five fixed and rotary-winged aircraft. Colonel Friers served in a multitude of locations around the world from Vietnam to the Persian Gulf. He served at many levels: DOD Staff, Air Force Headquarters, and Major Command. Colonel Friers was awarded command a remarkable five times. He commanded a detachment, a squadron, a group, a DOD staff agency, and the Air Force's elite Combat Rescue School. He also served as flight examiner, aide to commander, director of command protocol, and chief of rescue division at the major command level.

The decorations from his 28 years of service include the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal with six oak leaf clusters, the Aerial Achievement Medal, and the Joint Service Commendation Medal.

Colonel Friers commanded troops during our nations' triumph in the Persian Gulf. He also commanded during the Khobar Tower bombing, when his 1st Rescue Group lost 19 brave airman.

During good times and bad, Colonel Firers has led with courage and distinction. Like our great national symbol, the eagles of a colonel are well suited to represent the character of this greater leader.

RIESTERER'S BAKERY 70TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Riesterer's Bake Shoppe & Café on their 70th Anniversary for their commitment and contributions to the Long Island community.

The Riesterer family embodies the spirit of small business with their dedication to service and values. Their 70th Anniversary is a landmark achievement for this family-owned and operated establishment that has become an integral part of life in West Hempstead.

A celebration of the anniversary is planned for Friday, October 27, 2000. The Riesterer family will display a giant seven-foot, seventier picturesque Birthday cake commemorating each decade with a tier full of pictures of the Riesterer's legacy.

I would especially like to recognize Karl Riesterer, Sr., the father of the family, who has recently been installed to the position of President of the Bakers Association of America. Comprised of over three thousand members, the Bakers Association of America is the largest baking organization in the country. I salute Karl's dedication that has allowed him to reach the top of his profession.

The Riesterer family is a pillar of the Long Island small business community and the community as a whole. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Riesterer's Bake Shoppe & Café on their 70th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING CHESTER BROWN ON THE OPENING OF THE WEST WARD CULTURAL CENTER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chester Brown for the realization of his dream with the opening of the new location for the West Ward Cultural Center, Inc. in Newark, New Jersey. This Sunday, October 29, 2000, will mark the relocation of a community organization that was the realization of a great dream by a truly remarkable man. The West Ward Cultural Center has served the community for over 20 years, providing food, clothing and social services to everyone from babies to senior citizens.

Mr. Chester Brown, the founder and president of West Ward Cultural Center, was educated at Marywood College in Pennsylvania. A community leader and advocate for positive change, Mr. Brown has worked diligently over the past 20 years helping to make a difference in the lives of others. West War Cultural Center's new home stands as a tribute to his dedicated efforts.

Chester Brown is also a devoted family man. His wife, Mrs. Loucinda Brown, and their talented daughters, Christina and Crystal, share his community spirit. As such, Christina and Crystal inspired the concept for the "Children of Vision," whose aim is to encourage young people to aspire to academic excellence. Christina and Crystal are student instructors in Journalism, Computer Science and Cultural Arts at West War Cultural Center and participate as mentors for the young.

Chester Brown is the son of the late Mr. Willie Brown and his wife, Mrs. Mable Brown. Blessed with a unique family of 16 sons and daughters, Mr. and Mrs. Brown successfully raised their family by working as a team. They also took pleasure in helping others, which earned them the respect and admiration of many. It also set a precedent for their children, especially Chester, to follow. Mr. and Mrs. Brown would be proud of the admirable accomplishments of their son, Chester. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chester Brown is more than worthy of receiving this honor and our praises, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in recognizing this truly remarkable man.

OUR NATIONAL ENERGY SUPPLY—RUNNING ON EMPTY

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government's approach to energy reminds me of the teenager that has a number of intense priorities—none of which involve filling the family car up with gas. As recent sharp increases in prices for gasoline, heating oil, natural gas, and electricity, and regional fuel shortages indicate, the United States is running on empty and no one wants to pull over and fill up the tank. In fact, running out of gas appears to be an affirmative policy of the regulatory and land-use agencies of this administration.

During the past decade, the Federal Government has actively discouraged exploration, production, transportation and use of conventional energy sources. The sudden increase in energy costs and reliability problems are symptomatic of a fundamentally flawed federal energy policy with serious adverse economic consequences that are only beginning to bubble to the surface. Although the Congress protected the public from their ill-conceived Clinton/Gore Btu-tax early in their administration, Clinton and Gore appear to have achieved their anti-people goals through restrictions on energy production and use through the back door. By using the regulatory powers of the Federal agencies, the Clinton/Gore administration has increased the price of energy to all Americans. How quickly some have forgotten the lessons of the recent past such as the Arab Oil Embargo of the 1970's.

My district in Michigan has many small and large businesses that support the automobile-manufacturing sector. I am very aware of how energy costs affect not just the economy, but the very prosperity so many working Americans have been enjoying.

Our prosperity, and particularly the driving force of our prosperity, the manufacturing sector, which generated almost 30 percent of growth of the gross domestic product and was pivotal in creating 22 million new jobs in the 1990's, is still dependent on adequate and reliable energy supplies at internationally competitive prices. And the current situation is not good. The loss of 133,000 net manufacturing jobs in a broad range of industries in August, and another 66,000 lost jobs in September, is primarily due to higher energy costs. Because firms cannot raise prices in this competitive environment, they must respond to higher energy costs by reducing costs elsewhere. Despite the high value that is placed on American workers, sometimes they become the victims of bad federal energy policy.

To maintain affordable energy supplies, all sources of energy need to be on the table. Unfortunately, the Clinton/Gore administration has been encouraging only the politically correct arrows in our energy supply quiver: conservation, non-hydro renewables and, as "transition" fuel, natural gas. This is an detrimental and dangerous energy strategy. Instead, in addition to continuing efforts to encourage energy efficient choices and develop alternative energy sources, increasing the supply of all conventional energy sources remains critical for sustained economic growth.

Currently, the most glaring policy disconnect is between the projections of natural gas demand over the next decade compared with supply realities. Some of the most promising energy efficiency technologies—combined cycle gas turbines and this generation of fuel cells—require natural gas. Several organizations, including the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration (EIA) and the National Petroleum Council, predict there will be approximately a 30 percent increase in the use of natural gas over the next 10 to 15 years. Yet U.S. natural gas production has remained stagnant for the past 6 years. Canada

already has increased its exports to the U.S. by more than

More importantly half of American households depend on natural gas for heating. The American Gas Association estimates that their bills this winter will increase at least 40 percent over last year, and that is if we have an average winter. In addition, our economic prosperity itself is also in jeopardy. The tens of millions of working Americans who depend on natural gas for space heating, process energy, and product feedstocks, are finding the spot prices for natural gas increasing 2 to 3 times over what it was in January of this year. For many energy intensive businesses, such a those that support America's automobile manufacturing sector, this is a very serious matter. And this pain, this crisis, is largely the result of the Clinton/Gore policies of the past eight years. The Clinton/Gore administration has systematically denied access to natural gas resources and discouraged adding natural gas infrastructure to bring natural gas to market.

The irony is that everyone knows where there is plenty of natural gas, but federal policies do not allow it to be developed. The Outer Continental Shelf and the multiple-use public lands on the Eastern Slope of the Rocky Mountains contain trillions of cubic feet of natural gas reserves that cannot be produced due to moratoria or numerous Clinton/Gore policies and regulatory actions that impede or prevent their development and production.

And natural gas is just one energy source that suffers from federal policies. Coal and oil resources are similarly being locked up by federal land use restrictions on multiple-use lands. Only one new base-load coal plant and two expansion units have been built since the late 1980's, and none since 1996. No new major oil refinery has been built in 25 years.

We haven't started construction on a nuclear plant in a decade, and no major hydroelectric dam has been built in memory. Moreover, federal policies have actively discouraged continued operation of even existing energy facilities. For example, the relicensing schedule for hydroelectric dams is an inexcusable eight years.

It seems that, for the current administration, atrophy and diminishment are the only energy policies they'll consider, as indicated by their support of the flawed Kyoto Protocol, which would use international pressure to coerce Americans into massive cuts in fossil fuel use. Unconstitutionally, this treaty has never ever been submitted to the U.S. Senate for consent, and the Clinton/Gore administration has indicated no intention of ever submitting the resolution to the Senate. To negotiate a treaty against the advice of the U.S. Senate and to have no intention of ever submitting the treaty to the Senate for consent is blatantly and flagrantly unconstitutional.

Via the Kyoto Protocol, the Clinton/Gore administration would commit the United States to what amounts to a 31 percent reduction in fossil energy use over levels otherwise projected by 2010. I oppose the attempts by the federal agencies to implement the protocol without Senate ratification and without implementing legislation. I thank my colleagues who have continued to support reasonable limitations on the Federal agencies that have forgotten how fundamentally important an adequate supply of energy is to our economic and social well-being.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD a resolution by the Board of Directors of the National Association of Manufacturers expressing their concern for current energy supply policies. This resolution, which the NAM Board adopted earlier this month, notes that in order to sustain economic growth, this country must have adequate supplies of energy at internationally competitive prices. I agree with their analysis that all energy options must be on the table for us to maintain and grow our economy, and that energy supply considerations must be part of the overall federal regulatory policy. I commend the attention of my colleagues to the NAM resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the NAM resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION OF CONCERN OVER ENERGY SUPPLY POLICIES

An adequate and secure energy supply at globally competitive prices is necessary for the nation's economic growth. The NAM—and its more than 14,000 member companies and associations, including 10,000 small and mid-sized manufacturers—supports the development of markets and policies that provide adequate, reliable and competitively priced energy resources with minimal government intervention. The NAM understands the critical importance of an economically viable mix of energy sources, consistent with prudent environmental policies. The NAM is concerned that current federal policies are at odds with the fundamental need to maintain adequate future energy supplies for the economy and the welfare of the American people.

Overall, U.S. manufacturers continue to strive for improved efficiency in the competitive world marketplace, including increasing energy efficiency. The remarkable productivity gains of this past decade however, have tended to raise energy use. Simultaneously increasing productivity and energy efficiency in the face of foreign competitive pressures has required developing and installing innovative equipment and processes in all aspects of the manufacturing sector.

Despite manufacturers' ongoing investments to increase energy efficiency, and federal and private efforts to develop economically viable alternative sources, increasing the supply of traditional energy sources remains critical in order to sustain economic growth. For example, the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and the Outer Continental Shelf should be opened for environmentally responsible oil and gas production. With respect to electricity, federal legislation should be enacted that would strengthen reliability and efficiency of supply, and facilitate wholesale and retail competition as soon as possible.

Energy warning signs are not just flashing because of this past summer's regional electricity disruptions. Also this year, the United States has been experiencing tight supplies of natural gas and transportation fuels, and the Department of Energy has even announced plans to dip into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve out of concern for heating oil prices this winter. The drastic step of withdrawing oil from the SPR is a wake-up call that current federal policies are jeopardizing economic growth and prosperity.

The current Administration has created an unbalanced national energy policy by focusing only on energy efficiency, natural gas and non-traditional energy sources, while limiting the development and use of other energy sources. There are limits to how much energy-efficiency measures and alternative energy sources—some of which remain of speculative economic viability—can contribute to meeting the energy requirements of our growing nation. Of particular concern is the policy disconnect between projections of increases in natural gas consumption to meet new energy demands, contrasted with current federal policies that discourage the production and delivery of new natural gas supplies. If federal policies will not allow more natural gas to be produced and delivered, then natural gas will not be able to fulfill its potential to sustain economic growth.

By undermining the development of domestic oil, gas, nuclear, coal and hydroelectric power, this Administration has created ''supply-side'' disincentives that add up to what is essentially a policy of planned energy dependence by the United States on foreign sources. Historically, the federal government has caused enormous economic waste when it tries to pick ''winners'' and ''losers'' in the energy marketplace. It has also caused waste when its energy policies are not coordinated with other policy objectives or considered in the context of economic growth.

Current federal policies that discourage energy supplies and distort energy consumption jeopardize economic growth. To meet the challenges of a growing population and increasing prosperity, while ensuring national security and environmental protection, America must fully utilize all of its energy options. The next Administration and Congress must make the availability of adequate supplies of reliable and competitively priced energy a national priority.

As adopted by the NAM Board of Directors—October 4, 2000.

HONORING MARILYN CULPEPPER

HON. SONNY CALLAHAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Marilyn Culpepper for her dedication to the health and well being of Monroe County, Alabama, citizens.

Marilyn Culpepper was appointed to the Monroe County Hospital Board in July 1996 and elected its chairman by unanimous vote of the board a few months later. She served as chairman from 1997 to 2000. Mrs. Culpepper has since moved to Mobile, and I wish her well as she takes on new challenges.

A native of Grove Hill, Alabama, Mrs. Culpepper is a 1980 graduate of the University of West Alabama (formerly Livingston University) and was the recipient of that school's Alumni of the Year Award in 1996.

Over the years, she has had several successful careers and civic achievements. In 1986, at age 17, she was elected to the Sumter County Board of Education. She was elected a second time in 1988 and served with distinction until moving to Monroe County in 1991.

In Monroe County, Marilyn Culpepper served first as associate editor, then managing

editor of the Award-winning weekly newspaper, The Monroe Journal. She also distinguished herself through community service in several capacities. To name a few, she was president and/or board member of the Monroeville Area Chamber of Commerce, the Monroe County Public Education Foundation, the Monroeville Kiwanis Club (where she was the first woman elected as ''Kiwanian of the Year''). She also served as a volunteer for the Monroe County Heritage Museums, and for the Alabama Writers Symposium during their inaugural year. In addition, she served in Israel as the representative of the Monroe County Commission and the Monroeville Area Chamber of Commerce during performances of ''To Kill a Mockingbird.'' Manifesting her talent, Mrs. Culpepper is a two-time recipient of the Alabama Medical Association's Douglas L. Cannon Recognition for Excellence in Medical Journalism.

As editor of the Monroe Journal and, later, economic developer for Monroe County from 1997–2000 and as chairman of the Monroe County Hospital Board, Mrs. Culpepper was an advocate for accessible health care for all citizens regardless of age, social or economic status. She was a driving force behind expansion of hospital services and creation of a rural health clinic in Monroe County.

Under Mrs. Culpepper's leadership, the hospital in Monroeville embarked on a major expansion and construction project, the creation of a cancer-treatment center and the development of a diabetes support program. She also oversaw the creation of Monroe Health Foundation and has been a contributor to the foundation.

Today, Mrs. Culpepper serves as executive director of the Historic Mobile Preservation Society. Her commitment to community development—preservation, education, and innovation in enriching the lives of all citizens continues. She is committed to developing a regional network of cultural, civic and humanitarian efforts to benefit all residents of south Alabama and continues to be a friend to Monroe County and Monroe County Hospital in this endeavor.

HONORING MONTE BLUM AND HIS HEROIC SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a great man, a real American hero. My statement today is a formal ''Thank You'' to Mr. Monte Blum, a proud veteran from World War II. It is a thank you he has never expected or asked for from his country.

The middle son of Russian immigrants, 19-year old Monte Blum enlisted in the Army and volunteered for the hazardous duty of disarming underwater mines as a deep sea diver in the 106th Engineering Corps. Clearing the way for ally shipping lanes off the coast of France in 1944, Cpl. Blum's attempt to disarm an enemy mine was disastrous when the explosive detonated.

With little chance for survival, Cpl. Blum was transported to a military hospital in Wales. His oldest brother Herman Blum, who received medals for heroism in the Battle of the Bulge, traveled from his post in Germany to take his younger brother back to America to live out his last days.

Herman was determined not to let his brother Monte die overseas. After months of prayer, a miracle occurred—Monte Blum survived. He was subsequently awarded both the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

Monte Blum will be turning 75 on February 26. He has been married to Helene Englander for 49 years and raised a son, Murray and a daughter, Robin. His children say that affection for their father gave them strength as Mr. Blum was in and out of the hospital during their youth. After dozens upon dozens of operations, medical technology finally was able to stem the constant discomfort they saw him endure while they were growing up. Helene was a constant rock and loving companion in tough years that would have sent most weaker wives packing.

In spite of his disability, Monte Blum was a hard working and successful business man all his life. No one but his immediate family ever knew that he had health problems. He held his head high, and provided a happy home or a well-loved family. He not only sent his two children to college but was instrumental for the education of 2 neighborhood kids. When there wasn't a synagogue in Baltimore where he bought his family a home, he pitched in and built one.

He taught his children about sacrifice and his undying love of our country. He emphasized the values of family, Judaism and kindness. His wife and children watched him laugh when he should have cried and never, never ever to this day, did he once complain.

His family has endured many tragedies. His older brother Lt. Senior Grade, Murray Blum, at 22, was killed in action as he dove overboard from a Merchant Marine vessel to rescue a drowning Swedish sailor, the only man to have perished on the ship, the SS Leonardis Polk. Murray Blum is buried in Cambridge, England at the beautifully tendered U.S. Military Cemetery. His brother Simon who worked stateside in the service because of a disability, died of a heart attack, after the war.

Retired Major Herman Blum, who received a Bronze Star, died September 23, 2000 at age 82 and received a full military send-off befitting a retired Army Major and now rests with his parents and brothers.

At this point in is life, Monte Blum is a frail health, but still walks with dignity and the step of a man half his age. He is surrounded by those who adore him. Monte Blum and his youngest brother Calvin, who was in the 67th Flight Corps, remain the best of friends.

He is a living monument and the embodiment, the heart and soul of the greatest generation. With Veterans Day approaching, we would do well to recount the service and sacrifice of veterans like Monte Blum.

ON BEHALF OF PEIRCE COLLEGE

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Peirce College, a matchless institution of higher education located in my district of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Peirce College has taken great strides to bridge the digital divide and become an institution dedicated to providing graduates for the information age. In fact, Peirce recently took two significant steps towards this goal. First, with the opening of its state-of-the art alumni Hall and second, through the recent approval of its online degree programs.

Despite its purely urban location, Peirce College is reaching out to provide competitive workforce and technology programs to individuals living in the more rural parts of Pennsylvania. Peirce College is well positioned to do this. In Fiscal Year 1999–2000 Peirce's off-site programs enrolled 408 students from rural and suburban areas across Pennsylvania. Through distance learning technologies, Peirce College intends to connect all of its students and programs including those in the rural areas of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has one of the largest rural population of any state in the county. To this extent, the Peirce distance learning programs can offer a significant opportunity for students, many of whom are adult learner, to gain training an education programs that are technology oriented and needed in today's job market.

I support Peirce College in its effort to secure a federal partnership to expand its on line and distance learning programs. To that end, I have worked with Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, ranking member for the House Appropriations subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA and Relocated Agencies. In this year's Fiscal Year 2001 House passed Agriculture Appropriation bill, report language was included to direct the Department of Agriculture to give consideration to the distance learning at Peirce College under the distance learning and telemedicine grant program.

The Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program, as authorized by the Food Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 and amended by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, aims to provide access to telecommunications services to improve rural educational opportunities. This program provided facilities and equipment to link rural education with more urban centers in order to increase educational opportunities for rural students. As such, I believe this program is well aligned with the goals and actions of Peirce College.

I strongly support Peirce college's proposal for a distant learning grant and look forward to working with the Department of Agriculture and the Committee to insure that Peirce College proposal receives full and fair consideration.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS COAL MINERS MEMORIAL

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Southern Illinois Coal Miners and the Memorial that has been dedicated in their honor. The memorial consists of a wall with the names of coal miners who currently work or have worked in the southern Illinois mines.

I would like to share with you this poem by Raymond D. Null of Herrin, IL. This work gives us an idea of the different kinds of struggles coal miners face.

''ILLINOIS BLACK GOLD''

In the early years, our MINERS lived in the ''patch,'' in their little company houses, along the train tracks
With their lunch bucket in hand, off to work they would go, most walking to work, through the summers and snows
Many fathers and sons, have worked side by side, in areas not tall, and sometimes not wide
They carved out their living, in walls of pure coal, as they worked hard and labored, to mine this ''Black Gold''
A ride down the deep shaft, a long walk through the mine, to this deep darkened land, where the sun never shines
Where it's deep as a dungeon, and nearly as cold, and the MINERS were proud, to mine this ''Black Gold''
Deep in the ground, everyday these men toiled, as they spotted and blasted, through the layers of soil
They were our MINERS, and they brought us our coal, with their shovels and picks they mined this ''Black Gold''
These pioneers of labor, with the coal black face, are the legends of mining, that time won't erase
They worked dangerously hard, in their race against time, in this deep dark hole, that they call the mine
In the early years, lives were taken at times, and the news spread quickly, to other towns and their mines
There would be sounds of sorrow, and sounds of pain, like the quill from the whistle, of a slow passing train
There are memorials that salute, those who answered their call, and prayers are said daily, for those who gave all
And for all of the MINERS, who mined this ''Black Gold,'' Let us give thanks, and may God bless their soul.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the coal miners of Southern Illinois. Due to their hard work and dedication in the mining industry, it is clear that they are an asset to Southern Illinois and all of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I was unavoidably detained, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 554. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

IN HONOR OF JUDITH WEST

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Judy West, an outstanding New Yorker, on the occasion of her retirement from Local 802 of the American Federation of Musicians.

Judy West has had a long and successful career serving as Director of Public Relations and Legislative Affairs for Local 802 since 1983. Her contributions to the Labor movement in particular, and to society as a whole, have been exemplary and set the standard to which we should all rise.

As an outspoken advocate for all working people, Judy has fought to ensure that Labor's agenda is always at the top of every elected official's list. From her work on exposing the abuses of farm labor in New York State to highlighting the particular concerns of musicians and other performing artists, her persistence and determination on behalf of these causes have become her trademarks.

In addition to her myriad endeavors on behalf of labor, Judy has also devoted her energies to the struggle for civil rights, affordable housing and decent health care for all. She has been so committed because she believes that as a citizen it is her duty to create a more just society for all. Through her unstinting devotion of time and generous use of talents, Judy West has become recognized as one of the most effective advocates of our time.

Mr. Speaker, Judy West may be officially retiring from her job, but I know that she will continue making outstanding contributions in the service of society. Her leadership will be missed, however, she and her family will have the opportunity to spend more time together. I join with all working people in thanking Judy for her tireless advocacy, personal commitment to our community and for her friendship.

IN HONOR OF NICK A. ANDRIOTIS, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE SAINT DEMETRIOS CATHEDRAL PARISH COUNCIL AND CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE ST. DEMETRIOS SCHOOL BOARD

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Nick A. Andriotis, the former president of the Parish Council at the Saint Demetrios Cathedral and Co-Chairman of the St. Demetrios School Board in Astoria, Queens, New York. Mr. Andriotis will receive this years Odyssey Award from the Cathedral in recognition of his long and distinguished service to the church. The award will be presented at the church's 73rd Anniversary celebration this month.

Mr. Andriotis has been a tireless activist for the entire Greek-American community of Astoria through his work with the Hellenic Cultural Center and the St. Demetrios School System. He has served as a strong advocate for the preservation of the Greek Orthodox faith, as well as for Greek culture, traditions, and the Greek language. He is the founder of the St. Demetrios High School, which is the direct product of his vision, determination, and enthusiasm. In fact, the new high school building became a reality due to Mr. Andriotis's valiant efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud to have such a community-oriented leader and visionary working to improve the lives of the many Greek and Greek-American residents of New York. This year's Odyssey Award will honor a worthy man and a diligent and faithful member of the Greek-American community. I congratulate Mr. Andriotis on his award and his many years of community service and I am confident that the selfless dedication he has demonstrated toward his friends and neighbors will continue through the work of the Saint Demetrios Cathedral.

MOVIE MAKERS RESPOND WEAKLY

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member encourages his colleagues to read the following editorial, from the October 9, 2000, edition of the Norfolk Daily News. This editorial highlights the insufficient answers from the film industry about targeting younger audiences with inappropriate film content.

[From the Daily News, October 9, 2000]

MOVIE MAKERS RESPOND WEAKLY

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN PRODUCES LESS THAN SATISFACTORY ANSWERS BY INDUSTRY

The movie industry's responses to congressional concern about targeting younger audiences with inappropriate film fare is unsatisfactory. The practice of using young test audiences is reprehensible.

While Jack Valenti, the veteran political operative who speaks for the Motion Picture Association of America, promised the industry would change the objectionable practice, it is not enough. Ratings ought to change and entertainment ought to be lifted from the gutter.

Mr. Valenti did say that ''inappropriate'' targeting of children for R-rated movies would stop. That practice has found some filmmakers attempting to appeal to youngsters whose age would disqualify them from viewing.

The Internet figures in this problem as well. For the industry's teen Web sites can be utilized, and there were no promises that marketing of R-rated films would be entirely barred from them.

The president of Sony, parent company of Columbia Pictures, termed the marketing of a violent PG–13 film to a younger audience ''a judgment lapse.'' It would more properly be called a stupid error demanding far more prompt attention than it received. That company is far from alone, however.

Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R–Texas, expressed the sentiment of many Americans

when she responded to the recent testimony from film executives: If the industry doesn't take steps to keep violent films away from young children, she said, ''you're going to see some kind of legislation.'' There are others who feel just as strongly about the portrayals of casual sex and use of obscene language as they do about gratuitous violence.

The legislative powers seem limited, however, even though the Supreme Court has indicated ''community standards'' can be allowed to prevail in the contests between pornography and free expression, especially where young people are concerned.

In this situation, with movie complexes overbuilt and family movie nights rare, a rational reaction would find the industry doing all it could to tell interesting stories with at least a little less violence and graphic sex. It was possible in the earlier days of television and films.

The industry ought to find a way to reverse the trend toward coarseness and crudity. It could start by raising its standards, revising its inaccurate and unreliable ratings, and leaving more to the viewers' imaginations.

THE FIREARMS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SAFETY ACT OF 2000

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss legislation I introduced just before the August recess, H.R. 5012, the Firearms Research and Development Safety Act of 2000. This legislation would enhance the research and development tax credits permitted to firearms businesses to accelerate and explore further what has been termed as Smart Gun Technology, or as some prefer to call it, ''Firearm Personalization Technology.'' In fact, at a later date, I intend to amend the legislation in committee to reflect that terminology.

My proposal increases the research and development tax credit, determined under the applicable rules of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (which is usually 20%), to 30% for smart gun technology research and development. It also quantifies this benefit is only available to federal firearms licensees, and it is not available for use on monies received in the form of a grant. Additionally, the base used to determine allowable expenses for the credit is at 100% of a firm's, corporation's, or individual's expenditures for the years 2001, 2002, and 2003, instead of the incremental increase as under current procedure.

These enhancements are intended to do exactly what ought to be done in terms of encouraging innovation and development in safety technology for firearms. That is, the marketplace ought to determine these innovations, and ultimately their acceptance by consumers, law enforcement, and, indeed, even the military in some cases.

The role of the government ought not be to mandate the use of this technology, but rather to encourage and foster its development. Regrettably, much has been said about ''Smart Gun,'' or ''Firearm Personalization,'' technology, and the panacea some claim it to be in preventing unauthorized access to firearms by felons, violent individuals, or other persons who should not have access to a firearm. The truth is, there are many different approaches to safe gun storage, any of which may be valid depending on the particular circumstances faced by the owner or authorized user.

Mandating the integration of an internal locking system in a firearm is simply not going to prevent determined individuals from gaining access to a gun and misusing it. As in other approaches to safe gun use, training and education are paramount, so each individual owner can develop a strategy for the safe storage and use of their firearm. ''Firearm Personalization Technology'' assists in doing just this, and if the marketplace responds favorably to these innovations, gun technology will change.

My bill simply allows the gun industry an enhanced opportunity to accelerate work in this field, and to explore whether or not consumers will respond favorably to safe, reliable and practical innovations in gun technology.

Naturally this type of innovation research is not inexpensive. As Members are aware, the industry has been under enormous economic stress, due largely to the anti-gun policies of the current Administration and to frivolous law suits being filed against the industry by anti-gun interests. Precious resources the industry could be devoting to technological innovation have been used to defend its lawful and responsible businesses. Perhaps this credit will help the industry get back into the business of developing better products, instead of having to devote its resources to defending the lawful manufacture, sale, and use of its products.

In order to encourage this technology, my legislation has an additional provision which exempts that part of the firearm which is enhanced or added and devoted solely to the addition of Firearm Personalization Technology, from the federal excise tax on firearms. For example, if a firearm normally costs $500, and $500 worth of electronic components are added to the firearm for Firearm Personalization Technology, the $500 enhancement would be exempt from the federal excise tax. A $50 savings on a $1,000 gun may not seem much at first glance, but as many in the industry will tell you, guns are very price-sensitive commodities, for which consumers make a decision to buy or not to buy, based on surprisingly small price differences.

In closing, let me say, Mr. Speaker, while there are certainly obvious sharp divisions in this Chamber on private firearms ownership in our country, I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should be able to support improvements in gun technology which are voluntarily pursued by the manufacturing community, with little rather than more government involvement. Allowing market forces to determine innovation in the field, is the natural and correct way progress ought to occur.

DATABASE PROTECTION

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for an important issue that will require the full attention of Congress in the coming year—database protection. While I am disappointed that consensus could not be reached this year on legislation to protect the right of individuals and organizations to protect their databases from the outright theft of their products, I am hopeful that the 107th Congress will act expeditiously on this issue when it convenes in January. A database anti-piracy law is an imperative for an information society that is growing ever more dependent on the Internet and on the information available in electronic databases.

Companies that compile the complex information for these databases put a tremendous amount of work into developing an accurate, understandable resource bank for private or public use. This is a lengthy, expensive, and ongoing process that deserves to be protected. Individuals, companies, and organizations that work hard to compile information for the benefit of their consumers should be protected under our laws. It is not acceptable to allow a ''data pirate'' to steal the product of someone else's hard work and profit from it, while causing the original compiler market harm. Our nation's intellectual property laws have long recognized the importance of rewarding work with legal protection, and this is one area where the law needs to be improved to keep up with advances in technology unforeseen by earlier generations of lawmakers.

In the district I represent, the consequences of inaction are very real. I have a background in small business and real estate, so I know that importance of this legislation. From the local realtor to the database company that employs thousands in my state, not acting to provide legal recourse to the victims of data piracy, significantly affects jobs and commerce in Central Ohio.

I am concerned that without legislation to protect their databases, there is no incentive to devote time, capital, and resources to the creation and maintenance of dependable and accurate databases. People from all walks of life utilize these databases everyday for information on medicine to information on real estate. Society will be severely affected if these information systems cease to exist. Without legislation to protect them, the lack of incentives for creating and maintaining databases of accurate information will eventually lead to the non-production of these important data compilations.

In the next Congress, we can develop legislation that will protect database producers and still allow consumers the same access to the free flow of information for legitimate purposes. Developing sound legislation on database anti-piracy will be a top priority for me in the 107th Congress. I look forward to working with Mr. COBLE, Chairman of the Judiciary Courts and Intellectual Property Subcommittee, the Commerce Committee, and the House Leadership on this important issue.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Chairman LEACH and Mr. LAZIO, and my colleagues on the House Banking Committee for their tireless work on moving legislation that brings some much-needed reforms to the overall housing industry. S. 1452 will enhance home ownership throughout the country.

Furthermore, I am pleased to see that many provisions of H.R. 1776, the Housing and Economic Opportunity Act, have been included in the S. 1452. As my colleagues may remember, H.R. 1776 passed our chamber earlier in the year by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 417 to 8. However, there is one particular omission that concerns me. Unfortunately, this omission may ultimately have an impact on the number of families who will realize the American Dream of homeownership.

The provision that has been omitted from S. 1452 is Section 102 of H.R. 1776. Section 102 requires that the Federal government perform a housing impact analysis before it issues new regulations. The impact analysis would determine if a significant negative impact on affordable housing would result from those new regulations. ''Significant'' would be defined as increasing consumers' cost of housing by more than $100,000,000 per year.

Further, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1776 stipulates that the private sector would have an opportunity to submit an alternative to the proposed regulation if it would have less of a negative impact on the cost of homeownership. As with the other provisions in Title I of H.R. 1776, the goal of the housing impact analysis is to alert federal agencies and the general public of the impact of regulation on housing affordability.

Ultimately, the objective would be to help bring down the cost of a home by minimizing regulations that pose a barrier to homeownership. The housing impact analysis addresses this issue by requiring the Federal government to perform an ''internal check'' of sorts in a quest to see if the regulation might be constructed in a better way that would not lock some individuals out of homeownership.

I see this internal check as a positive action, Mr. Speaker, and I am concerned that this worthy provision, a provision 417 of my colleagues supported, was left out of the legislation that comes before us today. I hope that this concept does not die with the closing of the 106th Congress, but is reviewed again next year, with the commencement of the 107th.

RECENT VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of Congress a recent letter from United States military leaders regarding the recent violence in the Middle East. The letter follows:

We, the undersigned, believe that during the current upheavals in Israel, the Israel Defense Forces have exercised remarkable restraint in the face of lethal violence orchestrated by the leadership of a Palestinian Authority that deliberately pushes civilians and young people to the front lines.

We are appalled by the Palestinian political and military leadership that teaches children the mechanics of war while filling their heads with hate. We are appalled by Palestinian ''military commanders'' who place armed adults amid civilian rioters, including children, and then callously use the inevitable casualties as grist for their propaganda mill. The behavior of those Palestinians, who use civilians as soldiers in a war, is a perversion of military ethics.

What makes the US-Israel security relationship one of mutual benefit is the combination of military capabilities and shared political values—freedom, democracy, personal liberty and the rule of law. Yitzhak Rabin said at the beginning of this peace effort with the Palestinians that one can only make peace with one's enemies. But the enemy must have decided to put down his weapons—rocks as well as rifles—and make peace in good faith. The Palestinian-initiated violence in Israel now strongly tells us that the necessary good faith is sorely lacking on the Palestinian side.

America's responsibility as a friend to Israel, the only country in the Middle East that shares our democratic and humanitarian values, should never yield to America's role as facilitator in this process. Friends don't leave friends on the battlefield.

Lt. Gen. Marcus Anderson, USAF (ret.), Inspector General, US Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Robert Baer, USA (ret.), Deputy Commander, Army Materiel Command.

Maj. Gen. Max Baratz, USAR (ret.), Commander, US Army Reserve.

Lt. Gen. Jared Bates, USA (ret.), Inspector General, US Army.

R. Adm. Charles Beers, USN (ret.), Commander, Submarine Group Ten.

Lt. Gen. Arthur C. Blades, USMC (ret.), Deputy for Plans, Policies, and Ops.

Lt. Gen. Anthony Burshnick, USAF (ret.), Commander, Military Airlift Command.

Adm. James Busey, USN (ret.), CINC, US Navy Europe.

Lt. Gen. Paul Cerjan, USA (ret.), Deputy Allied Commander, Europe.

Adm. Hank Chiles, USN (ret.), Commander in Chief, US Strategic Command.

Gen. J.B. Davis, USAF (ret.), CoS, Supreme HQ Allied Powers Europe.

Adm. Bruce DeMars, USN (ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion.

Maj. Gen. Lee Downer, USAF (ret.), Director of Operations, Air Combat Command.

Adm. Leon Edney, USN (ret.), Commander, US Atlantic Fleet.

Gen. John Foss, USA (ret.), Commanding General, Training and Doctrine Command.

Maj. Gen. Donald Gardner, USMC (ret.), Commander, III Marine Expeditionary Force.

Maj. Gen. William Garrison, USA (ret.), Commander, Joint Special Operations Command.

Lt. Gen. Jay Garner, USA (ret.), Assistant Vice Chief of Staff.

Maj. Gen. David Grange, USA (ret.), Dir., Army Operations, Readiness & Mobilization.

Lt. Gen. Tom Griffin, USA (ret.), Chief of Staff, Allied Forces Southern Europe.

Gen. Alfred Hansen, USAF (ret.), Commander, USAF Logistics Command.

Adm. Jerome Johnson, USN (ret.), Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

V. Adm. Dennis Jones, USN (ret.), Deputy CINC, US Strategic Command.

V. Adm. Bernard Kauderer, USN (ret.), Commander, Submarine Forces, Atlantic Fleet.

R. Adm. Herbert C. Kaler, USN (ret.), Dir., Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Org.

V. Adm. Anthony Less, USN (ret.), Commander, Naval Air Forces, US Atlantic Fleet.

Maj. Gen. Jarvis Lynch, USMC (ret.), Commander, Eastern Marine Recruiting Depot.

Lt. Gen. Charles May, USAF (ret.), Assistance Vice Chief of Staff, USAF.

Maj. Gen. James McCombs, USAF (ret.), Deputy CINC, US Special Operations Command.

R. Adm. William F. Merlin, USCG (ret.), Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

Maj. Gen. William C. Moore, USA (ret.), Director, Operations, Readiness & Mobilization.

Maj. Gen. Robert Patterson, USAF (ret.), Commanding General, 23rd Air Force.

V. Adm. James Perkins, USN (ret.), Deputy CINC, US Southern Command.

Lt. Gen. Everett Pratt, USAF (ret.), Vice Commander, US Air Forces Europe.

Maj. Gen. Milnor Roberts, USA (ret.), Deputy Chief, US Army Reserve.

R. Adm. Norman Saunders, USCG (ret.), Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

Maj. Gen. Sidney Shachnow, USA (ret.), Commander, JFK Special Warfare School.

R. Adm. Sumner Shapiro, USN (ret.), Director, Naval Intelligence.

Adm. Leighton Smith, USN (ret.), Commander, US Forces, Southern Europe.

Maj. Gen. Larry Taylor, USMCR (ret.), Commander, 4th Marine Aircraft Wing.

Adm. Carlisle A.H. Trost, USN (ret.), Chief of Naval Operations.

V. Adm. Jerry Tuttle, USN (ret.), Director, Space and Electronic Warfare.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. White, USA (ret.), Exec. to the Chairman of the JCS.

R. Adm. Guy Zeller, USN (ret.), Dir., Surface Warfare, OPNAV.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 782, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act.

I would like to begin by recognizing Chairman GOODLING and Ranking Member CLAY for all of their hard work in producing this legislation. Mr. CLAY will be missed in this chamber next year.

I also would like to extend my deep appreciation to Subcommittee Chairman MCKEON

and Ranking Democrat TIERNEY for their dedication to our older Americans.

Although I believe that this legislation is flawed and still has several problems, it is an important bill and Congress can no longer allow the important programs served under the OAA to continue without authorization.

Unfortunately, this bill contains new formulas for funding which, in the coming years, could shift vitally needed resources away from Northeastern urban areas such as my home of New York City.

Like with the funding formulas used by the VA, the Government tries to allocate resources based on new population data, neglecting the needs of those who need the most care.

But while this bill has several problems—problems I hope will be worked out in a bipartisan way by the Congress next year, this bill also contains a number of important new programs as well.

This legislation establishes a $125 million caregiver program. This creation will help thousands of New York families be able to provide for their loved ones in their later years. I salute this new program.

Additionally, the Committee included a hold harmless provision for nutrition programs such as the Meals and Wheels program, which benefits so many of my older constituents, particularly in such places like Mitchell-Linden in my District.

This legislation also toughens up the language on a top concern of mine—elder abuse. Although I did not have the opportunity to amend this legislation with provisions from my bill, the Elderly Protection Act (H.R. 1984), to provide for Federal background checks of employed caregivers or assistance to train new caregivers to identify signs of domestic abuse, I am pleased at the new language.

This bill increases the severity of committing crimes such as fraud and exploitation of the elderly—an all too common occurrence in our country.

In my district, Father Coleman Costello of Walk the Walk is establishing a new and innovative center to provide for the abused elderly and provide treatment for their abusers. While this bill could have gone further to address this hidden crime, it does make positive steps.

I ask welcome the language regarding the senior jobs program in Title V of the OAA. Our senior need jobs, but we must ensure that these jobs are in their communities and serving their needs as well as the needs of the elderly in their neighborhoods.

All in all, with the problems notwithstanding, I will vote to support this legislation as it will provide some new funding streams to New York City as well as reauthorize a number of key programs under the Older Americans Act.

Stating that, it is my hope that Congress can revisit some of the questionable provisions of this bill in the 107th Congress so that all older Americans can fully benefit from the Older Americans Act.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 835, ESTUARIES AND CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000. This landmark legislation will enhance our ability to protect the nation's valuable shoreline habitats, extend the cooperative partnership to preserve the Chesapeake Bay and Long Island Sound, and expand the effort to improve water quality in our nation's lakes.

Estuaries are some of the most valuable natural resources of the nation, but they are also vulnerable and many are collapsing. This important measure promotes the restoration of one million acres of estuary habitat throughout the country by directing $275 million in funding and other incentives to local estuary protection projects.

Estuaries are the bays, gulfs, sounds, and inlets where fresh water from rivers and streams meets and mixes with salt water from the ocean. These areas represent some of the most environmentally and economically productive habitats in the world.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, 75 percent of fish and shellfish caught in the United States by commercial fishing operations depend on estuaries for survival. Moreover, these habitats—river deltas, sea grass meadows, forest wetlands, shellfish beds, marshes, and beaches—support a large number of endangered or threatened species of plants and wildlife.

These areas are fragile and vulnerable to human and environmental pressures. Growing populations along the coastlines have threatened the natural balance of these habitats. Dredging, draining, the construction of dams, sewage spills, and other forms of pollution have led to the degradation and destruction of many estuary habitats.

This measure exemplifies environmental policy based on partnership and cooperation, and not on governmental mandates and regulations. S. 835 encourages states, local governments, and community organizations to work together to identify estuary habitat restoration projects.

Estuaries are national treasures, and they deserve a national effort to protect and restore them. Responding to the growing threats to our bays, sounds, and other coastal waters presents a difficult challenge: federal resources are limited, the need is great, and the pressure on these areas is intensifying. The Estuaries and Clean Water Act takes the necessary steps to protect and restore these natural habitats.

The time to act is now. We are not doing enough to protect these valuable resources. Many estuaries are on the brink of extinction because of manmade pressures. We need to preserve these vitally important habitats. They are an integral part of this country's environmental balance. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

TRIBUTE TO SID YATES

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. Sid Yates. Mr. Yates was a good friend. He was there to welcome me here on my first day in Congress and I was glad to have served with him for over a decade.

Mr. Yates and I worked on many bipartisan issues to improve our nation and home state of Illinois. I was always appreciative of his friendship and admired his work both within the Illinois delegation and on the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Yates began his distinguished career as an attorney in Chicago. He was first elected to this House in 1948. As a member of this body, Mr. Yates was a quiet but strong voice.

Mr. Speaker, Sid Yates served this institution, his constituents and community well and he will be greatly missed. I extend my condolences to his wife and family.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SIDNEY R. YATES

HON. JOE SKEEN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret and sadness that America has lost a dedicated public servant, the Honorable Sidney Yates.

I served with Sid on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior when he chaired the Committee and when he was the ranking member. Even though we had our philosophical differences, Sid was a fair chairman and an effective member of the committee. He supported priorities for my district in New Mexico even though he may not have been completely in agreement. But he knew it was important to my constituents so he went along with my request.

Over the years, Sid and I developed a friendship that was characterized by mutual respect, humor and a common goal of public service. We understood each other's priorities and respected one another for the principles we stood for and our commitment to serve our country in the legislative branch of the federal government.

His passion for the arts, his firm resolve to preserve our natural resources and his devotion to Native Americans personify Sid's legacy.

When Sid retired from the House of Representatives nearly two ago, members of this House gave Sid the appropriate acknowledgment for the many years of service to our country. I'm pleased that Sid was present to witness the appreciation for his service.

We will miss Sid. His family remains in our thoughts and in our prayers.

PROVIDING RESOURCES AND EDUCATION FOR KIDS ACT (PRE-K)

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today, kindergarten teachers estimate that one in three children enters the classroom unprepared to meet the challenges of school. Prekindergarten programs are key to helping these young people be ready to learn when they attend their first day of school. Many children, however, do not have access to pre-k programs. While several states, including Wisconsin, are expanding their prekindergarten programs, only one state in the country, Georgia, currently has a universal pre-k program.

To help states meet the challenge of providing quality prekindergarten programs, I introduced the Providing Resources and Education for Kids Act (Pre-K Act) on October 25, 2000. This legislation would provide grants to state education agencies to help establish or strengthen prekindergarten early learning programs that provide full day, full calendar year early learning services for children age five and under. To encourage states to participate and ensure their long-term investment, the bill creates a sliding scale over five years for the federal-state match.

Good quality early education helps children develop, enter school ready to succeed and improve their skills. In fact, studies of several state prekindergarten initiatives offer convincing evidence of the benefits of early education for children at risk of school failure such as higher mathematics and reading achievement, increased creativity, better school attendance, improved health and greater parental involvement. Further, prekindergarten programs have proven cost-effective over time. The Rand Corporation and a team of researchers at the University of Wisconsin estimate that the most effective prekindergarten programs create savings to the government of $13,000 to $19,000 per child. This savings is realized in higher school achievement, less retention in a grade, a reduced need for special education, and less crime.

I hope that Congress would consider this important issue before we adjourn for the year. If, however, we are unable to debate the Pre-K Act, I will work to make it a top priority when the 107th Congress considers the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK E. SOUDER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss issues concerning the Republic of Macedonia. The largest population of Macedonian-Americans resides in my district. During the Kosovo Crisis, and throughout the wars in the Former Yugoslavia in the 1990's, Macedonia has shown remarkable strength and resilience which has allowed this democratic country to emerge as a point of stability in the Balkans as well as a strong ally of the United States. I believe we need to adhere to our financial commitments and reemphasize our support for Macedonia.

As many of you know, President Boris Trajkovski is engaged in a long-term economic development program following the aftermath of the Kosovo crisis. Also, I understand that the continued border instability is undermining the Republic of Macedonia's overall economic climate and risks future economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the managers of the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for including language that strongly supports President Trajkovski's government's efforts to bring stability and economic prosperity to all Macedonians and to the Balkan region.

As a strong supporter of Macedonia, I support the manager's intent to encourage the Department of State to provide adequate resources to fund critical project components of President Trajkovski's Economic Stabilization and Development Plan.

RECOGNIZING DOLORES LARKIN, THE HOT DOG LADY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the Contra Costa Times newspaper wrote an article about a person who has become a fixture in central Contra Costa County. Dolores Larkin has had an amazing career serving hot dogs at Caspers Famous Hot Dogs in Pleasant Hill, California. For more than 45 years Dolores has done more than serve hot dogs. For all these years she has had to listen to people in our community who have had problems or are down on their luck. It is not unusual to go into Caspers and see Dolores counseling someone about their kids or talking to her own kids. Whenever you walk into Caspers, she always has a smile for you. That is why so many people go out of their way to get a dog at Caspers.

Mr. Speaker, I should know; I have eaten as many Caspers hot dogs as any person in the county. I started eating hot dogs at Caspers in Richmond. There was a rumor when we were young that the record number of dogs eaten in one sitting was 19. On a challenge I tried to break it and got to 14. Even today the debate goes on as to where the best hot dog was served. Was it Chris's in Oakland, Doggie Diner in Oakland and Richmond or Kaspers with a "K"?

Mr. Speaker, time turned out to be the test; most of the others are gone now—they just could not compete with the great people at Caspers, especially Dolores who has been a great friend to so many in the community. It is wonderful to see her get this recognition. I submit the following article from the Contra Costa Times:

Hot Dog Lady's a Fixture at Pleasant Hill eatery

(By Katie Oyan)

PLEASANT HILL—Dolores Larkin rarely goes unnoticed.

People point and stare at her in the grocery store, at the doctor's office—even once when she was vacationing in Hawaii.

"Kids will say, 'Look mom, it's the hot dog lady!' " she said, "It used to embarrass me, but it doesn't anymore. I like it."

In November, the 68-year-old great-grandmother will celebrate her 45th anniversary as an employee at Casper's Famous Hot Dogs, a popular hang-out and fast-food joint on the corner of Vivian Drive and Contra Costa Boulevard.

The Concord resident doesn't sling dogs for the money. In fact, the only bad thing one of her managers, Ron Dorian, could say about Larkin is that she sometimes forgets to cash her paychecks.

Instead, the "hot dog lady" said she has stuck around for the company.

"I like my customers—that's why I'm here," said Larkin, wearing her long, dark hair in a pony-tail and bubble-gum pink earrings to match her Casper's apron.

Over the years, Larkin has made Casper's her second home. Of her five children, 10 grandchildren and six great-grandchildren, seven of them have worked with her at the restaurant, and some still do. To family, she's known as "Grandma hot dog."

Before coming to Pleasant Hill, Larkin spent five years at the Casper's on First Avenue in Oakland. In 1960, her boss sent her to the Pleasant Hill Casper's to train employees before the restaurant's grand opening. She has been there ever since.

And so have many of her customers.

Bob Wescott, a retired military pilot and researcher, has been a regular for so long, Larkin gave him his own key. Five days a week, he opens the store and starts the coffee, getting a cup ready for Larkin when she comes in.

"Another gentleman and his wife did it for years, but they got too old and said they couldn't do it anymore. I guess I just happened to be there," Wescott said.

A couple of retired Pleasant Hill police officers also lend Larkin a little volunteer labor. They come in each morning and restock the restaurant's paper cups and lids. If there are any light bulbs that need replacing, they do that, too.

"Everyone thinks the world of Dolores," Wescott said. "That's why we do it. She's just an awful nice person, that's all."

One of the first fast food chains in the Bay Area, Casper's migrated to the East Bay from Chicago in 1934. In addition to the one in Pleasant Hill, there are 10 Casper's restaurants—in Albany, Richmond, San Pablo, Walnut Creek, Dublin, Concord, two in Oakland and two in Hayward.

Among the other stores in the chain, the Pleasant Hill Casper's is known as "the country club" for its friendly, comfortable environment, Larkin said. Devoid of a playland or flashy banners, a couple of counters and a handful of wooden tables give the restaurant its old fashioned appeal. "Floy," the philodendron in the front window, is named after a coworker who died about five years ago. "We raised our kids together," Larkin said.

The Pleasant Hill Casper's is also the most successful in the chain, selling about 200,000 dogs a year.

People go out of their way to stop there for a $2 or $3 meal. Larkin said the most popular item is the Casper's dog, a natural-casing frankfurter that comes on a steamed bun with mustard, relish, tomatoes and onions. Employees also serve 10-inch spicy polish, smoked Cajun and turkey frankfurters.

Red Skelton is the most famous person Larkin can remember serving.

He came in two or three times, she said. Congressman George Miller stops in once in a while, too.

In her spare time, Larkin makes cakes for her friends' birthdays and weddings. Her other hobby is ''kids.''

''My last girl was born on my day off, she said. ''I worked all nine months.''

About 10 years ago, a mathematician who dropped in for a hot dog figured out that if someone were to line up end-to-end all the hot dogs that Larkin has served, they'd stretch from here to San Diego.

By now, they'd probably stretch halfway back again.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 835, ESTUARIES AND CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 2000

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the House leadership for bringing this important legislation before us. The Estuary Habitat and Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 2000 clarifies Congress' commitment to restoring one million acres of estuaries over the next decade and promoting a partnership between federal, state, and local governments, and the private sector.

The conference report we consider today includes one area that is particularly important to Southern California and the residents of the district I am honored to represent. This area is the Los Cerritos Wetlands. Los Angeles County has lost more than 93 percent of its coastal wetlands. The Los Cerritos Wetlands are one of only three sizable areas of coastal wetlands remaining that could be restored to provide better habitat for fish and wildlife. Furthermore, these wetlands are among a limited number nationwide existing in an urban environment. It will offer numerous benefits to school children, university researchers, and simply improving the quality of life in a major city such as Long Beach.

Thus far, state and community agencies have worked closely together in the spirit of cooperation and coordination called for in the Estuary Restoration Act. The Wetlands Recovery Project—a partnership of federal, state, and local government, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector—has made acquisition of these wetlands its top priority. The restoration of the Los Cerritos Wetlands will provide an important addition to improving the environment in our region.

Again, I thanked the House leadership, my good friend Representative WAYNE GILCHREST, Chairman BUD SHUSTER, and the other members and staff who—through this legislation—have made an important contribution to the Nation and to Southern California.

DAIRY MARKET ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This is a bill to restore stability to America's dairy markets. I introduced the Dairy Market Enhancement Act of 2000, H.R. 5372 earlier this year. The bill establishes a fair and accurate reporting system for manufactured dairy products, requires independent verification for price reporting, and implements measures to ensure compliance with reporting and verification requirements. Senator RUSS FEINGOLD (D–WI) introduced the companion bill in the Senate. This bill S. 2773 now goes to the White House where the President is expected to sign it into law.

Recent reporting errors have highlighted the need to make reporting of dairy products mandatory, verifiable, and enforceable. While I recognize that this legislation will not solve the problem of low milk prices, it will go a long way toward assuring an accurate Federal order price and stabilizing month-to-month fluctuations for farmers.

The bill requires that the U.S. Department of Agriculture use the current survey format as a starting point for mandatory reporting. In order to ensure accuracy, the bill allows the Secretary of Agriculture to require that reporting companies make their records available for department audit. Any willful and intentional violation of requirements to make accurate and timely reports is punishable by a civil fine of up to $20,000 under the terms of the bill. It also requires that USDA guard the confidentiality of information from each reporting company.

Because the determination of the federal order price is based on the price of components such as butter, cheese, and dry milk, it is important to have processors report price and inventories. This bill makes such reporting mandatory to assure that farmers are paid a price that reflects the current demand for milk and milk products. This is good legislation and I'm glad my colleagues in Congress join us in recognizing its merits.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 2413, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000. I would like to recognize over 260 of my colleagues who joined me as a cosponsor of H.R. 4033, an identical House version of this bipartisan legislation designed to save the lives of police officers, which my colleague from New Jersey, FRANK LOBIONDO, and I sponsored and which was approved overwhelmingly by the House earlier this year. Mr. LOBIONDO has once again proven that he is an indispensable leader on this vital issue. His commitment to police officers in his district and nationwide is absolutely unquestionable. Furthermore, he has repeatedly championed the cause of corrections officers, who are often the forgotten arm of the law enforcement community. In this age of expanding and increasingly violent prison populations, Mr. LOBIONDO has taken the lead in pushing for the development and use of stabproof vests to protect those who keep violent criminals behind bars. I am pleased to say that, largely due to his efforts, S. 2413 includes provisions which will make stabproof vests available under the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant program. Mr. LOBIONDO's staff, especially his Legislative Assistant, Bryan Cunningham, have been incredibly helpful in this process. Their work has been a worthy reflection of Mr. LOBIONDO's long-standing commitment to the protection of our nation's law enforcement officers. I would also like to extend my thanks to Senator CAMPBELL and Senator LEAHY, the Senate sponsors of this legislation. It has been my pleasure to work with them to see this bill passed before the conclusion of the 106th Congress.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to Crime Subcommittee Chairman BILL MCCOLLUM, whose dedication to this program has proven invaluable in securing a speedy floor vote on this reauthorization. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Carl Thorsen, a member of the Judiciary Committee staff. Formerly an assistant to Mr. LOBIONDO, Carl worked with us on the original authorization of this program and has been a valuable ally in our efforts to pass bulletproof vest legislation in the 106th Congress. The Crime Subcommittee's Ranking Democrat, BOBBY SCOTT, has also lent his powerful voice to this important cause. I commend his efforts in pushing this legislation forward, and thank him on behalf of the police and corrections officers who will benefit from its enactment. Bobby Vassar, on Mr. SCOTT's staff, also deserves praise for his dedication and support, which helped make an often long and difficult process fast and painless. All of these gentlemen recognize the importance of this legislation to law enforcement officers, who put their lives on the line every day for our safety.

As an appropriator, I would be remiss if I did not mention the considerable assistance we have received from the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary. Chairman HAROLD ROGERS and Ranking Democrat JOSE SERRANO have been instrumental in ensuring that this program is consistently funded at its authorized level.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the law enforcement community who have worked with me and my staff to ensure that we crafted the best possible legislation to meet their needs. I am proud that the Fraternal Order of Police, National Sheriffs' Association, International Union of Police Associations, AIL–IO, National Troopers' Coalition, Police Executive Research Forum, and the Law Enforcement Alliance of America have placed their collective memberships of over 500,000 law enforcement professionals and community leaders squarely behind this legislation. In particular, I would like to express my

gratitude to Tim Richardson of the Fraternal Order of Police and Dean Kueter of the National Sherriffs' Association, who's input was vital in shaping the important changes found in the legislation before us today.

The seed for the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant program was planted over six years ago, when I was told by local police officers that many gang members and drug dealers in Northwest Indiana had the protection of bulletproof vests, while many of the police officers who patrol the streets in my district did not. I was absolutely stunned by this. I believe that when police officers are issued guns and badges, they should be issued a bulletproof vest as well. If we are going to ask these men and women to risk their lives to keep our streets safe, we have a responsibility to ensure they have the equipment needed to do their job. Unfortunately, we often fall short of this obligation.

Each year, hundreds of police officers in this nation are killed in the line of duty. Studies show that, between 1980 and 1996, there were 1,182 felonious deaths of police officers due to firearms. Of those deaths, 924 of the officers were not wearing bulletproof vests. Wounds to the torso area killed 42 percent of those officers; wounds that could have been prevented had those officers been equipped with bulletproof vests. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has estimated that risk of fatality from a firearm for officers not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing body armor. In fact, modern bulletproof material has saved the lives of more than 2,500 police officers from gunfire since its introduction in the mid-1970's. However, bulletproof vests are not limited to stopping bullets. Police officers will attest to vests' roles in saving their lives from impact during car accidents, adding an extra layer of protection while subduing a violent suspect, and giving them the confidence they need to carry out dangerous assignments.

Despite these statistics, tens of thousands of law enforcement officers do not even have access to a vest. This problem is accentuated by our nation's commitment to beefing up our police forces. In May 1999, the Department of Justice announced that we had reached our goal of putting an additional 100,000 officers on the streets almost a year ahead of schedule. But what good is hiring new officers if we cannot give them the tools they need to do their jobs?

I was even more troubled to learn that many law enforcement agencies, especially in small towns or rural communities, simply found the costs of vests prohibitively expensive. During a visit to a local chapter of the Fraternal Order of Police in Dyer, Indiana, officers explained that a good vest can cost over $500, while heavier body armor can cost almost $1,000. As a result, many agencies are simply unable to budget for vests, a fact which sometimes forces officers to purchase vests at their own expense. Despite the risk, many officers are unable to balance the cost of the vest with the cost of feeding their families, making car payments, or sending their children to school.

Statistics show that officers in small police departments are much less likely to have vests than their counterparts in larger departments with greater resources. Yet, just because they do not have access to vests, if does not mean they are immune from the violent crime that plagues many of our communities. In this age of cross-country drug and illegal firearms trafficking, rural methamphetamine labs, and rapidly expanding suburban areas, even rural and small town police officers increasingly find themselves faced with dangerous, well-armed criminals. Without vests, these officers are at the mercy of these criminals.

Even in larger departments, officers may have vests purchased years earlier which are now either worn out or obsolete. The National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center at the National Institutes of Justice has recommended that bulletproof vests be tested every 5 years for bullet resistance degradation. Even as we begin to provide vests for the estimated 25 percent of law enforcement and corrections officers without access to bulletproof and stabproof body armor, other officers are wearing vests that are losing their protective qualities due to constant wear and tear.

In order to alleviate this problem, in 1997, I, along with Mr. LOBIONDO, introduced H.R. 2829, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act. With over 300 co-sponsors, the measure passed by an overwhelming margin. Ultimately, a similar measure introduced by Senators BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL and PATRICK LEAHY was enacted on June 16, 1998. The 1998 law created a program which authorized $25 million per year to pay up to 50 percent of the costs of bulletproof vests for local and state law enforcement agencies. In order to ensure that smaller jurisdictions received a fair share of the funds, the money was to be distributed evenly, with half going to jurisdictions with under 100,000 residents and half going to larger jurisdictions.

In each of the first two years of this program, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant program has provided over 3,000 law enforcement agencies with funding to purchase over 90,000 bulletproof vests and body armor. The program is operated through the Office of Justice Programs' first Internet-based funding application process. The web site was developed within six months of the appropriation, and offers a one-stop application process. The site allows law enforcement agencies to log in, purchase vests from a choice of dozens of manufacturers and hundreds of styles, and automatically apply for the grant upon purchase. This effort garnered the prestigious 1999 Intergovernmental Open Systems Solutions Gold Award from the Federation of Government Information Processing Councils for the program.

Unfortunately, in the most recent year of the program, funding was insufficient to provide any law enforcement agency with the full matching grant requested under the program. In fact, the average grant award represented only 30 percent of the cost of the vests, a 20 percent shortfall on the federal side. These agencies came to us in good faith and committed to providing vests to their officers if the federal government matched their funds. For many smaller agencies, this shortfall is devastating, and could end up taking away funding from other important departmental programs. Therefore, we must, in turn, honor our commitment to provide these agencies with the full 50 percent of the costs of these vests. In order to do so, S. 2413 doubles the yearly authorization of the program to $50 million from Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 through FY 2004. This figure, based on demand from the first two years of the program, should be sufficient to fully fund all grant requests at the 50 percent matching level we promised in 1998.

The original authorization of this program also included a provision to allow the purchase of stabproof vests for corrections officers and sheriff's deputies who regularly face violent criminals in close quarters in our nation's jails. The primary threat to these officers comes from homemade knives. The ingenuity displayed in smuggling in and creating sharp weapons in prison is phenomenal. This combination of violent felons and deadly weapons often leads to explosive conflicts into which deputies and corrections officers must insert themselves to restore order. In order to do this, they must be confident that they have the best protection possible from the criminals they must subdue.

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice decided that requests for funding for stabproof vests under the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant program were not valid until a national standard for such vests is developed by the National Institutes of Justice (NIJ). After over two years of development, NIJ continues to delay the implementation of such a standard. In order to address this issue, we supported amendments to the measures, offered by Chairman MCCOLLUM during subcommittee consideration of H.R. 4033 in the House and by Senator LEAHY during floor consideration of S. 2413 in the Senate, which will allow states to develop their own stabproof vest standards, independent of NIJ or the Department of Justice. These standards will then be used as a basis for agencies within each state to purchase stabproof vests through the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant program and until NIJ makes good on their promise to complete a national standard.

Finally, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 would take extra precautions to ensure that those small agencies, which are often in most need of additional funding for bulletproof vests, would receive the entire grant for which they apply. As I noted earlier, many smaller agencies find themselves unable to purchase vests for their officers due to limited funding. The program, to date, has not fulfilled their expectations, because it has fallen short of giving many of these agencies a full grant. Therefore, S. 2413 includes a provision which ensures that smaller jurisdictions, with under 100,000 residents, will receive all of the funding they request before money is allotted to larger jurisdictions. This is more of a safeguard than a limitation. Under statistics from the first two years of the program, less than $15 million would be needed to fully fund these small jurisdictions. Under a $50 million authorization, this would leave well over half of the funding to larger jurisdictions. However, with an expected increase in demand due to the new treatment of stabproof vests, it is vital that we ensure smaller communities that their police officers will be cared for. We must protect the Crown Point, Indiana, officer who unknowingly pulls over an armed drug dealer on U.S. Highway 231 as much as

the New York City officer involved in an orchestrated drug raid.

Our legislation is intended to reauthorize a highly successful program which provides a partnership between the federal government and state and local law enforcement agencies in order to make sure that every police and corrections officer who needs a bulletproof vest gets one. It is clear to us that every officer on the street should have a vest, and that the need to supply officers with vests is important enough to warrant direct federal assistance. Furthermore, the overwhelming positive response we have received from law enforcement agencies and officers to this program highlights the continued need for the program.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this effort is our desire to save the lives of police officers. When we make this commitment, we offer protection not just to the officers, but to every community in America. We prevent the suffering of families of fallen officers. We prevent the loss of leaders in our communities. Perhaps most importantly, we give those who protect us the ability to do their job better, more confidently, and with a knowledge that their entire nation is behind them every day, in even the most dangerous situations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up in support of our police and corrections officers, and vote for S. 2413.

RETIREMENT OF HON. TILLIE FOWLER

SPEECH OF

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, for the past eight years, I have had the privilege of serving in the U.S. House of Representatives with the distinguished gentlelady from Jacksonville, Florida, Tillie Fowler. It has been my and my wife, Emilie's great pleasure to get to know Tillie and her husband Buck. They have become close friends of ours as we worked together to serve our constituents in Florida.

The residents of Florida's 4th Congressional District have been fortunate to be represented by a hard-working, dedicated Member of Congress. Tillie has served as the Vice-Chairman of the Republican Conference, making her the highest-ranking woman in the Congress and the only Floridian who is part of the leadership. While she has been involved in the leadership, she has not neglected the needs of her constituents.

Her service on the Armed Services and Transportation Committees has been exemplary. She worked very hard to ensure that Florida received its fair share of highway funding.

Tillie Fowler is a class-act and we need more individuals like her here. We will truly miss her. But we know that she will not stop serving the residents of Florida no matter what she does next.

RETIREMENT OF HON. TILLIE FOWLER

SPEECH OF

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make my last address as an honored Member of this distinguished body. There is no doubt in my mind what I will miss the most about this job. It will not be the late nights—and it will not be the ever-changing schedule. I will miss my friends—and I have made so many.

This institution is filled with so many extraordinary people, who, in my time here, have done some extraordinary things.

I make it a point in every speech I give back home to talk about the people I serve with here in this great body. I want people to know that the portrayal they see of politicians in the press and on TV is far from accurate. While scandals and controversy may sell newspapers, they are certainly not the norm around here.

I never give a speech without talking about the dedication, the devotion and the selflessness with which nearly every Member of congress serves this institution and his or her country.

I may not always agree with someone's politics or ideology, but I would never question the sincerity or the purpose with which they pursue their agendas. People serve here for the right reasons—I truly believe that.

Serving with all of you has been such an honor. And as I look back over the last eight years, I look with pride at what we were able to do in such a short time.

Together, we reformed Congress. We have made this institution more open, more accountable and more responsive to the people. When I first set foot on this House floor in 1993, Congress' approval rating was a dismal 17 percent. That number is much higher today.

Together, with the hard work of the American people, we turned around an economy saddled by high interest rates and high unemployment.

Together, we balanced the federal budget for the first time since I was a staffer on Capitol Hill back in the 1960's.

Together we ended welfare as we knew it, and created a new system that rewards work and responsibility.

If I have one wish as I leave this institution, it is that some progress can be made toward reducing the partisanship that has plagued us.

I have tried very hard over my eight years to focus on the task at hand and leave the partisanship on the Capitol steps. When you look back at some of our best accomplishments, you find that they were mostly gained with support from both sides of the aisle. That should be a lesson to future Congresses.

I was proud to serve on the planning committee for the two bi-partisan retreats, and I hope that those retreats will continue and their mission expand.

I was also proud to serve on Speaker Hastert's leadership team these past two years. When he was unexpectedly tapped for the speakership, I said then he was the right man for the right time. Working with him the last two years, I witnessed first hand how true that statement was.

Always the calm in the eye of the storm, the speaker's steady hand and sharp focus have resulted in an impressive list of accomplishments, despite our razor thin majority. Some in the body may not always share his priorities or his political philosophies, but I have never heard a cross word spoken about Speaker HASTERT as a person. In this era of personal attack and partisanship, that is a real testament to the Speaker, and it has been my privilege to serve on his team.

To my constituents, I want to say that representing you has been the greatest honor of my life. I have tried to be both an effective representative and an honest steward of the incredible trust you have placed in me.

I want to thank all my colleagues who have taken to the House floor the last few days to say such nice things about me. I am humbled by their words and touched by their sentiments. While I will retire from this institution, I am not retiring from life. If there is one thing I learned from my parents, it is that public service and service to your community is a lifetime obligation. There will be new opportunities and new challenges, and I look forward to those. But serving in this body, with all of you, will forever be one of the most cherished times of my life. God bless you, God bless this institution, and God bless America.

INTRODUCTION OF H. CON. RES. 433 REGARDING BELARUS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 433, a resolution introduced on Monday by my colleague on the International Relations Committee, Mr. Gejdensen, concerning the recent parliamentary elections in Belarus.

The Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and other European institutions, as well as the State Department, all concluded that these elections were not free, fair and transparent and that they failed to meet the international norms for democratic elections. Unfortunately, the Lukashenka regime did not meet the four conditions that the OSCE set back last spring—namely, a democratic election law, an end to human rights abuses, access by the opposition to the state media, and genuine powers be granted to the parliament. Instead, in the run-up to the elections, we witnessed the denial of registration to many opposition candidates; detentions and fines of individuals advocating a boycott of the elections; confiscation of 100,000 copies of an independent newspaper among other examples of harassment of the opposition; rampant governmental interference in the election process and extensive irregularities on election day itself. These elections represent a continuing pattern of violations of human rights and the erosion of democracy which has

haunted Belarus throughout the last six years of Alexander Lukashenka's rule.

The Helsinki Commission, which I chair, has monitored and chronicles developments in Belarus, holding hearings which have included Belarusian democratic opposition leaders and leaders of the 13th Supreme Soviet, the legitimate parliament which Lukashenka disbanded in 1996. In July, I led the US delegation to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly meeting in Bucharest where the deteriorating situation in Belarus was high on our agenda. Importantly, this resolution includes language reaffirming Congress' recognition of the 13th Supreme Soviet as the sole democratically elected and constitutionally legitimate legislative body in Belarus, which is also important, especially as the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly continues to recognize that to seat the 13th Supreme Soviet as well. In the last few years, I have made numerous direct and indirect intercessions, including through various OSCE institutions, to draw attention to the deplorable situation in Belarus and to encourage the establishment of democracy in Belarus and I assure you that the Helsinki Commission will continue its efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution, and am eager for the House to go on record in support of the restoration of democracy in Belarus. I am especially pleased that the resolution urges the Lukashenka regime to provide a full accounting of the disappearances of several prominent opposition members and urges the release of those imprisoned in Belarus for their political views. I look forward to working with my colleagues to keep the spotlight on Belarus and to encourage the Belarusian government to comply with its freely undertaken OSCE and other international commitments.

ROFEH INTERNATIONAL HONORS MR. ARNOLD ZALTAS AND DR. TATSUO HIROSE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been my distinct honor over the years to take note of the extraordinary valuable work done by Rofeh International, in conjunction with the New England Chassidic Center led by Grand Rabbi Levi Horowitz. Grand Rabbi Horowitz, the Bostoner Rebbe as he is known, is a very distinguished scholar in the field of medical ethics, in addition to his eminence as a scholar of Judaism. Rofeh facilitates making the superb medical treatment that is available in Boston to people from all over the world, and if it were not for Rofeh, a large number of people who have benefitted from this medical treatment would not have been able to do so.

As part of their effort, Rofeh and the New England Chassidic Center have an annual dinner, at which they honor people who have been particularly distinguished in their service to this wonderful cause. This year Rofeh will honor two men. Arnold Zaltas and Tatsuo Hirose.

Dr. Hirose was born in Japan, and graduated from Kanazawa University School of Medicine there in 1961. His initial visit to the United States was 1965 when he was awarded with the Fulbright Fellowship, which allowed him to study clinical electrophysiology in vision at the Department of Ophthalmology, Cornell Medical School in New York. This happened when he was in the third year in the Postdoctoral School in Medicine in Kanazawa University. After spending three years in Cornell, he went back to Kanazawa and finished Postdoctoral School in Ophthalmology at Kanazawa University where he was awarded Doctor of Medical Science in 1969. He came to the Schepens Retina Associates, Retina Foundation (now called Schepens Eye Research Institute) and Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary for training and studying the surgery of the retina in the spring of 1969. He became a member of Schepens Retina Associates in 1973 at the same time he continued conducting research in studying functions of the retina at the Schepens Eye Institute, Harvard Medical School. He has been specializing in difficult complex retinal detachments, such as surgical failures in adults and children. He is particularly interested in infant and children's retinal detachment particularly in premature born babies. He published more than 140 papers in scientific medical journals, edited two books, including the most recent one: Schepens Retinal detachment and allied diseases. He contributed 23 book chapters. He received a Research to Prevent Blindness award, honor award of American Academy of Opthalmology, Senior Honor Award of American Academy of Ophthalmology, The Paul Kayser International Award of Merit in Retina Research. He has been selected in the Best Doctors in America 1996–1997, and Boston's Best Doctors in Boston Magazine, 1999. At present, he is a Clinical professor in ophthalmology, Harvard Medical School, senior Clinical Scientist as Schepens Eye Research Institutes, and Surgeon at the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary.

Arnold I. Zaltas is a partner in the Natick firm of Zaltas, Medoff & Raider, where he concentrates in estate planning, real estate and banking law.

He is a Trustee and General Counsel to the Middlesex Savings Bank, and serves as a Director of the Natick Visiting Nurse Association. He has served as Trustee of the Leonard Morse Hospital. Mr. Zaltas is a graduate of the Boston University School of Law, is past President of the Boston University Law School Alumni Association, and a recipient of the School of Law's Silver Shingle Award in recognition of outstanding service to the School. He is a Trustee of Temple Israel of Natick, where he was the recipient of the Maurice Geshelin Humanitarian Award.

Arnold is a long-time resident of Natick, where he resides with his wife, Brenda. They have three children: A. David Zaltas, an attorney, Mandi M. Kunen, an ophthalmologist, Marjorie Rubin, an attorney, and three grandchildren.

Arnold Zaltas and Tatsuo Hirose deserve hearty congratulations for the excellent work they do. Being recognized by Project Rofeh is a great honor, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to salute the work of this important organization of these two men.

A COWBOY'S LAST RIDE

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, family and friends recently said their final goodbyes to 101-year-old Paul T. Veluzat, one of the last of the American cowboys. He leaves behind a great legacy.

Paul's travels as a cowboy and a shrewd businessman began on Dec. 6, 1898, when he was born in Summershade, KY. At age 17 he went to work in a shipyard, then made his way to Texas where he joined the Texas Rangers. Paul was one of the first people to board the German submarine that sank the Lusitania, an event that precipitated the United States' entry into World War I.

Paul's love of horses led him back and forth to Mexico, where he rode with the revolutionary, Francisco "Pancho" Villa. He eventually came to California where he worked as a bodyguard to industrialist J. Paul Getty and evangelist Aimee Semple MacPherson. He became a devout Christian—something his family and friends said was one of the most important aspects of his life. He purchased real estate throughout the Los Angeles area, including a ranch he called the "Diamond B" in Saugus where he ran cattle, and raised racehorses.

Paul's passion for horses was as strong as his passion for filmmaking. The Veluzat family owns Melody Ranch, home to over 750 "B" western movies as well as other notable films and television shows such as the beloved Gunsmoke. "Last Man Standing" starring Bruce Willis was recently filmed there.

Paul was very successful. He and his first wife, Opal, were simple and down to earth, they were astute in business and had unquestionable integrity. Paul's word was his bond. Ninety percent of his business was conducted by a handshake or over the phone. Paul's true success was measured by his deep spirituality and the love and respect he gained from his family and his many friends. He will be remembered as a generous man who was liked by all.

Paul Veluzat is survived by Rosa, his wife of 14 years, his sons, Rene, Andre and Renaud, four grandchildren, Shantel Hudson, Daniel, Paul and Marcel Veluzat, three great-grandchildren and many, many friends.

STATEMENT OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE SAYAVONG

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues the following letter and testimony sent by His Royal Highness Prince Sayavong to Philip Smith, of the Center for Public Policy Analysis, for the U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos that was held on September 7, 2000. My foreign policy advisor, Mr. Al Santoli, was one of the keynote

speakers at this event after returning from a research mission to Southeast Asia.

As a Member of the House International Relations Committee, I appreciate the important role of the Royal Family in Laos—past, present, and future. Laos is currently ruled by a one-party Communist regime. After 25 years of communism, its people want and need change. The Lao and Hmong people are rightfully demanding freedom, democracy, human rights and economic prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD the important statement of His Royal Highness.

Paris 4 September 2000

Hon. PHILIP SMITH,
Center for Public Policy Analysis, U.S. Congress—Capitol Hill, Washington, DC.
Subject: U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos—7 September 2000.

I should be most grateful if you could kindly distribute the attached paper—though unsolicited—to Distinguished Members of the Forum who are to examine the ''challenges and opportunities surrounding the 25th Anniversary of the Lao People's Democratic Republic''. The views expressed herein are those of the Lao people as a whole whom I am privileged to represent during the last 4 years from our operating Bureau in Paris (40bis Rue Championnet 74018 Paris—France).

Thank you most sincerely for your kind assistance and understanding.

H.R.H. PRINCE SAYAVONG,
Brig. General, The Lao National Army—Surviving son of King Sri Savangvong (1885–1959) and Half-brother of King Sri Savang Vatthana (1907–1980).

[U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos, U.S. Congress—Capitol Hill, Washington, DC 20510 Sept. 7, 2000]

THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC (LPDR): AN APPRAISAL AFTER 25 YEARS OF COMMUNIST RULE.

(By Brig General Tiao Sayavong)

The year 1975 should go down in Laos' history, indeed in Indochina's as the most tragic date in our common memory—where our beloved country suddenly sustained a horrible cataclysm of gigantic magnitude, plunging that part of the world in total darkness. That was the year where millions of peoples—young and old—had to leave behind their most cherished treasures in order to escape forced-labour camps and death, and to seek freedom in foreign lands.

For us free Laotians we consider December 2nd of each year as the time of mourning—of national mourning—of national mourning since it brings back to memory the death of our age-old traditions and way of life, of our fertile soils and rivers and mountains which we inherited from our forefathers. The Kingdom of Laos was one of the most ancient nations in Asia—the cradle of post-angkorian civilization. Of course, we will never forget that we were the victims of world politics, and we know too that we were the sacrificial lambs of the American foreign policy at that time. That the Pathet-Lao were able to overwhelm us so massive support-politically, militarily and logistically from the Soviet stooges who at the very moment run the show from Hanoi which incidentally will become the future capital of the Socialist Republic of Indochina by the year 2020!

DISASTROUS BALANCE SHEET

After 25 years behind the bamboo curtain what do we see today? Politically we see that the following inhumane abuses are daily occurrence: violation of basic human rights; non-respect of fundamental freedoms; brutal suppression of democratic dissent; emprisonment without due process of the law; arbitrary arrest upon simple denunciation and torture. Economically the LPDR ranked among the ten poorest countries in the world today according to the United Nations. Per capita income is less than $300; foreign debt amounts to well over $3 billion or more; local currency (the Kip) is almost worthless; inflation averaged 300 percent annually thus pushing the rate of the Kip up to almost 10.000 to a dollar. Without substantial external assistance the government will not be able to function normally. The inevitable consequence is that ordinary citizens find their daily existence totally unbearable—fueling pervasive resentment against the dictatorship of the proletariat. it is obvious to everyone that the LPDR is actually on the brink of explosion at any moment! Socially peaceful Lao traditional society is turned upside down—forcing thousands of young men and girls to flee across the borders in order to escape misery and seek good fortune in neighboring Thailand. Meanwhile millions of foreigners, mostly from North Vietnam—keep pouring into the country to fill the void—thus bringing destruction and irreparable damage to our thick forests and wildlife and driving local inhabitants to abandon their lands with apparent impunity. Recently Hanoi promised to triple the Lao population—actually estimated at 5 million—by the year 2010!

PATH TO SALVATION

Since the Lao people are being prevented from changing their government for the better through democratic means external intervention—essentially from Western powers, the United States and Japan therefore become critical in order to bring about needed radical reforms in our country.

Even before S. Res. 240 and H. Res. 169 were officially adopted by the US Congress we have had numerous opportunities of submitting to The Honorables Senator R. Grams, Senator C. Thomas, US Representative B. Vento and Chairman J. Helms for consideration of a number of concrete proposals aimed at restoring social justice, liberty and democracy in our homeland. They still remain valid to these days, viz:

1. We humbly request that S. Res. 240 and H. Res. 169 be transmitted to the Executive Branch as soon as feasible together with ample budgetary appropriations necessary for their implementation;

2. We humbly request that the US government set up a Special Lao Task Force (SLTF) to be charged with the responsibility of translating the sense of the US Congress into practical reality without further delays; the SLTF should be required to work closely with all truly anti-communist groupings (such as the Lao Liberation Front led by Major-General Vang Pao and the Party of Vientiane Government—PGVT—under the chairmanship of Phagna Houmphan Saignasith) put in place by Lao refugees in the United States, Europe and elsewhere—excluding those openly or discreetly in favor of power-sharing with the communist Pathet-Lao;

3. We humbly request the US government to take the lead in choosing the future Lao political leaders from among the Lao anti-communist elite to all ethnic groups residing abroad; these selected intellectuals should form the backbone of the Kingdom's political, economic and administrative framework;

4. We humbly request the US government to solicit the concurrence, support and commitment of the countries signatory of the Geneva Accords of 1962 on Laos neutrality and of those which were party to the Paris Agreements of 1973;

5. We humbly request that the US government resolve in collaboration with ASEAN and the United Nations—to exert maximum diplomatic and military pressure upon the marxist authorities in Vientiane in order to compel them to relinquish power and be replaced by a new power structure freely elected by the Lao people; and

6. We humbly request that the US government, with the concurrence and support of its allied, announce a massive assistance programme designed to help the newly-elected government of the Kingdom of Laos to reconstruct the country anew on the basis of respect for basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In the end it will prove to be necessary to convene an International Conference similar to the Geneva Conference of 1962 to tackle various abuses and problems confronting Laos today—in particular the non-respect of the neutrality, sovereignty and independence of our country by its immediate neighbours.

In view of the fact that a great number of political groupings set up by Lao refugees abroad are heavily infiltrated by communist elements and opportunist trouble-makers it will be difficult—if not impossible altogether for them alone to create a single anti-communist entity without American proding. The success of the US pro-democracy crusade in Laos will undoubtedly trigger throughout the Asia region a genuine tidal wave carrying a powerful signal as well as an unmistakable warning to dictators and tyrants in other lands hence that the international community will no longer tolerate undemocratic practices and uncivilized and inhumane behavior by members of the United Nations.

The Lao people both inside the country and overseas hope and pray with us that the American people will understand and support their government's resolute action humanely intended to assist the Kingdom of Laos in regaining peace, independence and liberty essential ingredients for economic advancement and well-being in the years to come.

PARIS 1 SEPTEMBER 2000

THE HOME AMENDMENT, H.J. RES. 39

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to bring to your attention an amendment which I introduced the first session of the 106th Congress. H.J. Res. 39, The Home Amendment ''would provide for a Constitutional amendment requiring that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to a home, which shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State.''

Despite the economic growth that has brought unprecedented prosperity to the nation, we are still faced with shortages of housing and affordable rents, particularly in larger cities such as New York. Indeed, many people have not been included in the economic windfall of the 1990's.

I first introduced this amendment during the 104th Congress, and again in the 105th at the request of Reverend Dr. M. Moran Weston, who was actually the inspiration behind the development of this legislation.

Weston, who for many years served as pastor of St. Philip's Church in my 15th Congressional District of New York, is the Founder and long time President of the National Association for Affordable Housing. One of our community's greatest religious leaders, his genuine concern for people who lacked the most basic need, a descent place to live, inspired him to do more.

This renowned Harlem pastor responded as an example to others, by playing a leading role in renovating a block on Harlem's 135th Street. As a member of the original board of directors of Carver Federal Savings & Loan in my congressional district, he was the sponsor of a federal government guaranteed renovation project, a 198-unit development, which he viewed as an early step in the creation of a "New Harlem." It was his inspiration and way of desire for a better life for all people, that led to my introduction of this amendment.

Though Reverend Weston no longer resides in my congressional district, his many contributions to our community over the years, have not gone unnoticed or have been forgotten by this Congressman or the people of New York.

Only last year that Dr. Weston was named with a Distinguished Lectureship in Urban and Public Policy established in his name by Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. The first two speakers in the lecture series were Chairman of Fannie Mae Franklin Raines and Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Andrew Cuomo.

It is my hope that on behalf of Reverend Dr. M. Moran Weston, and millions of people who would benefit from H.J. Res. 39, that we support this amendment, and look forward to its enactment.

TRIBUTE TO SPECIALIST FOUR DON LESLIE MICHAEL OF LEXINGTON, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Alabama's true heroes, Specialist Four Don Leslie Michael. Michael's life was one of service to his country and brave sacrifice. I honor him today on the occasion of his induction into the Alabama Military Hall of Honor.

Michael's family recently attended the induction ceremony at the Hall of Honor located in Marion, Alabama. Michael, 1 of 13 members asked to join this elite Hall, was born in Florence and soon moved to Lexington where he grew up with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy O. Michael, now deceased. The Alabama Military Hall of Honor is described as "a permanent and visible tribute to Alabamians who have distinguished themselves in the Armed Services of their country. It serves as a constant testimony to present and future generations that patriotism and heroism are not forgotten, but ever serve as challenges for those who are yet to come."

Michael's distinction with the Alabama Military Hall of Honor brings additional honor to his memory. In May of 1969, President Nixon handed the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded to Michael to his family at a White House ceremony. While in the Army 173rd Airborne Brigade, Michael sacrificed his life in service of this nation. During a conflict in Vietnam on April 8, 1967, Michael put himself on the line to throw six grenades. He was successful in destroying the enemy positions, yet he was mortally wounded in the effort. Michael's award citation reads "His inspiring display of determination and courage saved the lives of many of his comrades and successfully eliminated a destructive enemy force. Specialist four Michael's actions were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect the utmost credit upon himself and the U.S. Army."

Michael, the only Congressional Medal of Honor winner in northwest Alabama, has gone unrecognized long enough. I am pleased that his induction into the Alabama Military Hall of Honor will ensure that the example of his life and his unceasing dedication to the United States and its democracy can be an inspiration for our state for years to come. On behalf of the United States Congress and the people of North Alabama. I want to express my outstanding respect and admiration for Specialist Four Michael. I know that his family is deeply proud of his legacy and I share my joy with them that his life and memory are being properly recognized.

IN HONOR OF DR. ORLANDO EDREIRA, FOR DEDICATING HIS LIFE TO LANGUAGE AND TEACHING

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Orlando Edreira for his life-long commitment to education.

Dr. Orlando Edreira has been a symbol of learning since his days as a student in Cuba during the 1950s and 1960s. It was then that he decided to make the study of language and the education of others his life's work. His decision was based on a true understanding of the value of language and the freedom it provides.

Dr. Edreira began his career as an educator in 1966, when he became an instructor in the Department of Spanish at Columbia University. In 1968, he joined the faculty of Kean College of New Jersey as an assistant professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, where he has been an integral part of the faculty ever since, and where he became as associate professor in 1972 and a full professor in 1977.

As a member of the faculty at Kean College, Dr. Edreira served as the Coordinator of the Bilingual Education Program from 1971–1972, and the Chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages from 1974 to 1986. He has served as the Director of the Spanish Speaking program since 1972.

In addition, Dr. Edreira has made important contributions to program development, faculty development, and student development at Kean College. He is a member of the Committee on Academic Concerns of Hispanic Students; a member of the Language Laboratory Committee; and a member of the Committee on Academic Support for Hispanics. He also initiated and coordinated faculty training programs for faculty of the Spanish Speaking Program, and developed and directed In-Service Training Programs for Bilingual Teachers in the State of New Jersey.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Dr. Orlando Edreira for his lifetime commitment to education and for the support and guidance he has provided Hispanic students.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAVID L. HOBSON

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Republic of China on Taiwan which celebrates its 89th anniversary as a nation this month. I join my colleagues to commend Taiwan's successful efforts towards developing a democratic nation as well as electing a new leader. Chen Shui-bian in a free and fair election.

Taiwan also is excelling in areas of economic growth and currently is ranked twenty-fifth in the world in per capita income and nineteenth in the world in terms of Gross National Product.

Taiwan's many accomplishments serve as a measure of its leaders' dedication to strengthening principles of freedom, democracy, and economic prosperity, values all Taiwanese citizens may enjoy.

Additionally, I would like to recognize Ambassador C.J. Chen of the Republic of China on Taiwan for diligently representing his nation in the United States. I look forward to a continued and prosperous relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

HONORING KEITH WOODS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Ms. WOOLSEY, and I rise today to recognize our good friend, Keith Woods, who is resigning as President and CEO of the Santa Rosa, California Chamber of Commerce after 13 years of dedicated service to his community.

During Mr. Woods' tenure, Santa Rosa, the 34th largest city in the state, developed the

seventh largest chamber in the state. The Chamber boasts 1,600 members, 18 staff people, 48 committees and task forces, 650 active committee volunteers and a budget of $1.4 million.

Some of Mr. Woods' innovative projects include Good Morning Santa Rosa breakfast meetings, the Business-Education Roundtable, Tomorrow's Leaders Today, Good Evening Santa Rosa, job fairs, training seminars and the Forum on the Future series that focused on issues affecting businesses, families and lifestyle in Sonoma County.

Through Mr. Woods efforts, the Chamber also provided staffing for the Sonoma County Technology and Manufacturers Group and managed the Downtown Market and the Santa Rosa Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Mr. Woods has spent 32 years in Chamber work with the San Francisco, San Antonio and San Jose Chambers and as an instructor for the U.S. Chamber at seven universities throughout the country.

In 1998, he traveled to Moscow to conduct training for 40 Russian Chamber executives.

He was recently elected Chairman of the Western Association of Chamber Executives for 2001 and last year was voted the ''Top Business and Community Leader'' in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County.

Although Mr. Woods is retiring from the Chamber, he is not leaving the business community or Sonoma County. His next assignment is as Chief Executive for the North Bay Builders Association.

Mr. Speaker, because of Keith Woods' many contributions to the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce and to Sonoma County, it is fitting and proper to honor him today for his many accomplishments and contributions.

VETERANS DAY HONOREES

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, November 11, 2000, marks the observance of Veterans Day, honoring all veterans who have pledged allegiance to their country and all of its endeavors. This day is sets aside to recognize the boldness and bravery of those who have fought to uphold the standards of democracy.

Just prior to Veterans Day on Thursday, November 9, a special ceremony titled, ''Salute 2000: An American Patriotic Celebration'' will be held at the Radisson Star Plaza Theatre in Merrillville, Indiana, to celebrate patriotism and pride and to honor five local veterans for their dedicated military service. Those veterans that will be honored include: Joseph M. Dzieglowicz, John Gamez, David Hinshaw, Harry Kaczorowski and James J. Thiel.

Joseph M. Dzieglowicz, a United States Army veteran of World War II, served our country from October 12, 1942 to December 28, 1945 as a combat engineer with the 339th Engineer Construction Battalion. He stayed with the 339th Battalion for his entire 30 months of duty in the southwest Pacific theatre of operations. John Gamez is another fine example of one of our American heroes. As a member of the Armed Forces, John Gamez earned numerous medals during his tour of duty in Korea including the Silver Star Medal, two Purple Heart Medals, the Korean Service Medal with three Bronze Service Stars, the Republic of Korea United Citation, the United Nations Service Medal and the Combat Infantry Badge. Additionally, David C. Hinshaw of Hammond, Indiana, is a veteran of the United States Army. He left the active Army in 1973 and joined the Indiana National Guard. While in the National Guard, Captain Hinshaw rose to Lieutenant Colonel and later Commander 2nd of the 151st Infantry in South Bend, Indiana. Hinshaw was a member of the Army Reserves until his retirement in 1998. As a member of the United States Army, Harry Kaczorowski served his country until he was discharged in December of 1944. During the Battle of Kasserine Pass, Kaczorowski was taken as a prisoner of war by General Rommel's Afrika Korps and was later liberated by the Soviets in 1945. A graduate of Dyer High School, James J. Thiel enrolled in the Army Air Corps at age 19 and served his country until 1945. Thiel earned the Presidential Unit Citation with Cluster, Aerial Gunner's Wings, ETO Ribbon with four Battle Stars, Air Medal with Six Clusters, Good Conduct Medal and a WW–2 Victory Medal for his 50 aerial combat missions over northern Italy, Austria, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Germany, southern France and the Balkens.

The great sacrifice made by these five men and those who served our country has resulted in the freedom and prosperity of our country and in countries around the world. The responsibility rests within each of us to build upon the valiant efforts that these men and women who fought for this country have displayed, so that the United States and the world will be a more democratic and prosperous place. To properly honor the heroism of our troops, we must make the most of our freedom secured by their efforts.

In addition to the five veterans who are to be honored at this patriotic celebration, I would also like to commend all of those who served this country for their bravery, courage, and undying commitment to patriotism and democracy. May God bless them all.

We will forever be indebted to our veterans and their families for the sacrifices they made so that we can enjoy our freedom. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in saluting these five men and the other veterans who have fought for our great country.

TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. ROBERT E. HAILS (RET.)

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEOGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to honor a great American, retired Lieutenant General Robert E. Hails, who has recently been selected for induction into the State of Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame.

Lt. Gen. Hails graduated from Auburn University and received his wings and commission in 1944 at Moody Field in Valdosta, Georgia. During World War II, he completed 26 missions flying the B–24 Liberator bomber in the Pacific theater. After the war, Lt. Gen. Hails was instrumental in helping develop critical technology such as the first Heads Up Display (HUD), the use of an inertial gyroscope platform (IGP) for automatic navigation and guidance of aircraft and bomb launch, and the first use of a digital computer to control and integrate HUD and IGP systems. The Heads Up Display which Lt. Gen. Hails helped develop is essential to many of the newest and most important military aircraft in our force today, including the F–22, F–117, the F–14, and F–15.

These innovations greatly assisted American pilots in performing their missions to defend and protect American interests around the world and even now serve commercial aviation by providing increased safety during takeoffs and landings in poor weather conditions.

As the Director of Maintenance Engineering, Air Force Logistics Command, in 1968, Lt. Gen. Hails was responsible for engineering and developing of the pilotless reconnaissance aircraft used for missions over hostile territory during the Vietnam War. As Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center, he provided engineering and logistical support to a range of crucial weapons system upon which our military consistently relied, including Air Force helicopters, C–130, C–141, F–15, and U–2 aircraft. His role as Vice Commander of Tactical Air Command and Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force have left a lasting legacy on our military which has most certainly contributed in developing the superior Air Force that continues to bravely and courageously serve our nation today.

Lt. Gen. Hails deserves our greatest recognition. I have had the honor and pleasure of knowing and working with Lt. Gen. Hails. His important contributions to American engineering and aviation are well known, and I offer my sincerest congratulations to him on his induction into the State of Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame. His character, patriotism, and values are an inspiration to each of us and I am proud to pay tribute to this great American who has given so much for his country.

HONORING MS. LAURA BERG

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the notable accomplishments of a young woman from the thirty-fourth district of California. It is both fitting and proper that we recognize achievements of young adults when they serve as outstanding role models for today's youth and bring credit to themselves and to this Nation. Such an outstanding young woman is Laura Berg.

At Santa Fe High, Ms. Berg was Co-Captain of the softball team. In college, she led Fresno State to a tie for third at the 1997 World Series and the 1998 NCAA Championships. And when the U.S. won gold at the 1998 World

Championships, she led the team in runs scored.

Laura has brought honor and credit to the community and country as part of the U.S. team that won the gold medal in softball at both the Atlanta and the recently concluded Sydney Olympic games. Laura Berg's leadership and persistence not only helped the U.S. softball team rebound from losing three games in a row, she powered the game-winning run against Japan that gave the United States the gold medal in Softball at the 2000 Sydney Olympic games.

In returning to her roots at Lakeland Elementary School, Ms. Berg challenged students to never give up on their dreams and stressed the value of education.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to rise in support of Ms. Berg, not only for her accomplishments on the field but also to recognize her as an outstanding role model for the youth of this country.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to stand before the House today to honor the Fairfax County Park Authority's 50th anniversary on December 8, 2000. Fifty years ago, private citizens were the catalyst for the creation of the Fairfax County Park Authority. Looking to the future, they worked with the county's elected officials to establish the means to protect open space, historic sites, places for family recreation, and resource areas where wildlife could continue to thrive.

The wisdom of those farsighted activists is evident today. Islands of woodlands and playing fields, strips of stream valleys and trails, historic fragments of Old Fairfax, Virginia and centers for active recreation and leisure pursuits form a patchwork of parks across the county, accessible to everyone and offering something for every interest. Fairfax County has a park system recognized as among the best in the nation.

The Park Authority has over 386 parks on more than 19,326 acres. Park facilities include a horticulture center, a working farm, an activities and equestrian center, eight indoor RECenters, five nature and visitor centers, eight golf courses, on/off-leash dog park, three lakes, two campgrounds, an ice skating rink, a Water Park and a working mill. Recreational opportunities in the parks abound, with millions of people per year enjoying picnicking, hiking, fishing, tennis and golf. There are also carousels, miniature golf courses, amphitheaters and marinas.

Together, people of Fairfax and their Park Authority have kept trust with the ideals of those who founded the Park Authority. With the support of the people and volunteers, the agency has maintained its commitment to preservation, protection and play. With their support the agency has survived shifting attitudes towards land use, the ups and downs of budget, changes in government and shifts in demographics.

The Fairfax County Park Authority was created in 1950 to plan, acquire, develop, operate and maintain a park and recreation facility system that would contribute to the quality of life and environment for the citizens, visitors and tourists to Fairfax County. Over the past five decades, this system has evolved into a diversified mosaic of open space and recreation facilities, ranging from small neighborhood parks to an extensive network of county-wide parks which afford a variety of recreational opportunities for county residents. The park system also serves as the primary public mechanism for the preservation of environmentally sensitive land, water resources and areas of historic significance.

The Park Authority protects, manages and preserves thousands of natural and cultural resources located within its 19,326 acres. The cultural resources, bits and pieces of our history which allow us to understand our present and plan our future, include structures, roads, landscapes, folklore, artifacts, historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. These resources are preserved for our enjoyment and the education of our children.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this December, the Park Authority will mark a half century of touching people's lives. Today, the children and the grandchildren of our original park patrons come to our parks for recreation, relaxation and respite. Together, people and parks will build on the past to shape the future. Like the couple at the golden wedding party, I toast a powerful union and an enduring relationship.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER DISTRICT DIRECTOR AND FRIEND JOHN J. McGUIRE

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 16, 2000, John J. McGuire, my former District Director in Syracuse, New York, and close, personal friend, died after a long battle with brain cancer. John served as an integral part of my staff since my election to Congress in 1988. Prior to that time, he served as a compliance officer for 11 years with the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in Syracuse.

John McGuire, a former Marine, was a highly decorated disabled American veteran. He is a past recipient of the Veterans Service Award from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, four Special Achievement Awards and the Federal Distinguished Career Award. After serving as a sergeant in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam War, John taught English both here in the United States and in the Balkans.

With John's death early last week, his wife and children lost a terrific husband and father, and I lost a neighbor, a close advisor and loyal friend. The Central New York community lost a tireless worker and community advocate, and the entire nation lost a dedicated public servant and true American patriot.

I submit the attached column by Mr. Sean Kirst printed in the October 18th issue of the Syracuse Post-Standard, which so eloquently details John McGuire's motivation and career, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to commemorate his distinguished life.

He certainly will be missed, but can never be forgotten.

VETERAN, AIDE, FAMILY MAN DIDN'T DIE FOR NOTHING

John McGuire was a neighbor. He lived on the dead-end block of Robineau Road in Syracuse. Years ago, he bought a big metal pole and set it into a deep hole. He got a backboard and a rim, and he hung them above the street.

His children, all the time, were out there playing basketball. Other kids often joined them in shooting hoops. Sometimes they were kids McGuire never saw before.

It became clear, over the years, that he was a true believer.

McGuire, 55 died Monday morning. His death was the second jolt in recent weeks on our small block, where Nick Rossi, a teacher, also died of cancer. In a sense, that is the cost of any strong neighborhood. With every loss, the fabric changes—much like a family.

Years ago, Representative JIM WALSH also lived on that same block. WALSH and McGuire, as neighbors, turned into good friends. When WALSH was elected to Congress, he asked McGuire to join his staff. McGuire was called ''district director,'' but an awful lot of people knew him as WALSH's guy for vets.

WALSH will tell you he got lucky. He couldn't have made a better choice. There are countless stories of McGuire going to the wall to help someone receive benefits, or McGuire helping old veterans get the medals they deserved.

McGuire was an ex-Marine, a combat veteran of Vietnam. Sometimes he'd be sitting outside on his porch, watching a crowd of kids playing basketball, and he'd talk a little about the war. He spoke in a soft voice, with an accent forged in Brooklyn, and he'd recall the time they split dozens of Marines into two groups. They put both groups on different planes, to fly to the same place.

One plane got hit. Everybody died. John McGuire was on the other plane.

He came home angry, he said, lacking faith in anything. He wondered at the senseless luck that sent him back alive, when good friends in Vietnam seemed to die for nothing. Over the next few years, he forged a hard logic. He dedicated himself to justifying those who died, and the best way to do it was by helping veterans. If that circle went unbroken, then their sacrifice made sense.

That is what he did, for the rest of his life. He married a strong women, Joyce Kusak, and they had four terrific children. McGuire lived for two things—his family and his cause. Kusak-McGuire tells a story of standing exhausted at the door, a newborn baby in her arms, while her husband left in the middle of the night to take down a veteran threatening suicide.

The McGuires settled on the dead-end block of Robineau. Years later, my family moved in down the street. One night, McGuire sat on the porch and watched a crowd of kids shooting baskets. Some of them he knew. Some of them he'd never seen. As he watched, he explained why he lived in the city.

He expressed a great respect, almost a reverence, for elderly veterans. He spoke of how he admired his parents and their contemporaries, the way they dealt with the Great

Depression, World War II, all the fears of the Cold War. But he also said that generation could not solve every problem, and one of the problems handed down was the polarization over race.

''We'll never solve anything,'' McGuire said, ''unless we take it on.'' His wife felt the same way. They stayed in Syracuse.

A couple of years ago, McGuire returned to his hotel room at a business meeting. He kept trying to push his room key into the lock, upside down. His close friend, Harry Schultz, knew something was wrong. He got McGuire to a nurse, who examined him and then rushed him to a hospital. Brain tumor. They did surgery, but the tumor eventually came back.

McGuire, in the past few months, often took long walks. I saw him walking on a June morning with his son Aiden just after I returned from a conference in Washington. I think McGuire also had his toddler grandson with him, but maybe that is how I want to remember it.

I had visited the Wall, the Vietnam Memorial, for the first time. By coincidence, I had been there on Father's Day. As always happens on that day, there was a gathering for grown children of the soldiers whose names are on the wall. They brought sponges and buckets of water. They scrubbed their fathers' names to a shine.

I told McGuire the story. He started weeping, shoulders heaving, in the middle of the road. He said sonething—his voice cracking—about men who died for nothing.

That burden's gone. He's with them now. He spent his life shining the wall.

INTRODUCTION OF THE U.S.-SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT ACT OF 2000

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement Act of 2000. It is a critical and timely piece of legislation.

Positioned strategically amid vital shipping lanes, Singapore is one of the United States' closest, most strategically important friends in Southeast Asia. Singapore is the tenth largest export market for the United States. Literally thousands of Americans depend on exports to Singapore for their jobs. The U.S. is also the number one foreign investor in Singapore—with a total of $25 billion in 1999. There are more than 1,300 U.S. businesses with offices in Singapore and more than 13,000 U.S. citizens living in the multi-ethnic island nation.

Singapore has established itself as the business hub for Southeast Asia and it is quickly becoming a hub for much of the rest of Asia.

Not just in business, but also on vital national security issues, Singapore offers us a perspective on the region informed by kinship with its neighbors and its own history of development. It is a reliable source of stability in a region of the world undergoing generally positive, but sometimes wrenching political, economic, and societal change. The U.S. Western Pacific Logistics Command is based in Singapore, and Singapore and the U.S. conduct both joint air and joint naval exercises. Most recently, Singapore has undertaken to build a deep-water pier and naval base, entirely at their own expense, and offered its services to U.S. aircraft carriers.

Singapore's trading regime in goods and services is the freest in Asia. The environment for foreign investment is inviting and the government is a helpful hand for Americans looking to make investments. Having said that, however, there are sectors where American companies are eager to compete. I am hopeful that a U.S.-Singapore trade agreement can both recognize the very free trade and investments relationship that exists and at the same time provide even greater opportunities for American business.

A free trade agreement with Singapore is important for the international free trade agenda as well. The United States must continue to work to bring down barriers to trade throughout the world. Free traders in Congress have had some key victories this year with the Africa Free Trade Bill, the Caribbean Basin Initiative and PNTR for China. We all celebrated those victories, as well we should. However, an anti-trade element still exists in Congress that seeks to turn the political tide against free trade. It will take constant vigilance to build and sustain an active free trade constituency. It is my hope that progress on a Singapore agreement will lead to bi-lateral and multilateral agreements with other Pacific Rim countries that share our interest in opening markets.

A U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement serves several key U.S. national interest. It supports U.S. jobs. It supports U.S. worldwide investment. It solidifies a vital trans-Pacific U.S. relationship. It will serve as a model for free trade agreements throughout the Pacific-Rim, and encourage the opening of consultations to this end.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the U.S. Singapore Free Trade Act of 2000 and I urge its passage into law.

SPECIAL ORDER ON THE HONORABLE JOHN KASICH

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVEN C. LaTOURETTE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good fried, JOHN KASICH.

Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress in 1995, I joined an amazing group of men an women who made up the Ohio delegation. We had JOHN BOEHNER and DEBORAH PRYCE in Leadership; RALPH REGULA and DAVE HOBSON on Appropriations; MIKE OXLEY in Commerce; ROB PORTMAN on Ways and Means; the venerable Lou Stokes as Dean of our delegation; the very capable TONY HALL, PAUL GILLMOR, MARCY KAPTUR, SHERROD BROWN, JIM TRAFICANT and TOM SAWYER and, or course, JOHN KASICH as Budget Committee chairman.

I think all of us—no matter what our party affiliation—have come to truly respect JOHN KASICH for his Herculean effort to pass genuine welfare reform, and to reach a balanced budget agreement for the first time in a generation. I remember when I first came here I was a bit taken back by JOHN's intensity. He had such genuine enthusiasm for Congress, and it was a bit out of the ordinary. JOHN kinda reminds me of that Will Farrell character on ''Saturday Night Live''—the Spartan cheerleader—just bouncing off the walls with team spirit.

There is something inherently appealing about JOHN KASICH's tenacity and enthusiasm, his Midwestern sensibility, and his irrepressible zest for life. People trust him, respect him, and they know they're getting the real thing. It's been said that all you really need to know about JOHN KASICH is that even his ex-wife's mother votes for him. We should all be so popular.

JOHN leaves an important legacy in the House: He proved that you can work in a bipartisan fashion, maintain friendships on both sides of the aisle, retain the respect of your peers, and still achieve very big things. The House needs more folks like JOHN KASICH who care so passionately, and refuse to give up.

JOHN KASICH stood his ground and truly changed the way Washington operates. I came here at a time when we spent recklessly and never gave much thought to the future, and now we've ushered in a new era of making government live within its means. Our children are going to inherit a federal government that is more fiscally responsible and more responsive, and no small thanks is due to JOHN KASICH.

I'm proud to have served with him, and for the opportunity to have had the last six years to witness him up close. I will miss his loud ties, his manic energy, how he often seemed less than serious but was always taken seriously, and how—despite being a Republican—he always got to hang around with cool people, like Bono (Bah-no) from U2.

I also will miss hearing JOHN speak on the House floor. He always commanded attention. In fact, I've always thought that when JOHN KASICH took to the floor to speak about anything, he was sort of like road kill—you just couldn't look away. Folks are drawn to his plain but spirited manner and his refreshing candor.

Mr. Speaker, most state delegations could never fill the oratory void left after the departure of a JOHN KASICH. Of course Ohio is a little different from most states. We've been blessed with an abundance of fine orators who command the public's attention. I just hope that in the 107th Congress my good friend, JIM TRAFICANT, will step up to the plate and shed that terrible shyness he has around the C–SPAN cameras.

JOHN KASICH, I thank you for your service to our country, to our fine state of Ohio, and for your years of friendship and guidance. Ohio is losing a great legislator, but I know our state and country have not heard the last of you.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HISPANIC HEALTH ACT OF 2000

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Hispanic Health Act of 2000, legislation to address disparities in access to health care, research, program funding, cultural competence, and representation of Latino health care professionals. This legislation aims to reduce these disparities in three specific disease areas that particularly impact the Hispanic community: diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and mental health in the Hispanic community.

As Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Task Force on Health, I am committed to fighting the health disparities that Hispanics face in this country. Last year, I and the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus released a Report on Hispanic Health in the United States. The report was a direct result of testimony received from community leaders, health providers, and policy makers in a series of forums during the first ever Hispanic Health Awareness Week in September, 1999. The report summarizes the findings from the experts and outlines their recommendations to improve health care delivery to Hispanics.

Racial and ethic minorities continue to experience serious disparities in health. The report's findings demonstrate the seriousness of the situation and the need for immediate action.

Type 2 diabetes accounts for 90 to 95 percent of diabetes cases, and it is the most common form seen in the Latino community. Among Hispanics, type 2 diabetes is twice as high compared to non-Hispanic whites. Six percent of Hispanics in the United States and Puerto Rico have been diagnosed and it is estimated that another six percent have undiagnosed diabetes. One out of every four Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans ages 45 and older have diabetes. One out of three elderly Hispanics have diabetes. Hispanics account for 20% of new AIDS cases, but only 11% of the population. In 1997, AIDS was the third leading cause of death among Hispanics between the ages of 25 and 44, and 10th for Hispanics of all ages. Mexican American women are more likely to report severe depression than their non-Hispanic white, or African American female peers.

Substance abuse increased among Hispanic youth at the same time that it declined for non-Hispanic white and African American youth. Those at greatest risk appear to be Hispanic girls. Hispanic girls now lead girls nationwide in rates of suicide attempt, alcohol and drug abuse, and self-reported gun possession.

The Hispanic Health Act of 2000 reflects the recommendations outlined in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Report on Hispanic Health in the United States. One of the most important issues that this legislation addresses in data collection and research funding. If we do not address disparities in research, we are not going to develop cures that address the health disparities that exist in Hispanic and other minority communities. With a clearer understanding of what we face, we can then deliver culturally competent health services that meet the needs of these communities.

This legislation requests an annual report from the Secretary of Health and Human Services on the progress of Latino initiatives throughout the agency regarding diabetes, HIV infection, AIDS, substance abuse and mental health. This information will prove invaluable in monitoring the responsiveness of HHS to the health needs of the Hispanic community and will give us the tools to direct resources were effectively in the future.

The legislation authorizes two diabetes programs to reduce the devastating impact of this disease on Hispanic-Americans. To increase prevention activities, the bill authorizes $100 million for the National diabetes Education Program of the Center for Disease Control. These activities include identifying and targeting geographic areas that experience a high incidence of diabetes and diabetes related deaths particularly in the Hispanic community with educational and screening programs.

In addition, this bill authorizes $1 billion to the National Institute on Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases to implement the recommendations of its Diabetes Research Working Group. This working group's plan was developed and delivered to Congress pursuant to the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations Act of the Department of Health and Human Services.

On HIV and AIDS, the legislation requests a plan from the Centers for Disease Control to address the under-representation of Hispanics in Community Planning Programs. The legislation also calls for the establishment of AIDS education and training centers at eligible Hispanic Serving Institutions funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration. An emphasis shall be placed on providing culturally and linguistically appropriate training of health providers to deliver bilingual HIV treatment and education. In too many cases, the lack of appropriate information creates a barrier to prevention and treatment, costing countless lives and suffering.

In an effort to reverse the trends in Latina suicides, the legislation establishes a female adolescent suicide prevention program. The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in

The Hispanic Health Act of 2000 also provides for bilingual health professional training with respect to minority health conditions. The bill authorizes $1 million for the development of culturally competent educational materials and technical assistance in carrying out programs that use such materials. In addition, it provides an additional $5 million for a Center for Linguistic and Cultural Competence in Health Care through the Office of Minority Health.

A cultural competence demonstration project in the legislation would provide grants to two hospitals that have a history in the Medicare program. The hospitals shall receive a $5 million grant for five years to enable them to implement standards for culturally competent services to address the needs of any population that is 5% or more of the total population they serve. An additional $1 million is provided for the purpose of program evaluation. The bill allows for hospitals to use disproportionate share hospital funding to pay for translators for a population that is limited English proficient and makes up 10% or more of the population they serve.

Increasing the numbers of Hispanics who join the health professions is a necessary component of any plan to reverse the historical disparities faced by the community. The Hispanic-Serving Health Professions Schools provision authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to give grants to Hispanic-serving health professions schools for the purpose of carrying out programs to recruit Hispanic individuals to enroll in and graduate from the schools. More Hispanic health professionals will assist greatly in providing culturally competent and linguistically appropriate care.

Finally, the Hispanic Health Act requires the Secretary to include data on race and ethnicity in health data collected under programs carried out by the Secretary. Outcome measures will be developed to evaluate, by race and ethnicity, the performance of health care programs and projects that provide care to individuals under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

The Hispanic Health Act of 2000 fills an important gap in research, program implementation and evaluation, training, and facilitating cultural competence in health care institutions. I ask my colleagues to join us in taking the historic steps needed to reverse the trends that have left too many behind.

BRING THEM HOME ALIVE ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the ''Bring Them Home Alive Act of 2000.'' This bill creates an extraordinary opportunity for nationals of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, China, and the independent states of the former Soviet Union to do a wonderful thing and be richly rewarded for it. If a national from any of these countries personally delivers a living American Vietnam War POW/MIA into the custody of the U.S. Government, he or she will be granted United States refugee status.

I am deeply moved when I think of the grief that is being endured by so many Americans, the Americans who are living with the uncertainty of having family members who were missing in action or prisoners in Vietnam and have not been heard of since the end of the war. Certainly this bill will not help all of them. In fact it may only help a few of them. But I feel very strongly that the bill is worthwhile even if it only brings one soldier home to his family after all of these years.

I urge you to vote for the ''Bring Them Home Alive Act of 2000.''

TRIBUTE TO SHAFEIK MOHAMMED

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Shafeik Mohammed, an outstanding individual who has devoted his life to his family and to serving the community. Mr. Mohammed retired from Phipps Community Development Corporation on September 1 and moved to California to be with his children.

Originally from Trinidad, Mr. Mohammed and his wife first came to this country in 1971 to seek medical help for their daughter who had been seriously injured in a car accident. The early years were rough: four young children, a foreign country, and few marketable skills. The whole family enrolled in school, worked, studied, and saved. His wife became a registered nurse and Shafeik, while working full time, made the Dean's List at Medger Evers College. Their daughter recovered, went to law school, and is now Assistant District Attorney in Los Angeles.

Mr. Mohammed has worked in impoverished communities in both Brooklyn and the Bronx helping residents learn skills, gain employment, and develop careers. For more than thirty years he has worked with a passion and commitment that has inspired thousands of individuals and been instrumental in lifting whole families our of poverty.

In 1996, after fifteen months of retirement, he came to work for Phipps Community Development Corporation in my congressional district and has been the guiding light behind our educational and employment services ever since. Phipps CDC is the human services affiliate of Phipps Houses, New York City's oldest and largest not-for-profit developer of affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing a happy retirement to Mr. Shafeik Mohammed.

HONORING MEREDITH J. KHACHIGIAN

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to one of California's most remarkable women, Meredith J. Khachigian.

Ms. Khachigian has chaired the Board of Regents of the University of California (UC) for three terms. In this position she manages the leading public research university in the nation. With 97,000 employees and 167,000 students, the UC system includes nine university sites, a graduate health science campus in San Francisco, three law schools, five medical schools and five hospitals. The Regents oversee the University's $43 billion annual budget and also manage the UC Retirement System, the largest in the United States, and a General Endowment Pool of $5.3 billion.

Ms. Khachigian is a consultant in community and public affairs and is the former Executive Director of Vital Link-Orange, a program that matches high school students' educational backgrounds with the needs of future employers. She is currently serving as a member of the Governor's School-To-Work Advisory Council for the State of California. Additionally, she represents the University on business matters through her involvement with the Orange County Business Council's workforce preparation initiative.

She has served as President of Human Options, a shelter for battered women, and is the co-chair of the program's 20th anniversary celebration, which in 2001 will commemorate two decades of dedicated service in the field of domestic violence.

Ms. Khachigian has combined a career in public service with her dedication to the needs of others and is well-known in the United States for her achievements. She is recognized for her expertise and is regularly asked to speak on prestigious news programs. She has served as an advocate for the University in Washington, DC, meeting with legislators on issues important to the hospitals and medical schools as well as the people of California.

I ask my colleagues to please join with me in recognizing an extraordinary woman. Meredith J. Khachigian.

TRIBUTE TO LISE THIBAULT, NEWEST MEMBER OF THE WORLD COMMITTEE ON DISABILITY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the selection of Ms. Lise Thibault as a member of the World Committee on Disability. Ms. Thibault brings to her new position some thirty years of leadership in the disability movement in her native country, Canada.

When Lise Thibault was a teenager, she suffered a tobogganing accident that left her with a permanent disability; however, having to use a wheelchair has never slowed her down. She went on to become a wife, the mother of two, the grandmother of five, and a prominent public figure.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Thibault taught adult education and worked for the Canadian Broadcasting Company as a host and a researcher for programs about family and community issues. She was appointed to the Quebec Ministry of Education in 1977, became director-general of the Quebec Office for Persons with Disabilities, and Vice President of the Quebec Occupational Health and Safety Board (1987–1993). Throughout her life, she has been an active leader in the disabled community, serving as president and director general of the Quebec Bureau for the Handicapped and board member of the Canadian Red Cross.

In 1994, Lise Thibault was given the YWCA's "Woman of Merit" award for her involvement in the community. That same year, she was named "Personality of the Year" by Chatelaine Magazine. On January 30, 1997, she was sworn in as Quebec's 27th Lieutenant Governor by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Ms. Thibault is the first woman and the first person with a disability to hold this office.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in welcoming this extraordinary warm-hearted woman who has dedicated herself to the well-being of others, Ms. Lise Thibault, as a member of the World Committee on Disability.

IN HONOR OF JOHN "JJ" JOHNSON, RECIPIENT OF THE NEW JERSEY AFL–CIO LABOR AWARD 2000

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NORTH JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John "JJ" Johnson, recipient of the New Jersey AFL–CIO Labor Award for the year 2000. The AFL–CIO Labor Award is given to extremely dedicated individuals, who have made enduring contributions to the labor movement.

John Johnson became active in the labor movement in 1960, when he organized the Peter Pan factory in East Newark, New Jersey. In 1975, Mr. Johnson co-founded Local 617 of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), which elected him executive vice president, a position he held for 23 years.

Today, Local 617 represents approximately 3,500 employees, making it the largest public employees local of the Service Employees International Union in the State of New Jersey. Mr. Johnson's hard work and dedication have been a major factor in the growth and success of Local 617.

In 1996, Mr. Johnson was elected to the Executive Board of the Services Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, CLC, becoming the Union's first African American official to serve in that capacity. The Service Employees Union is the third largest union in the AFL–CIO, with a membership of 1.3 million.

In addition, Mr. Johnson serves as a board member of the Public Sector Division and the Political Committee of SEIU; was elected president of the SEIU New Jersey State Council; was appointed to the board of the New Jersey State AFL–CIO, CLC; and was elected president of Local 617.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring John "JJ" Johnson for his enduring contributions to the labor movement.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN KASICH ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my fellow Ohioan and good friend, JOHN KASICH. I used to serve with my

colleague from Ohio on the Budget Committee, and I know how difficult it is to put together a budget that moves the country forward in a positive direction and remains responsible to the American taxpayer.

I want to take a minute to go back a few years and look at where we have been, and how far we have come under the leadership of the Chairman of the Budget Committee. After 30 years of Congress recklessly spending more than we take in, American voters demanded a change. In 1995, the Republican majority came to Congress to restore discipline to the budget process.

But before he became Chairman in 1995, the Congressman from Ohio was writing his own balanced budget every year. Back then some of the people who had been in Washington for a while, called it tilting at windmills. But what really was going on was he was building a groundwork for the budget discipline the American people would demand, and Republicans would bring to Congress after we became the majority.

In 1991, Mr. KASICH's balanced budget received 114 votes, and the other 303 votes were for a budget that continued to raid Social Security and pile up debt for our children and grandchildren.

In 1993, he was able to win another 21 votes and his balanced budget received 135 votes, and the other 295 votes were for a budget that continued to raid Social Security and pile up debt for our children and grandchildren.

In 1994, he added 30 more votes, and his balanced budget received 165 votes, and the other 243 were for a budget that continued to raid Social Security and pile up debt for our children and grandchildren.

In 1995, the gentleman from Ohio as Budget Chairman passed a Republican budget by a vote of 238–193.

And in 1997, this Congress and the Administration came together in a bipartisan to write the Balanced Budget Act—which once and for all, ended the raid on Social Security, which ended once and for all, the reckless practice of spending more than we take in, and which finally balanced the budget, and put our country's books in order.

I want to thank the Budget Chairman, on behalf of myself and my colleagues and the constituents in my district and across the country for his service to his country. We are going to miss your expertise, your tenacity, your endless optimism, and your vision of a better America now that you have completed your final budget in the House.

As Ohio's Seventh District Representative to the Congress of the United States, I take this opportunity to join with members of the Ohio delegation and members of the Budget Committee to honor the efforts and the many outstanding achievements of Representative JOHN KASICH. His many contributions as a member of the House of Representatives and leadership as a valued Committee Chairman will be remembered.

HONORING ROBERTO GARCIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Roberto Garcia, recipient of the Napa County Hispanic Network Lifetime Achievement Award, for his outstanding contributions to the youth of Napa County. He has devoted his life to promoting mutual understanding and respect in our community and is an excellent role model for us all.

Roberto Garcia has placed a high priority on providing much needed positive role models for Latino youth, as well as promoting the importance of learning English and pursuing higher education. Undoubtedly, he is a dedicated educator and community leader. Over the course of his highly successful career, he has worked as a Migrant Education Secondary School Advisor, an ''English as a Second Language Instructor'' at Napa Valley College and an Outreach Specialist for the Citizenship Project of the Napa County Council for Economic Opportunity. He cares deeply for the problems that face our nation's youth and has worked tirelessly to find long-lasting solutions in the community. To that end, he has helped mediate gang conflicts, including the organization of the largest gang forum in the Napa County.

Our community and our nation have benefited greatly from Roberto Garcia's time, effort, and dedication. He was a cofounder and past president of the Napa County Hispanic Network. Within this organization he founded the Napa County Hispanic Network Scholarship program. He has also served on the Board of Directors of the Mexican Cultural Center for the Bay Area, was a past docent of the Napa Valley Museum Hispanic Trunk Presentations and an active member of the Napa County Chicano/Latino Democratic Caucus.

Roberto Garcia's past achievements in his quest to educate the community have been numerous. He has organized many cultural events including the annual ''Christmas in Mexico Festival,'' Spanish Zarzuela Concerts and art exhibits of Yucatan Mexico. He was instrumental in bringing the Mexican Consul to the Napa Valley several times each year to issue documentation and address concerns of the local Mexican population. In addition, he was honored in 1998 by the Napa County Democratic Caucus as the Democrat of the Year.

Roberto Garcia is a devoted father and has been blessed with two daughters, Christina and Lourdes Xochitl, and one granddaughter, Susan Parks.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Roberto Garcia for his dedication and commitment to so many important and worthwhile causes. He has devoted his life to addressing the concerns of the community and specifically the problems facing Latino youth. He has helped foster awareness and understanding, working to bridge gaps between our diverse community. For these reasons, it is necessary that we honor this leader and my good friend for his continuing distinguished service to the people of the Napa Valley and for receiving the NAPA County Hispanic Network Lifetime Achievement Award.

TRIBUTE TO MACON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT PAUL R. NAGLE

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a great American and Georgian, Paul R. Nagle, who recently retired as president of the Macon, Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Nagle has been an inspiration to all of us. Appointed as president in 1991, Mr. Nagle has been a leader and public servant that has always given 100 percent to the citizens of Macon.

Mr. Nagle was born in Hominy, Oklahoma, but serving his country and his professional career have taken him around the country. He graduated from the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration and a major in Marketing. Additionally, he has given his time and energy to many wonderful causes including Robins Air Force Base 21st Century Partnership, the Macon, Georgia 2000 Partnership and the NewTown Macon Board.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the distinct pleasure of working very closely with Mr. Nagle on many projects, including the very important Fall Line Freeway project. I am confident that his superior accomplishments and lasting legacy will continue to be felt in Macon and throughout Middle Georgia.

I will miss working with Mr. Nagle, at the Macon Chamber, but will continue to wish him the best in his new endeavors.

HONORING MR. JOE BARRERA

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today and honor Mr. Joe Barrera, an extraordinary American citizen who served our Nation with honor and bravery during World War II. On November 11, 2000, this Veterans Day, I will proudly present the Purple Heart Medal to Mr. Barrera for his acts of bravery during the War.

Mr. Joe Barrera was born on January 7, 1925 in Los Angeles. He graduated from Polytechnic High School in 1943 and soon after married Rosalie Barrera, his wife of 56 years. On August 9, 1943, he was inducted into the U.S. Army and began his military service.

After four months in basic training, Joe spent 14 months as a TEC 3 Surgical Technician and 14 months as a TEC 3 Medical Aidman receiving a Medical Combat Badge. On December 6, 1944, Mr. Barrera was sent to France for his first experience overseas and served with the Medical Detachment in the

276th Infantry Regiment in the European Theater of Operations for 16 months. During combat, he worked the front lines administering medical treatment to the wounded and performing emergency surgeries. Mr. Berrera carried out his many duties with exemplary courage.

On March 20, 1945, Mr. Barrera was injured and received 2nd degree burns to his eyes from a mine explosion. On April 15, 1946, Joe returned to the United States receiving his Honorable Discharge on May 8, 1946.

Upon return to civilian life, Mr. Barrera owned and operated the Metro Barbershop in Los Angeles near Cal State L.A. from 1948 to 1989, and he and his wife raised four wonderful children. His two daughters, Kathy and Carol, are both happily married and have successful lives. His son John is a Foreman in the Los Angeles County Fire Department. His other son, Joseph, who passed away in 1992, had been employed by Northrop Grumman constructing Stealth Bombers.

After 41 years of running his own business, Joe retired to enjoy a well-deserved leisure life. Today, he continues to be a happy and modest man surrounded by a wonderful family and many friends.

I would like to urge all my House colleagues to join me today in recognition of Mr. Joe Barrera's remarkable service and contribution to our Nation and to offer our personal congratulations as he receives his Purple Heart Medal this Veterans' Day.

FOR THE RELIEF OF PERSIAN GULF EVACUEES

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a bill that unanimously passed the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims and our Full committee. This private relief bill on behalf of 54 families and individuals seeking permanent resident status in the United States has much merit.

These families, known as Persian Gulf evacuees, have lived and worked in this country being evacuated out of Kuwait, at the behest of the United States government, just prior to U.S. Military Intervention in the Iraqi invasion of that country.

Many of these individuals, by order of then President Bush, were evacuated to keep them out of harms way when the United States intervened militarily in Kuwait, and hid them in their homes against Iraqi retaliation. Once here, the majority of the 2,000 evacuees adjusted their own status, often through asylum procedures. These 54 families remained in limbo, facing deportation and loss of work permits in the United States.

The Persian Gulf evacuees, are well educated, English speaking, mostly professional individuals perfectly capable of working and supporting themselves here in the United States without becoming wards of any State in which they have settled.

This action is good for this Congress and for America, and I support its passage.

PUERTO RICO STATUS PLAN

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4475, the FY 2001 Department of Transportation appropriations bill, includes provisions which I support that will promote informed self-determination for Puerto Rico. It is historic that Congress has authorized the President to cooperate with the Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to develop a legally valid and politically realistic program to support political status resolution for Puerto Rico. However, it was necessary to ensure that Congress can review the program plan before funding can be expended. Given the powers vested in Congress to determine the ultimate status of Puerto Rico based on a legitimate process of self-determination, the process of Congressional review contemplated by this legislation is entirely fitting and critical to a successful status resolution program.

MR. LUIS P. VILLARREAL

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate Luis P. Villarreal, who received the 2000 Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring for his work in developing science education and research programs to assist minority students at the high school and university level. Mr. Villarreal is a professor of molecular biology and biochemistry at the University of California, Irvin (UCI). He was selected as one of ten individual recipients to receive this prestigious award.

Mr. Villarreal began his academic career when he enrolled in a community college to become a medical technologist. Encouraged to continue his education, he went on to complete a four year degree in chemistry and then entered graduate school. As a researcher in biology, Mr. Villarreal is currently doing research on the connection between cervical cancer and viruses. He also manages a million-dollar annual budget for the minority science program at UCI.

One of his greatest accomplishments is to help struggling students achieve success in college, and to encourage them to become scientists. One of his students remarked that he is relaxed, but brilliant and very funny. Through his mentoring program, Mr. Villarreal has guided many under-represented students into the sciences. These students participate in a rigorous academic and research training program that is mentored by faculty members. The program includes paid internships, tutoring, academic advising, faculty seminars and participation at national conferences.

I ask my colleagues to please join with me as we honor Mr. Luis P. Villarreal for his outstanding academic and educational achievements.

HONORING MR. GARTH GARDNER

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today and honor Mr. Garth Gardner, an extraordinary American Citizen who served our Nation with honor and bravery during World War II. On November 11, 2000, this Veterans Day, I will proudly present the Purple Heart Medal to Mr. Gardner for his acts of bravery during WWII.

Mr. Garth Gardner was born on September 25, 1922 in Carbon County, Utah. He graduated from Carbon County High School in 1940 and attended Carbon County Jr. College for two years. At the age of 19, Mr. Gardner enlisted as a cadet in the U.S. Army Air Force. On March 27, 1945, Mr. Gardner departed to New Guinea, where he flew 29 missions against the enemy in a B–24 liberator with a crew of 10 servicemen.

Following his return to the United States, Mr. Gardner was married to Mary Ponti on December 30, 1945. In 1948, Garth graduated from USC, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. Following his graduation, Garth bought a house in Pico Rivera where he and his wife raised their three sons. Mr. Gardner worked for the County of Los Angeles Flood Control District for 25 years and upon retiring from the County in 1976, became a California Probate Referee—a position he has held for the last 26 years.

In March 2001, he will retire from the Pico Rivera City Council after 29 years of service. He has served 8 terms, including his final term, as Mayor. One of his major accomplishments is completing the flood control project, which began in 1991 and will be completed in 2001. This important project begins at the Pacific Ocean and extends 26 miles to the Whittier Narrows Dam and costs $250 million.

Mr. Gardner will always remain active in his community and continue a life of service. I would like to urge all my House colleagues to join me today in recognition of Mr. Garth Gardner's remarkable service and contribution to our Nation and to offer our personal congratulations as he receives his Purple Heart Medal this Veterans' Day.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. DOMINICK CONDO AND DR. SALVATORE LAPILUSA, ''2000 MEN OF THE YEAR''

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Dominick Condo and Dr. Salvatore LaPilusa, who are being honored by the Sicilian Citizens Club as ''2000 Men of the Year'' at the 73rd annual dinner-dance celebration.

On Saturday, October 28th, two of New Jersey's most talented and dedicated physicians will be honored for their contributions to medicine, to the health of the residents of the City of Bayonne, and to philanthropic causes.

Dr. Dominick Condo, whose parents, Domenico and Rosa Condo immigrated from Calabria, Italy, was born in Jersey City, New Jersey on August 13, 1954. Dr. Condo was raised in Bayonne, New Jersey, where he practices medicine today. In 1975, he received his B.A. from St. Peters College; studied medicine at the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara, Mexico, graduating in 1980; and performed his medical internship and residency at St. Michael's Medical Center in Newark, New Jersey.

Dr. Condo is an attending physician of internal medicine at Bayonne Hospital in New Jersey. He is a member of the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, and the American College of Geriatrics. Dr. Condo was named the Hudson County Physician of the Year in 1994, and was recently named one of the 100 Best Doctors in the New York Metropolitan area in New York Magazine (7/99).

Dr. Salvatore LaPilusa, the son of Sicilian immigrants, was born in Bayonne, New Jersey. He received his B.A. from the University of Notre Dame and his medical degree from Loyola Medical School in Chicago. Dr. LaPilusa received his orthopedic training at New Jersey Medical Center and Iowa University. After serving in the Korean War, he returned to America to start his own practice, and was certified with the American Board of Orthopedics.

Dr. LaPilusa was married to Lorrine McNally, a nurse at the Jersey City Medical Center, with whom he had a son, Richard. When his wife lost her battle with cancer, Dr. LaPilusa founded the Lorrine McNally Pavilion, in order for cancer patients to remain close to home for treatment. In addition, he started a scholarship fund at the University of Notre Dame, which currently provides support for 15 students. Dr. LaPilusa also volunteers his time and skills in developing countries, such as Vietnam, Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Bhutan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Dominick Condo, and Dr. Salvatore LaPilusa, the Sicilian Citizens Club's "2000 Men of the Year." They are truly exceptional physicians and dedicated community leaders.

HONORING ROSAURA SEGURA-LOPEZ

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Rosaura Segura-Lopez, the recipient of the Napa County Hispanic Network Lifetime Achievement Award. Ms. Segura-Lopez is an outstanding member of the community and has worked tirelessly to improve the conditions of low-income housing and public education for migrant farmworkers.

Recognizing a great need, Rosaura Segura-Lopez established the Immigration Services Office in St. Helena with a credit card in March, 1989. Since then, she has served as a board member of the St. Helena Public School Foundation from 1990 to 1993 and has worked on the County of Napa Grand Jury for the Fiscal Year 1991–1992. Also, since 1994, she has been a member of the Boys & Girls Club Board of Directors. In addition, Ms. Segura-Lopez acts as Vice-President and Sponsor for "Club Los Haro" which raises funds for her birthplace, Los Haro in Zacatecas, Mexico.

As a child, Rosaura vividly remembers how tired her father, a farmworker, was when he arrived home in the evenings. This prompted her to become involved with the Migrant Farmworker Committee and she has served as its Chairperson since 1994. She has been selected to serve on the Napa County Housing Committee, which has the task of gathering data and making recommendations regarding the update of the County's Housing Element and has been named Vice-Chair of the newly formed Napa County Farmworker Housing Oversight Committee.

In April 1999, Rosaura Segura-Lopez was honored with an award from the California Human Development in recognition of Community Business for Excellent Service Provided to the Community.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Ms. Rosaura Segura-Lopez for her dedication and commitment to worthwhile causes, as she is an inspiration to everyone. For these reasons, it is necessary that we honor this woman for her continuing distinguished service to the people of Saint Helena and all of Napa County, California.

CELEBRATION OF THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF LOUIS AND BERTHA WILLIAMS OF AIKEN, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Louis and Bertha Williams were married in Aiken County, South Carolina on October 27, 1950. There marriage symbolizes commitment, tenacity, and a spiritual bond between them that fosters a deep and comfortable friendship and partnership. Mr. Louis Williams retired from the Granitville Company in Granitville, South Carolina after 35 years of dedicated service as a shift supervisor/Mrs. Bertha Williams retired from the Aiken County Public School System after 37 years of dedicated service as a math teacher and high school basketball coach. Faith in God and family means everything to the Williams'. Mr. & Mrs. Louis Williams have two adult daughters, Carolyn and Barbara who reside in Maryland.

HONORING JOE GARCIA III

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate a very good friend, Joe Garcia Sr., who celebrated his 75th birthday on October 21, 2000.

The Mexican revolution left Mexico devastated with little food and medication. Joe's father was deathly sick and a relative in El Paso, Texas wrote them to let Joe's parents know that they had the medication that would help Joe's father. Joe Garcia's parents packed up their belongings and came to Texas at the end of the Mexican Revolution. On October 21, 1925, Joe Garcia was born in El Paso, Texas.

At the age of nineteen, Joe joined the army and proudly served the United States of America during World War II as a paratrooper in the 503rd. After the war, Joe became a publisher and started one of the first bilingual magazines covering Latinos in politics, sports, education, and entertainment. Joe was not only on a mission to report and inform the public of the impact and influence of Latinos in this country, he was also instrumental in helping shape the political landscape. He was very active working with numerous campaigns ranging from Roybal to Rockefeller, and he helped to elect the Honorable Leo Sanchez, the first Mexican-American Municipal court judge in California.

Not satisfied with his numerous accomplishments, he turned his attention to starting El Rey, a Mexican food company in the late 70's producing one of the first pre-packaged chorizo (Mexican sausage). Ever the entrepreneur, Joe and his wife Virginia started Reynaldo's Mexican Food Company in 1993.

Today, Renaldo's Mexican Food Company is a leader in Mexican food manufacturing. His products reach eleven states with warehouses in Los Angeles, San Diego, Texas, Arizona, Chicago, and Las Vegas. The company continues to set new standards for the manufacturing and processing of Mexican food and enjoys continued growth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all my colleagues to join me in saluting Joe Garcia Sr. who at the age of 75 shows no signs of slowing down. Mr. Garcia, Sr. is truly a testament to the American Dream. Through his hard work, entrepreneurial spirit, enthusiasm and community service he continues to serve as a role model for Latinos and all Americans.

UNSUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING INVOLVING THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, submit the following letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "Response to Comments by Rep. Curt Weldon Regarding the Government Reform Committee, Minority Staff, report, Unsubstantiated Allegations of Wrongdoing Involving the Clinton Administration."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, October 27, 2000.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. WELDON: On September 28, I spoke on the House floor regarding a series of unsubstantiated allegations by members

of Congress that have unfairly smeared the reputations of numerous individuals. I also entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD facts relevant to many of these sensational allegations.

As you know, one of the allegations I discussed was your claim in a 1998 floor statement that the President could have committed ''treason,'' one of the most serious crimes an American can commit. You responded in a floor statement of October 2, 2000. You claim that I made ''totally false'' statements relating to your ''treason'' remarks.

On September 28, I described your ''treason'' statement as follows:

In May 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) made remarks on the House floor regarding allegations that the political contributions of the chief executive officer of Loral Corporation, Bernard Schwartz, had influenced the President's decision to authorize the transfer of certain technology to China. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Weldon) described this issue as a, ''Scandal that is unfolding that I think will dwarf every scandal that we have seen talked about on this floor in the past 6 years.'' And said further, ''This scandal involves potential treason.''

You have not disputed this characterization of your remarks. You also did not dispute my statement that when a member of Congress makes such a sensational allegation, it can have tremendous impact. In your case, your ''treason'' remarks were not only part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but were publicized in national media reports.

You have, however, taken issue with two sets of facts that I put into the record on September 28 after describing your ''treason'' remarks. First, I said:

The Department of Justice examined the allegations relating to whether campaign contribution influenced export control decisions and found them to be unfounded. In August 1998, Lee Radek, chief of the department's public integrity section, wrote that ''there is not a scintilla of evidence or information that the President was corruptly influenced by Bernard Schwartz.'' Charles La Bella, then head of the department's campaign finance task force, agreed with Mr. Radek's assessment that ''this was a matter which likely did not merit any investigation.''

You said on October 2 that my statement was wrong, pointing to a passage in a July 16, 1998, memo by Mr. La Bella that discussed two documents potentially relevant to the Loral/Schwartz allegations. My statement, however, quoted two subsequent Department of Justice memos—an August 12, 1998, memo by Mr. La Bella and an August 5, 1998, memo by Mr. Radek.

Further, Mr. La Bella himself said that his July 16 memo took the view that the Loral/Schwartz matter ''likely did not merit any investigation.'' Discussing his July 16 memo (the ''Interim Report'') and Mr. Radek's August 5 memo (the ''Review''), Mr. La Bella stated on August 12, 1998:

The Review shares the view expressed in the Interim Report that this was a matter which likely did not merit any investigation.

In May 2000, Los Angeles Times investigative reporters examined the Justice Department's investigation of the Loral/Schwartz matter. In a May 23, 2000 article entitled Internal Justice Memo Excuses Loral, They wrote:

During a May 2 hearing, [Senator] Specter commented that LaBalla has pushed, in his

But the impression was wrong.

The LaBella report and related documents, which were obtained earlier this year by The Times, tell quite a different story. In fact, by the time LaBella delivered his report to Atty. Gen. Janet Reno in the summer of 1998, the task force had effectively excused Schwartz and Loral from the campaign finance investigation. . . .

''Poor Bernie [Schwartz] got a bad deal,'' one former task force investigator said in an interview. ''There was never a whiff of a scent of a case against him.''

As you can see, therefore, I was entirely accurate in my summary of the Justice Department's investigation. It is your description of the evidence—not mine—that distorts the facts.

You also took issue with the second set of facts I put in the record relating to your ''treason'' remarks. In my September 28 statement, I said:

The House select committee investigated allegations relating to United States technology transfer to China and whether campaign contributions influenced export control decisions. In May 1999, the committee findings were made public. The committee's bipartisan findings also did not substantiate the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania of treason by the President.

In your October 2 remarks, you asserted, ''Now, in fact, our Cox committee did not even look at this issue.'' This statement is remarkable, particularly since you were a member of the Cox Committee yourself.

As support for your claim, you cited language in the Cox Committee report which notes that the Committee did not end up looking at attempts by the People's Republic of China (PRC) to influence technology transfers through campaign contributions. Your ''treason'' remarks, however, centered on allegations relating to contributions by Bernard Schwartz, not the PRC. And, indeed, the Committee did examine these allegations.

As the Committee report notes, Mr. Schwartz was one of the individuals interviewed or deposed by the Committee. The Committee also interviewed or deposed Loral Vice President Thomas B. Ross. As noted in a May 24, 1998, New York Times article regarding the Loral/Schwartz allegations, Mr. Ross was the author of a February 13, 1998, letter to national security advisor Sandy Berger that urged a swift decision on the waiver issue. In fact, you drew attention to this very letter by Mr. Ross in your October 2 remarks.

Your assertion that the Cox Committee ''did not even look at this issue'' is therefore simply wrong.

The fact is, the Cox Committee report expressly mentions the Loral/Schwartz allegations, but does not confirm your conclusions in any way. This lack of findings in the report underscores the fact that your ''treason'' remarks remain unsubstantiated even though several investigative bodies have examined the Loral/Schwartz matter.

When a member of Congress makes a wild allegation, the burden should be on that member to support it. It is tremendously unfair—and contrary to our system of justice—to presume that the burden is on the target of the allegation or others to disprove unsubstantiated allegations. In this instance, the facts show that you made an inflammatory statement about the President in 1998 using the word ''treason'' and your statement remains unsubstantiated.

I hope this helps clarify the record.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Member of Congress.

LIBERTY COMMON SCHOOL, A COLORADO CHARTER AND CORE KNOWLEDGE SCHOOL, LAUDED IN REPORT

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, there is great change occurring in education today. Parents in the United States are frustrated with the results of their childrens' education, which largely is the result of government-owned schools' departure from teaching basic knowledge. The impressive results of Core Knowledge and charter schools are undeniable, and like all good ideas with conclusive results—people take notice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit excerpt from the Lexington Institute's September 2000, report by Robert Holland entitled, ''Public Charter Schools and the Core Knowledge Movement.'' This report details the success of Core Knowledge schools. I am proud to say the report also references the success of Liberty Common School, located in Fort Collins, Colorado, in which my children are enrolled. Liberty Common is a Core Knowledge charter school which not only exceeds the State of Colorado's standards, but Liberty Common also leads its school district as well. Mr. Speaker, I submit the Lexington Institute's report for the record:

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS AND THE CORE KNOWLEDGE MOVEMENT

A battle raged throughout the 20th Century over the best way to teach children—by teacher-directed, content-rich approaches or through a ''progressive'' method by which children direct their own learning.

It rages still, with progressivism continuing to exert a strong hold, despite mounting evidence that teacher-directed instruction using a core curriculum works best for most children.

Core Knowledge schools have risen to meet the need and demand for schools that teach children facts in a sequential manner, so that they gain the vocabulary and knowledge base for further learning. Implementation of a Core Knowledge Sequence started in 1991 with one school in Florida; this fall, there will be 1,100 Core Knowledge schools operating in 46 states. The parallel charter school movement offers opportunities for parents and teachers to start Core Knowledge schools.

A basic purpose of Core Knowledge and its founder, Dr. E.D. Hirsch Jr., is to advance equity in education by ensuring a full education for all, including children from low-income and minority homes.

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS AND THE CORE KNOWLEDGE MOVEMENT

In the past 30 years ample research has made possible a definite conclusion: Tightly focused teacher-directed instruction is more effective for most children than is child-directed instruction in which the teacher acts purely as a coach, mentor, or facilitator. For instance, a 1999 American Institutes of Research look at two dozen models of ''whole school'' designs reaffirmed the superiority of largely teacher-directed approaches like Direct Instruction, Success For All, and Core Knowledge.

Yet despite repeated proof that this is so, large segments of the education world stubbornly ignore this reality. They remain wedded to the so-called progressive doctrine. In her important new book, Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms, education historian Diane Ravitch documents how the progressive movement, championed most notably by philosopher John Dewey, has exerted a powerful hold on American education from the early days of the 20th Century to the present. Ms. Ravitch argues powerfully that American schools must return to their basic mission of teaching knowledge.

There can be little doubt that most parents prefer the traditional, structured approach over progressive ways. Public Agenda, a nonpartisan research organization, repeatedly asked parents during the 1990s what they expected form their children's schools. Invariably parents of all races and backgrounds wanted schools that taught the academic basics, with attention to children being able to speak and write standard English. Parents also wanted schools where children were expected to obey rules, such as being ''neat, on time, and polite.'' But Public Agenda found quite different goals among professors in the teacher-training schools, where strains of progressivism still exert a powerful grip. True to the old-time gospel of John Dewey, most professional educators thought advancing ''social justice'' more important than teaching children knowledge. Unlike parents, these teachers of teachers wanted schooling that is less structured and more ''learner-centered.''

The Rise of Core Knowledge

In 1990, Dr. Hirsch and his allies convened a national conference at which 24 working groups finalized a draft Core Knowledge Sequence for use in elementary schools. The sequence was based on research into the content and structure of the highest-performing elementary schools around the world, as well as consultation with teachers, parents, scientists, curriculum specialists, and others.

In 1991, the Core Knowledge Sequence debuted in a year of implementation at Three Oaks Elementary in Ft. Meyers, Florida under the leadership of the principal, Dr. Constance Jones (who in 1999 became president of the Core Knowledge Foundation in Charlottesville, Virginia). The Core Knowledge schools were born. The interest in and spread of these schools devoted to content-rich direct teaching has been phenomenal. This fall, there will be more than 1,100 full-fledged Core Knowledge schools in 46 states. (Hundreds of additional schools use portions of the Core Knowledge program.)

Particularly in the very early stages, adoption of Core Knowledge depended on principals and teachers who had to make the case to an often-skeptical school administration for importing a curriculum that rubs against the grain of education progressisivism. James Traub wrote about Jim Coady, a principal in liberal Cambridge, Massachusetts, who had to battle the administration's hostile curriculum supervisors to bring Core Knowledge to Morse Elementary School, which

With the emergence of the national charter school movement in 1992, Core Knowledge became a viable option for parents, teachers, and others seeking to secure charters to start their own schools. In Colorado, a state evaluation of the performance of 51 charter schools that have been in operation for at least two years found Core Knowledge distinguishing itself both in quantity and quality. Twenty-two of the public charter schools (or 42 percent) used the Core Knowledge curriculum. Among charter schools using a ''whole-school'' model Core Knowledge was clearly dominant—22 versus three for the next-most-used model. More important, Core Knowledge was delivering results. The evaluators concluded that 14 of the Core Knowledge schools ''exceeded expectations set for their performance,'' and the remaining eight ''generally met'' expectations.

Furthermore, Core Knowledge schools were a significant part of the reason Colorado charter schools scored, on average, 10 to 16 percentage points higher on basic subjects than public schools with comparable demographics. There is considerable research indicating that Core Knowledge is bolstering academic success. But first let's look at what the program is all about.

The Core Knowledge Sequence

''Shared'' is an important word in the Core Knowledge lexicon. In his 1996 book, The Schools We Need And Why We Don't Have Them, Dr. Hirsch emphasized the importance of shared knowledge. Citizens in a democracy need to share an extensive body of information in order to communicate and function fully in society. The same hold in the classroom: If students draw a blank at mention of the names ''Lee'' and ''Grant'' not to mention ''Bull Run'' and ''Appomattox,'' how can they be expected to engage in critical thinking about the Civil War?

Education progressives claim that knowledge is changing so rapidly that what children learn today will be outdated tomorrow; that schools therefore can at best only teach them ''accessing skills,'' such as how to surf the Internet. But such a rationale does a grave disservice to children, because there is a body of bedrock knowledge—pivotal events in world history, the development of constitutional government, principles of writing and mathematics. And there are masterworks of art, music, and literature—with which they should be familiar in order to be fulfilled individuals.

The Core Knowledge idea, as summarized on its Website (www.coreknowledge.org), is ''that for the sake of academic excellence, greater fairness, and higher literacy, elementary and middle schools need a solid, specific, shared core curriculum in order to help children establish strong foundations of knowledge, grade by grade.'' The Core Knowledge approach is not to throw tidbits of information helter-skelter at children. Rather the program specifies important knowledge in language arts, history and geography, mathematics, science, and the fine arts, and lays out a sequence for children to master what they need to know grade by grade.

Evidence of Core Knowledge Success

As cited earlier, the 1998–99 Colorado Charter Schools Evaluation Study showed that Core Knowledge schools were contributing in a big way to the success of charter schools in that state. Core Knowledge schools accounted for almost half the charter schools that were studied. And the charter schools outperformed their home districts and schools with comparable socioeconomic profiles.

From other states and researchers evidence of the positive effects of Core Knowledge has begun tumbling in. One of the most impressive studies was done by Gracy Taylor and George Kimball of the Oklahoma City Public Schools. Their study paired 300 Core Knowledge students with 300 students in other schools who had the same characteristics as the CK students on seven critical variables: grade level, pre-score, sex, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free lunch, Title I services, and special education. The control students were randomly selected via computer according to those variables.

The researchers studied the effects of implementing one year of Core Knowledge in grade 3, 4, and 5. The well-validated Iowa Test of Basic Skills was the measuring stick. Given the almost identical backgrounds of the two groups of students, one might have expected one-year differences to be less than pronounced. However, the study found that Core Knowledge students made significantly greater gains in reading comprehension, vocabulary, science, math concepts, and social studies. Moreover, the greatest gains, which came in reading, vocabulary, and social studies, were judged to be ''highly significant.'' The effect of raising vocabulary—the best predictor of academic success—was particularly noteworthy, because it shows hope for closing the socioeconomic gap in student achievement.

The researchers remarked that ''according to the literature and personal conversations with Dr. Hirsch prior to the analyses, the impact on student achievement related to Core Knowledge instruction should be most pronounced in vocabulary and comprehension. The implementation of the Core Knowledge scope and sequence is intended to provide and develop a broad base of background knowledge that children utilize in their reading. According to Dr. Hirsch's cultural literacy theory, the more background knowledge a child has, the greater facility in reading the child will have. The initial results of this study do appear to support that notion.''

In other words, the evidence so far is that the Core Knowledge approach accomplishes what it sets out to do. And if its adherents are right that knowledge builds on knowledge, the results should only grow more striking over the years.

Liberty School

Liberty Common School opened as a Core Knowledge school in Fort Collins, a pleasant community in the Rocky Mountain foothills of northern Colorado, three years ago. Today it enrolls more than 540 students in grades K–9, with a waiting list of close to 1,000. ''It is our goal,'' says headmaster Kathryn Knox, ''to equalize the playing field for all students through a common and rich foundation of content and skills, high expectations and good citizenship.''

Liberty's Board of Directors is composed of seven elected parents. The board establishes and oversees the school's educational and operational policies. It meets twice a month in sessions open to the public.

Liberty Common is serious about meeting its academic goals. One of them was that the school would exceed state standards as well as the district's, which it did. In all of the reading and writing tests for grades 4 and 7, Liberty Common School ranked No. 1 in the local school district.

THE PAST YEAR IN INDO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the close of this legislative year, I wanted to highlight what has been perhaps the best year in U.S.-India relations. This first year of

the new century has been a year of record setting in a wide range of categories, all highlighting the steadily improving relationship between two of the world's great democracies.

On September 14, 2000, Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee became the first, and only, foreign Head of Government to be invited to address a Joint Meeting of Congress in the 106th Congress. The fact that this unique invitation was extended to Prime Minister Vajpayee is evidence that the Congress recognizes that Indo-American ties will continue to emerge as one of our most urgent foreign policy priorities in the 21st century.

I'm proud that both Houses of Congress came together in a bipartisan manner to adopt Resolutions welcoming Prime Minister Vajpayee, and stating in strong terms the commitment on the part of the Legislative Branch to work for closer U.S.-India relations. I'm particularly encouraged that the House Resolution contained a provision urging that the U.S. Government ''consider removing existing unilateral legislative and administrative measures imposed against India, which prevent the normalization of United States-India bilateral economic and trade relations.''

The year 2000 witnessed the first State Visit by an American President to India in more than 20 years. This year actually marked the second time that India's Prime Minister and the United States President exchanged summit visits in the same year: President Jimmy Carter traveled to India in January of 1978, and Prime Minister Morarji Desai came to the U.S. in June of that year. With all the changes that have taken place in both nations during the past 22 years, the exchange of top-level visits between the U.S. and India was particularly momentous this year.

President Clinton's highly successful and productive visit to India in March helped to cement Indo-American relations as no other single act could have. Additionally, the joint statement that was signed by the two leaders also produced many substantive firsts. It establishes a framework for long-term, institutional cooperation in many areas, including a Joint Working Group on Counter-Terrorism, an Indo-American Financial and Economic Forum, a bilateral Commercial Dialogue, and an Indo-American Working Group on Trade. Agreements were signed on energy and environmental and scientific cooperation. Recognizing the unique similarities of both Indian and American security concerns for Asia, both countries pledged a new partnership on regional and global security issues. The Joint Indo-American Statement, which was issued during the Prime Minister's visit to Washington in September, reaffirmed all of these unprecedented agreements.

These unprecedented agreements were reaffirmed, and expanded by the Joint Indo-U.S. Statement issued on September 15, during the Prime Minister's visit to Washington. Indeed, during the five short months between summits, significant progress was made. We have seen regular foreign policy consultations at the ministerial and senior policy levels. Our two countries have played a major leadership role in the launch of the Community of Democracies. In the economic arena, three ministerial-level economic dialogues and the High-Level Coordinating Group are working to improve the bilateral trade environment, facilitate greater commercial cooperation, promote investment, and contribute to strengthening the global financial and trading systems.

In their September summit meeting, President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee welcomed the progress of the Joint Working Group on Counter-Terrorism, and agreed that it would also examine linkages between terrorism and narcotics trafficking and other related issues. They noted the opening of a Legal Attaché office in New Delhi designed to facilitate cooperation in counter-terrorism and law enforcement. The two leaders expressed satisfaction that the joint consultative group on clean energy and environment met in July and agreed to revitalize and expand energy cooperation, while discussing the full range of issues relating to environment and climate change. They welcomed the establishment of the Science and Technology forum in July and agreed that the forum should reinvigorate the traditionally strong scientific cooperation between the two countries. In that connection, they noted the contribution of the two science and technology related roundtable meetings held in March and September.

The two leaders also welcomed the recent initiatives in the health sector, including the joint statements of June 2000, as examples of deepening collaboration in improving health care and combating AIDS and other major diseases of our time. They pledged their strong commitment to addressing the global challenge of the prevention and control of HIV/AIDS through the close involvement and cooperation between the governments and civil society in the two countries. They expressed support for the collaborative program for research in various areas, including HIV/AIDS vaccine development, through the Joint Working Groups of scientists envisaged by the Joint Statement of June 2000. They agreed to encourage the formation of a business council to combat HIV/AIDS with the active involvement and participation of business and industry to raise awareness in the industrial workplace.

While relations between India and the United States have generally been cordial over the past half-century, the agreements signed this year in New Delhi and Washington represents a new chapter in bilateral cooperation.

During Prime Minister Vajpayee's visit to Washington, the Official Dinner hosted by President Clinton was the largest banquet at the White House during the eight years of the Clinton Presidency, with more than 700 guests in attendance. This number reflects the growing size and success of the Indian-American community, a community which finds itself at or near first place in terms of levels of education, income and professional attainment among ethnic groups in our country. The guest list also demonstrates the growing interest and support among Americans from all backgrounds of closer ties with India.

A final marker of the strong relationship that has been formed was seen with the dedication of a statue of Mahatma Gandhi across from the Indian Embassy on Washington's Embassy Row. The ceremony to dedicate the statue was led by President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee. For Americans, Gandhi's influence on the civil rights movement has a special place in our collective memory.

It is one of my most profound hopes that the relationship between the United States and India continues to deepen and expand as we move into the years to come. I have full confidence that our policies towards Asia will recognize the importance of India to our National economic and security well being.

HONORING CLIFF HARTLE ON OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Mr. Cliff Hartle, President/CEO of the Gasser Foundation. Mr. Hartle is retiring this year, at the age of 85, after serving the community in this organization since its creation in 1989.

Cliff Hartle is a remarkable, dedicated and vital community member of Napa County. He graduated from Napa High School in 1933. He worked diligently for Berglund Tractor, starting part-time in high school and then working his way up the ranks until he retired as vice-president after 36 years of loyalty and dedication.

When Vernice and Peter Gassar began the Gassar Foundation for the betterment of life for the residents of Napa County, they looked to Cliff Hartle to help shape this organization. They know him as a kind, generous, intelligent and hard-working businessman. He has exceeded expectation and has been instrumental in the foundation's success. His co-workers and associates have a deep respect and love for him.

Under Cliff Hartle's leadership and guidance, The Gassar Foundation has given $9 million to 275 recipients and 150 schools. The two main beneficiaries have been Justin Siena High School and the Queen of the Valley Hospital Foundation. However, almost all of Napa County's non-profit organizations have been supported by the generosity of the Gassar Foundation with Cliff Hartle working diligently on its behalf.

Specifically, the Gassar Foundation has been instrumental in building an Emergency Room, a new maternity wing and a media center for students. It has helped in the acquisition and preservation of Napa-Solano County Wetlands for Ducks Unlimited. The Foundation has contributed greatly to the Boys & Girls Clubs of Napa, St. Helena and American Canyon, the Napa County Homeless Shelter, the Napa Valley Symphony, the American Center for Wine, Food and the Arts, Little League and countless other non-profit agencies that help the homeless, disabled, and underprivileged. Cliff Hartle and the Gassar Foundation have touched the lives of thousands in our community.

Cliff Hartle has received numerous awards and recognition from non-profit agencies, including last year's Queen of the Valley Hospital's President's Crystal Clock Award.

Cliff Hartle is a dedicated family man. He and his wife, Louetta, married for 64 years, are blessed with one daughter, Patty and two grandchildren, Sean and Sara.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent Mr. Cliff Hartle as his Congressman. His distinguished service to the community has been

immense and his dedication and leadership is inspirational to all. For these reasons, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize Cliff Hartle for his meritorious service to the people of Napa and Solano County, California.

JANE BRYANT QUINN DENOUNCES MASSIVE TAX CUTS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in this Congress and on the campaign trail, Republicans are amply demonstrating that they are the party of fiscal irresponsibility. The Republican congressional leadership and the Republican presidential candidate have cynically plied the slogan "its your money" to justify massive and wreckless tax cuts, most of which would go only to the wealthiest Americans. I submit for the record a recent column by the respected financial columnist Jane Bryant Quinn, which explains why it is so important to maintain budget surpluses and resist the political appeal of massive tax cuts.

DON'T BE TOO QUICK TO DEMAND A FEDERAL TAX CUT

(Jane Bryant Quinn)

So you want a big tax cut because the government surplus is ours and we should get it back?

That's nice. But remember that the government's public debt belongs to us, too.

The debt grew over many decades, for spending we liked and spending we didn't like (lefties and righties, fill in the good and evil spending of your choice). Mostly, it grew during recessions and wars.

Today, there's a consensus that the total debt should be reduced. But how can we do that and get a big tax cut, too?

I have a modest proposal. It's inspired by those who argue for privatizing more of the government's functions. I propose that we privatize the debt.

We should all get big tax cuts. But each cut should be packaged with a proportionate piece of the public debt. That's the true libertarian way.

Do I hear you say that you don't want your piece of the debt on your personal balance sheet? You're for collective responsibility after all?

In that case, I have something else to say. It's in our collective interest that the government run surpluses today, rather than opt for big tax cuts or big new spending programs. These surpluses are our principal source of new investment capital for business modernization and growth.

To raise money to invest for the future, businesses have to draw on national savings. But on average, individual Americans aren't saving a dime. We're spending everything we earn (in some months, more than we earn).

So where are the new savings coming from, for business use? From the surplus. Few people

Here's how that happens, as explained by Nobel Prize-winning economist Robert Solow, in the Oct. 5 issue of the New York Review of Books:

In years when the government spends more than it collects in taxes, it borrows the extra money it needs from the investing public (U.S. and foreign individuals and institutions).

It borrows by selling us Treasury bills and bonds. When we buy them, money shifts from the private sector to the government sector, to finance public purchasing and programs.

Lately, the government has been collecting more in taxes than it needs to cover spending. The surplus reduces the need for debt. Some of those Treasury bills and bonds are being retired or redeemed.

When that happens, the institutions that own them have to replace them with something else. Often, they switch to corporate bonds (and perhaps some equities). So the money moves out of the government's hands, back into the private sector.

Running surpluses hurts an economy in recessionary times. But in prosperous times, it's a pro-growth, pro-investment choice.

Follow along with me here because this principle becomes central to financing Social Security and Medicare when the baby boomers retire.

Reducing the federal debt today—injecting more savings into the private economy—helps businesses buy more up-to-date equipment and take advantage of technological advances.

That makes workers more productive and raises their real incomes. As a result, they'll be able to cover more of the cost of supporting the older generation.

What's more, by working down the debt, the nation will have more room to borrow the money back, in the years when the boomers are straining the federal budget the most.

So we're choosing between using up this money now (in big tax cuts, higher spending and higher personal consumption) or investing it for the future. To me, that's a no-brainer. Invest, by paying down the debt.

NECHES RIVER SALTWATER BARRIER

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the groundbreaking of a very important project based in Southeast Texas, the Neches River Saltwater Barrier. This barrier is critically important in protecting over 150 billion gallons of water per year from saltwater contamination.

Saltwater threatens the freshwater intakes of lower Neches cities, industries and farms by moving upstream from the Gulf of Mexico through the deepwater channel to Beaumont. If downstream flows are insufficient, saltwater moves upriver and the lower Neches Valley Authority (LNVA) must take measures to protect the intakes.

As part of the Greater Houston area, the lower Neches River and Neches-Trinity Coastal Basins are characterized by moderately dense populations; a heavy petroleum and petrochemical industry; a hub of highway, rail and deep-water transportation facilities; and a major rice-producing agricultural industry. The well-being and prosperity of all of these interests are dependent on an abundant supply of freshwater.

Mr. Speaker, the Neches River Permanent Saltwater Barrier Project has become a reality. The Project, authorized by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, provides benefits for salinity control, water supply, navigation, fish and wildlife enhancement, and recreation. The Lower Neches Valley Authority has worked hand in hand with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District, bringing the project to fruition, and I commend them both.

The waters of the Neces River are used extensively for municipal, industrial and irrigation purposes and other water supply needs. These uses require an adequate supply of high quality water. During periods of low river flow, the saltwater travels up the river and if allowed to enter water intake structures, can cause damage to crops or contaminate water meant for consumption by humans or livestock. Traditionally, during these periods of low river flow, water has been released upstream from Sam Rayburn to "flush" the saltwater entering LNVA and City of Beaumont freshwater intakes.

The new barrier will permanently replace the temporary structures and be operated such that the gates will be open 99% of the time and closed only on those occasions when the saltwater wedge makes its way up the Neches River to the project vicinity.

At this time, I'd like to commend LNVA and the Corps. The Lower Neches Valley Authority has been an unusually committed, responsible, and cooperative local sponsor. They have worked tirelessly with the Corps of Engineers and Congress over the last several years towards completion of the saltwater barrier project and are deserving of much praise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM TURNER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 and October 19, 2000, I was not able to vote on roll call votes No. 531–540. Had I been present, on roll call No. 531, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 532, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 533, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 534, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 535, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 536, I would have voted "yea." On roll No. 537, I would have voted "no." On roll No. 538, I would have voted "no." On roll No. 539, I would have voted "no." On roll No. 540, I would have voted "yea."

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO ILLINOIS REPRESENTATIVE SIDNEY RICHARD YATES

HON. DAVID MINGE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, serving a region as ethnically diverse as Illinois' Ninth Congressional District is no easy task, but it is one Representative Sidney Yates attacked with vigor, insight and dedication for close to 50

years. As an advocate for both the National Endowment for the Arts and the environment, I am particularly appreciative of Representative Yates for his work in those areas.

His part in the creation of national parks and protection of waterways were testaments to his leadership as Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee. Closer to home, Sidney worked continually to preserve the beauty of Chicago's lakeshore. He also worked, relentlessly, to preserve the NEA budget, an allocation which seems constantly under assault. I am grateful to him for his work and leadership to protect funding for the arts. His tireless efforts will not soon be forgotten.

Sidney Yates was an esteemed political leader, respected by both Democrats and Republicans. At the time of his retirement, colleagues from both parties stood up to acknowledge his mastery of government and public service. Representative Yates will remain favorable in the memories of those who knew him, and especially with those of us in Congress who wish to serve with the same depth and commitment he exemplified throughout his tenure.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MALCOLM M. ELLISON

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Dr. Malcolm M. Ellison of New London, Connecticut. Dr. Ellisson was a legend among surgeons who touched the lives of thousands of people from patients to nurses to doctors throughout his life.

Dr. Ellison served as the chief of surgery at Lawrence & Memorial Hospital in New London. His career spanned 45 years at the hospital. A patient's ability to pay was never an issue for Dr. Ellison. He believed that his patients "came first, last and always," regardless of their financial status.

Dr. Ellison graduated from Hamilton College and the University of Rochester. He then went on to do his internship and residency at Yale New Haven Hospital.

People who knew Dr. Ellison have praised him for his skill, compassion, and commitment to excellence. Doctors at Lawrence & Memorial Hospital referred to him as Mr. Wonderful. Everyone who visited the hospital believed that the entire community was privileged to have Dr. Ellison.

In addition, Dr. Ellison worked tirelessly for the betterment of the hospital, serving as a corporator, manager and trustee. He also served as a member of the hospital's development and long term planning committees.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the entire New London community in mourning the passing of a tremendous human being, Dr. Malcolm M. Ellison.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SIDNEY RICHARD YATES

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the honorable Sidney Richard Yates was a dedicated public servant with whom I was privileged to serve in the United States House of Representatives for 10 years.

When I came to Congress in 1989 he had already served his beloved Ninth Congressional District of Illinois for 38 years. He knew the House inside and out and had been a subcommittee chairman for many years. He bore the "distinguished gentleman from Illinois" title with dignity and grace and knew the art of compromise.

My most outstanding memory of working with Mr. Yates was when he and I debated funding for the National Endowment for the Arts on the floor of the House. Of course, we were looking at the issue from two different perspectives but there's no question that I was dealing with an experienced debater and legislator. I enjoyed the opportunity.

HONORING BOB AND JANET HENKE

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to recognize two of my constituents Bob and Janet Henke of Whittier recipients of "Whittier 2000 Good Scout of the Year Awards" for over eighty years of combined service to our community.

Bob Henke was born in Peking to parents who had dedicated their lives as medical missionaries. The family stayed in China until the Communist Revolution. Upon returning to the United States, Bob found a similar people-oriented calling as an educator.

Bob met his future wife Janet at Oberlin College in Ohio, the first co-educational college in the country and married her in 1952. Moving to Whittier in 1955, Bob worked as a teacher for the Montebello Unified School District from 1955 until 1991 and with his wife raised five children. In 1980 he was named Montebello High School's favorite teacher.

Janet Henke, also an educator, has always found time for her community. She served sixteen years on the Whittier City School Board retiring in 1989. Three years later in 1992 she successfully ran for a vacant seat on the Whittier City Council. Janet served on the City Council until this year, including a term as Mayor of the City of Whittier from 1996 to 1997.

Bob and Janet Henke are now both retired and enjoying the rewards of a lifetime of hard work and service. They now spend much of their time with their seven grandchildren and are in the process of writing their memoirs. Janet says "I have written 120 pages and I'm not even ten years old yet."

Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to join me and the Whittier Boy Scouts in honoring Bob and Janet Henke for their numerous accomplishments and civic pride. They are true public servants and the best of America.

HONORING THE HONORABLE SID YATES

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, It was with great sadness that we learned of the passing of our friend and colleague Sid Yates on October 5, 2000. I remember when I first met Sid when I was first elected to Congress in 1987. Sid was very helpful in my transition as a new member. He had a deep respect for the traditions of the House of Representatives and impressed upon all of us what a privilege it was to serve in the "People's House."

There was no greater fighter for the causes that he believed in than Sid Yates. He was the strongest supporter of the arts; he was always there in support of Israel; and he was a constant defender of our constitutional rights. Sid Yates was my mentor. I have the privilege to serve in an office of public trust. Each day I am confronted by many challenges. I know that I am better prepared to meet these challenges because of Sid.

Congress and the nation lost a patriot and a good person on the passing of Sid Yates. He will be missed by us all.

ON THE CANCER AWARENESS WORKING GROUP'S HEARING ON CHILDHOOD CANCER

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report on an important event that took place on Capitol Hill last month. September was Childhood Cancer Month and during this time the Cancer Awareness Working Group held a hearing on the subject. On September 15, 2000, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. CAPPS and I gathered to listen to medical experts, afflicted children, parents, survivors and advocates from all over the country, share with the working group their stories, their knowledge, and their ideas on how best to fight this terrible disease.

It was truly a privilege to have so many wonderful individuals here in Washington to speak on this most important of subjects. An estimated 12,400 children and young people will be diagnosed with cancer this year and 2,300 children will die from the disease. It is the number one cause of death by disease in children under 15, and for the children and families who experience the tragedy of affliction there can be no greater harm. Leukemia, chemotherapy, lymphoma, neuroblastoma—these are terms a small child should not have to pronounce. Yet the incidence of cancer among children has been rising steadily for the past 20 years and the resources devoted to research and treatment of pediatric cancers

remain relatively small. For these reasons, the efforts provided by these individuals to increase the awareness of this devastating disease, are not only appreciated, but also truly needed.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind, I would like to present to you the names of the individuals who gathered for this special event to provide testimony on their experiences with all aspects of childhood cancer. Unfortunately, I am unable to include in these remarks the full text of each individual's testimony. Instead, I have provided summarizations and excerpts from them. I would encourage all Members to review the full transcript from this important hearing that is available on my website at www.house.gov/pryce. In addition, a text copy of the transcript can be found in the collection at the Library of Congress.

Dr. Susan Weiner, Founder of the Children's Cause, Inc., Parent, Silver Spring, Maryland. Dr. Weiner spoke about her organization, the loss of her son to pediatric brain cancer, scientific advances in the field, the need for mandatory coverage of cancer trails, and the importance of childhood research for cancer drugs.

Dr. Michael LaQuaglia, M.D., Physician, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. Dr. LaQuaglia spoke about the long battle ahead in the fight against childhood cancer, the devastating course a family goes through from diagnosis through treatment, the need for increased funding for research and coverage for childhood catastrophic illness.

G. Denman Hammond, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California. Dr. Hammond spoke about the history of pediatric treatments, the formation of the support groups such as the National Childhood Cancer Foundation and Children's Oncology Group (C.O.G.), and the need for increased awareness.

Nai-Kong Cheung, M.D., Ph.D., Physician and Researcher, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. Dr. Cheung spoke about his first hand experience treating childhood cancer patients, the devastating effects the disease has on families and the process they go through, the cost barriers to treatments and the limited support available to help, the need for a bill of rights for individuals with serious illness, the need for increased funding for research and orphan drugs, and the need for more accurate data collection.

Mark A. Mozer, M.D., Pediatrician and Parent, Blue Springs, Missouri. Dr. Mozer spoke about his personal experience with his son Jacob's neuroblastoma, the need for more targeted funding for childhood cancer research, and the adversarial relationship between insurance companies and victims of pediatric cancer.

Robert Barton, Parent, Tehana, Texas. Mr. Barton spoke about his personal experience with his son Brady's osteosarcoma, and the need for increased funding for childhood cancer research.

Joan Bondareff, Parent, Alexandria, Virginia. Ms. Bondareff spoke about her personal experience with her daughter Lori's neuroblastoma, the need for increased awareness and funding for pediatric cancer, and she urged congressional support for H. Con. Res. 115, H. Res. 576, H.R. 2621 and S. 1091.

Beverly Circone, Founder and Director of Kids 'N Kamp, Columbus Ohio. Ms. Circone spoke eloquently about her experience running a summer camp for children with cancer and the need for private and public fundraising to support families.

Janet Hall, Parent, Dayton, Ohio. Mrs. Hall spoke about her personal experience with her son's cancer and the need for increased research in this area. Mrs. Hall is the spouse of Congressman Tony Hall.

Craig Lustig, Survivor, Washington, D.C. Mr. Lustig spoke of his personal experience as a pediatric brain tumor survivor, and the need to reduce barriers to clinical trials and for continued funding for research.

Andrea Martini, Parent, Everett, Washington. Ms. Martini spoke about her personal experience with her daughter Alexandria's AML, the significant costs involved in treatment, and the need for mandatory coverage of cancer trials.

Pat Tallungan, Parent and Administrator of an On-Line Support Group, Bloomingdale, Illinois. Ms. Tallungan spoke about her personal experience with her son Nick's neuroblastoma, her involvement with various childhood cancer foundations and organizations, and the need for expanded availability of cancer trials, better pain management, and increased funding for research.

Beth Westbrook, Parent and Fundraiser for Childhood Cancer, Children's Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Ms. Westbrook spoke about her personal experience with her

Gina Peca, Parent, Balston Lake, New York. Ms. Peca spoke about her personal experience with her daughter Katie's neuroblastoma, the limited number of treatment options and facilities for afflicted children, and the need for mandatory coverage of cancer trials.

Robyn Raphael, Parent and Founder of Keaton Raphael Memorial Fund, California. Ms. Raphael spoke about her personal experience with her son Keaton's neuroblastoma.

Tom Dunbar, Parent, Louisville, Kentucky. Mr. Dunbar spoke of his personal experience with his son's neuroblastoma, the need for increased federal funding for research, and the many difficulties surrounding clinical trials. He also addressed the shut down of a promising clinical trial at St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital that he felt was caused by overzealous and irresponsible reporting on the part of the Washington Post.

Duane Parker, Uncle, Louisville, Kentucky. Mr. Parker spoke about his personal experience with his nephew Evan's neuroblastoma and the need for increased funding.

Diane Moore, Parent and Founder of Houston's Hope Fund, Fairfax, Virginia. Ms. Moore presented a slide show containing pictures of children lost to pediatric cancer.

Cathy O'Connell, Parent, East Hampton, Massachusetts. Ms. O'Connell spoke of her personal experience with her daughter Asley's neuroblastoma, the financial devastation that often faces families with sick children, and the need for increased funding for research.

Judy Gelber, Parent, Miami Beach, Florida. Ms. Gelber spoke of her personal experience with her son Zach's lymphoma, her family's program for kids with cancer—Camp Fiesta, and the need for increased government oversight of the FDA and funding for research.

Nina Petrarca, Parent, Registered Pediatric Nurse, and Founder of Nonprofit Organization Samantha's Way, Exeter, Rhode Island. Ms. Petrarca spoke about her personal experience with her daughter Samantha's cancer known as mixed scleroma, the need for increased access to information in order to make informed decisions about treatment, the need for support groups within treatment centers and increased federal funding for research, and her organization Samantha's Way.

Meg Crossett, Parent, Centreville, Virgina. Ms. Crosett spoke of her personal experience with her daughter Rachel's neuroblastoma and the need for targeted funding for pediatric cancer research.

Jacob Shoval, Parent, Germantown, Maryland. Mr. Shovel spoke about his personal experience with his son Benjamin's neuroblastoma, the need for increased funding for research, and the significant barriers to receiving even covered care from insurance companies.

Nick Schiaffo, Parent, Richmond, Virginia. Mr. Schiaffo spoke of her personal experience with his son Danny's medulloblastoma and the need for more research in this area.

Rosalie Baumann, Parent, Merrick, New York. Ms. Baumann spoke about her personal experience with her son Gregory's brain cancer and the need for increased research and awareness in this area.

James F. Sexton, Parent and Founder of Neuroblastoma Children's Cancer Society, Hoffman Estates, Illinois. Mr. Sexton spoke of his personal experience with his son Michael's neuroblastoma, the need for increased funding in this area, his organization the Neuroblastoma Children's Cancer Society, and the devastating financial impact the disease has on families.

Kelly Salvadore, Parent, Maryland. Ms. Salvadore spoke about her personal experience with her son Mark's neuroblastoma, the adversarial relationship between victims and insurance companies, and the need for increased funding for pediatric cancer research.

Susan Roe, Parent, Henderson, Nevada. Ms. Roe spoke of her personal experience with her son Christopher's leukemia, the adversarial relationship between victims and insurance companies, and the need for a Patient's Bill of Rights.

Charmaine Coulter, Parent, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Ms. Coulter spoke about her personal experience with her daughter Alise's osteosarcoma and the need for increased awareness and funding in this area.

Lise Yasui, Parent, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Ms. Yasui spoke about her personal experience with her son Lucas's neuroblastoma and the need for increased funding and awareness in this area.

Bobby McQuinn, Survivor. Mr. McQuinn spoke on his personal battle with leukemia and the foundation his family started to support victims of pediatric cancer.

Paul Steinberg. Mr. Steinberg spoke on the need for increased funding for pediatric cancer and the role of the federal government.

Rebecca Howard, Parent. Ms. Howard offered written testimony on her personal experience with her daughter Elizabeth's lyposacrcoma, the adversarial relationship between victims and insurance companies.

Lisa Tignor, Parent. Ms. Tignor offered written testimony on her personal experience with leukemia, the disease that afflicted both her sons, Brian and Kevin. Her testimony also addressed the need for increased awareness, data collection, and funding for research as well as increased access to cancer trials.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS RETIREMENT RELIEF ACT

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing on behalf of the more than 41,000 federal law enforcement officers a bill to more fairly calculate the formula used for disability retirement. Federal law enforcement retirement is based on a terribly complex formula which is less than equitable to the brave officers who become disabled when they put their lives on the line. My bill amends the federal disability retirement laws to properly reflect their retirement contributions and their public service.

Our federal law enforcement officers, federal fire fighters, capitol police and their families are now often treated inequitably after suffering what amounts to a career ending disability. My bill will correct this situation.

In too many cases, an officer injured in the line of duty may not have met the minimum years of government service required for disability benefits and survivor annuity. Their annuity and survivor benefits would then be computed at a lower rate than normal for law enforcement officers. it would be computed at the lower general civil service rate, despite the fact that the law enforcement officer paid a higher rate into his retirement. My bill provides retirement benefits and survivor annuities on an equitable and fair basis.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this legislation so that we can help provide fair and equitable treatment to the men and women who so courageously serve our country.

IN HONOR OF THE MAKE A WISH FOUNDATION

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Make-A-Wish Foundation of Northeast, Central and Southern Ohio, an organization which succeeds in bringing hope to children who face the adversity of fatal illnesses.

The Foundation is a charity which grants the very special wishes of children, between the ages of 2½ and 18, who have been diagnosed with life-threatening illnesses. Any child that has been diagnosed appropriately by their doctor qualifies for the Make-A-Wish Foundation. Following this, a team of Make-A-Wish volunteers visits the child and family to determine his or her wish. The organizations then works in conjunction with local contacts and businesses to transform the child's wish from fantasy into reality.

The Make-A-Wish Foundation offers children an opportunity to see their dreams come true. It recognizes the vital importance of hope to all human life. It seeks to extend a helping hand to all children in need. The Foundation granted the individual wishes of nearly 200 children in the fiscal year 1998. Each wish is limited only by the child's imagination. The organization helps all children irrespective of their families' financial need or status. It covers all expenses associated with a wish, including airfare and accommodation. It provides a ray of light for children in dark times.

I would also like to commend the tireless dedication of Rose Serraglio to the work of the Make-A-Wish Foundation. In her capacity as chairwoman and organizer of the Foundation's Halloween Benefit, she has demonstrated the highest order of caring for children whose world has been shattered by the traumatic effect of fatal illnesses.

My fellow colleagues, please rise with me in honoring the valuable contribution of the Make-A-Wish Foundation to the lives of children afflicted by the serious illnesses. It is an example to us all of the importance of helping the less fortunate members of our community.

INDEPENDENT FILMS AND TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, On behalf of Representatives MARK FOLEY, ROBERT MATSUI, and XAVIER BECERRA, I would like to express our continued interest in an issue designed to increase the production of independent films and television programming in the United States.

As the Members know, the 1990's have seen an accelerating departure of U.S. financed films and television programs to Canada, Mexico and other foreign countries. The trend has become so pronounced that a new phrase has been coined to describe the impact—"runaway productions." Next year, we intend address this issue, look for reasonable and responsible legislative remedies and work with our trading partners to reverse the trend of filmings outside the U.S. solely for economic reasons. These efforts are supported by a diverse group of entertainment trade associations and guilds and would be targeted at productions costing between $500,000 and $10 million.

The impact of runaway productions has been profound. Runaway production means fewer employment opportunities for individuals directly employed in the U.S. film and television industry. Runaway productions also significantly reduce the business opportunities for the film and television service industries like hotels, restaurants and catering businesses, post production services providing editing and music scoring, equipment rental and transport companies, electrical contractors and many others who service or supply the entertainment industry.

Moreover, these job losses are not limited to Hollywood or Southern California. Many states have seen once thriving film and television industries depart, leaving behind unemployed technicians and craftspersons, business losses and reduced local tax receipts. States like Illinois, Texas and Florida have been particularly hard hit, but even the state of Minnesota, for example, has just experienced its worst year in the past eleven for film and television production. In addition, the individuals whose jobs are lost usually are highly skilled workers who cannot replace their income with work in another sector.

Where are the jobs going? A surprising number are going to Canada. According to Statistics Canada, for example, independent film and television and video production was up 16 percent in 1997–98, the most recent year for which Canadian statistics are available. In British Columbia, alone, film and television production has increased five-fold since the late 1980s to over $700 million annually. Moreover, full-time Canadian employment in the film and television industry increased by 63 percent from the 1992–93 to 1997–98. The rising trend in Canadian film and television production exacerbates the runaway production problem because Canadian film and television crews and actors obtain the training necessary to accommodate even more productions.

More U.S. film and television production in Canada and elsewhere in the world means less production in the U.S. The U.S. production share of Movies of the Week broadcast on U.S. television declined from 62 to 41 percent between 1994–95 and 1999–2000 representing a loss of $727 million in U.S. production expenditures. Estimates of overall job loss in the U.S. film and television industry run as high as 23,500 in 1998 alone. To select just one of many examples that demonstrate the impact of this disturbing trend on employment, aggregate wages for musicians performing on film scores in 1999 declined by more than 30 percent from the previous year.

Runaway production is due, in large part, to the concerted efforts of governments to attract U.S. film production. Canada has been particularly successful in this regard. For example, the combination of federal and provincial tax credits in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario exceed 30 percent of wages paid in connection with a production. The sheer size of these credits has increasingly attracted productions to Canada that might otherwise have stayed in the U.S.

We look forward to working with our colleagues next year in an effort to keep independent U.S. film and television production here at home in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SIDNEY R. YATES

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I will never forget Sid Yates—ever. He loved the story of the Adams family. I could recite passages from the Adams Chronicles. He represented the finest this country has to offer.

Politics is not just serving. It's serving well and with high integrity. That was Sid Yates.

P.S.—He was lots of fun to be with!

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1614, CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on aspects of this bill that the Members of the Commerce Committee worked hard on this past year. Just last month, we marked up in full committee, HR 5291, the Medicare, Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Program Beneficiary and Improvement Protection Act of 2000.

I would like to mention several of the provisions in the Commerce package voice voted out of the Commerce Committee, that were included in the legislation we are voting on her today. I am hopeful that the President will support this package, which includes many bipartisan provisions.

We all know that one of the most pressing issues facing American senior citizens and persons with disabilities today is the need for coverage of prescription drugs under Medicare. While we continue to work to reach consensus on a Medicare prescription drug benefit, I want to thank Members from both sides of the aisle who supported a provision that would restore and preserve Medicare coverage for certain injectable drugs and biologicals that are crucial to seniors and persons with debilitating chronic illnesses. This legislation ensures that the sickest of our Medicare beneficiaries who suffer from life threatening illnesses such as cancer and multiple sclerosis, will receive life saving therapies by providing coverage for certain injectable medications.

In addition, we build on last year's step towards providing coverage of immunosuppressive drugs by eliminating the arbitrary 36 moths cap currently in place.

We build upon Medicare's colonoscopy benefit by allowing average risk beneficiaries the option of a colon cancer screening every ten years. This policy comports with American Cancer Society guidelines, and will ensure that average risk beneficiaries have another tool at their disposal to detect colon cancer.

We provide relief for Medicaid disproportionate share hospitals. These hospitals provide uncompensated care to the poorest in our Nation. We should recognize the value of those services. I want to thank Ed Whitfield and Brian Bilbray from the Commerce Committee for their tireless effort on this piece of the legislation.

This bill does not just help the seniors and disabled in our country, but also our most vital resource: our children. I want to talk about the changes we made to SCHIP. We created the program in the BBA 97. As a result of this provision, over two and half million children have health insurance today who might not otherwise have it.

Unfortunately, more than half the states have been unable to spend the 1998 dollars we thought they would. This concerns me.

One of the reasons states have not been able to spend their money is because we restricted the way in which money could be used for outreach. We said you get money for outreach, once you start enrolling children. Many states told us they could not enroll the children unless they had the money to do outreach first.

This legislation gives states money up front for outreach and allows them more time to spend their money. At the same time, those states that have spent all of their money will be given additional sums in recognition of their early and successful implementation of their SCHIP programs.

I also want to talk about Medicare+Choice. Yes, we do provide relief for health plans participating in the Medicare+Choice program. Seniors have asked us for choice in selecting their Medicare coverage. Seniors across he country should have choice, not just those in large metropolitan areas. Our Medicare+Choice provisions are targeted at rural areas to allow seniors in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the same choices as seniors in New York City enjoy.

I also want to highlight the adoption tax credit provisions in this bill. My wife and I are adoptive parents. At the beginning of the 106th Congress, I sponsored the Hope for Children Act (H.R. 531) in order to allow more families and children to experience the happiness my family has been blessed with over the years. The Hope for Children Act enjoyed the co-sponsorship of 280 of our colleagues. I am gratified my bill enjoyed broad, bipartisan appeal and am very proud that major provisions of the Hope for Children Act are in this bill.

The adoption tax credit provisions increase the non-special needs tax credit to $6,000 in 2001, $7,000 in 2002, $8,000 in 2003, $9,000 in 2004, and $10,000 in 2005. The tax credit for special needs is increased to $8,000 in 2001, $10,000 in 2002, and $12,000 in 2003 and years thereafter. Also, the income eligibility for the tax credit is doubled from present law. For all taxable years after December 31, 2000, this bill provides a full credit for all adjusted gross incomes under $150,000 and the credit is gradually phased out for incomes between $150,000–$190,000.

This legislation strengthens the American family by making adoption more affordable. Adoption is expensive and every penny spent helping these adopting families now will be returned tenfold in the future contributions of the children who ultimately benefit from the tax credit. These families are willing to put themselves on the line to give a child a chance for a real future.

Passage of this bill will unquestionably make a tremendous impact in the lives of adopting families, the least of which is to encourage those who are intimidated by the cost of adoption to move forward in opening their hearts and homes to a child in need of a loving home. We will make a meaningful difference in the lives of thousands of children upon passage of this bill.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN RON PACKARD UPON HIS RETIREMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and colleague from California, Ron Packard. After 18 years of service and dedication to his constituents and his country, Ron is retiring. While I join my colleagues in wishing him all the best as he dedicates himself to some well deserved time with his family, I also know that the House is losing a valued and trusted Member.

Ron Packard's career has been marked by fairness and bipartisanship. In his various roles on the Appropriations Committee, Ron has always gotten the job done. That's not always an easy task when it comes to funding the government, but Ron has done it with integrity, dignity, and purpose.

Ron's career has been marked with distinction since the beginning. Even the method of his election was notable. Ron is one of only four Members of Congress ever to have won their first election as a write-in candidate , but that's not surprising. He had experience as a businessman, a school board member, a city councilman, and mayor. He knew then what he knows now citizens' needs are best met on the state and local level by people who understand them rather than by Washington bureaucrats.

This is the legacy Ron Packard will leave behind. It is characterized by hard work, honesty, bipartisanship, leadership, patriotism, and strength. It will serve as an example for future legislators as they do the people's business. I join my colleagues in wishing Ron a fond farewell and a happy retirement.

IN HONOR OF MUNAWAR HUSSAIN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Munawar Hussain, a neighbor, an entrepreneur and a friend, who serves as a fine example of what a little ambition and hardwork can bring. This remarkable man gives us all hope that the American dream is still alive and well.

Mr. Hussain's story begins in 1955 in Lalamusa, Pakistan where he was born and raised. After spending most of his young life in Pakistan, Hussain realized that he wanted more for himself. At the age of 26, Hussain made the decision to come to America. Bravely, with only one dollar in his pocket, he made the long trip to the U.S. alone, without the comfort of family and friends. All he carried with him were the hopes and dreams of capturing some of the opportunity and prosperity that he knew existed in the United States.

Hussain originally settled down in New York City, where he remained for 15 years. However, the expense of living in New York

proved to be a heavy burden on Hussain. He worked as a mechanic, a taxi driver, and a limousine driver just to make ends meet. In 1996, Hussain and his brother, who had joined him in America in 1991, decided to move to Cleveland, Ohio. Together they agreed that a life in Cleveland held more promise for them than struggling to survive in the Big Apple. Shortly after arriving in Cleveland, Hussain made a choice that would permanently change his life for the better. With little money saved, Hussain used credit cards to purchase a 7-Eleven franchise. For four years, he worked diligently to save enough capital to buy the 7-Eleven store and bring it under his private ownership. Just last week, his goal became a reality, when the sale of the 7-Eleven became final. Hussain and his brother now independently own and operate the store, which Hussain has renamed ''Zishan Food Store'' after his son.

Today, Hussain still lives in Cleveland along with his wife of 15 years and their four children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me today in honoring Mr. Munawar Hussain. This kind, hard-working man should be commended for his dedication and drive to succeed. He truly serves as an inspiration to us all.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000. It has taken a lot of hard work and a long time to reach this point. In fact, the last time this bill was authorized was in 1992.

First, I would like to take a moment and thank several of my colleagues who have worked many, many hours to reach a bipartisan agreement and to bring this bill to the Floor.

Since February of last year, Ranking Member Clay, Subcommittee Chairman MCKEON, Congressman MARTINEZ and Congressman BILL BARRETT have been hard at work crafting a bipartisan proposal, which provides for the needs of older Americans and which makes several overdue changes in the Older Americans Act.

The fruits of their labor were rewarded earlier this month, when we reached a bipartisan ''pre-conference agreement'' with our colleagues in the other body.

It is this bipartisan House and Senate agreement that we will be voting on today.

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000 modernizes the Older Americans Act by streamlining services and ensuring flexibility at the local level. This program provides for better and faster delivery of services to seniors most in need.

Specifically, this legislation protects key programs like disease prevention, the state long-term ombudsman program, elder abuse prevention, ''Meals on Wheels'', and legal assistance, and consolidates others.

For example, two existing programs are consolidated into a new Family Caregiver program which assists families who care for frail loved ones. This program will help frail older Americans remain in their own homes. It provides information, counseling, supportive services, and respite care to family members faced with the often daunting challenge of caring for their older family members on a daily basis.

As for nutrition services, we have increased the transfer authority between the in-home meals program and the congregate program from 30 percent to 40 percent, with a waiver provision that would permit the transfer of an additional 10 percent. This provision will provide states and local providers the ability to move funds around to better serve the nutritional needs of participating seniors.

We have also added language to ensure that the meals served under this Act are appealing to senior participants and take into account their unique dietary needs. We have encouraged states to ensure meals do not spend an inordinate amount of time in transit before they have been served.

Another major change involves the additional funds provided to states by the Department of Agriculture to supplement payments under Title III of the Older Americans Act. At the present time, states often do not know the amount of funding they will receive from USDA until the end of the year. This legislation modifies the formula for distributing USDA funds so that payments are made using prior year's data. This will speed the delivery of funds to states and improve their ability to provide important nutritional assistance to seniors.

As many here know, Title III is the very heart of the Older Americans Act and provides grants to states and area agencies on aging for a variety of programs benefiting the elderly—everything from ''Meals on Wheels'', to disease prevention, to senior centers.

I am pleased to report that our bill ensures that no state will receive less than it received under the Title III funding formula in FY 2000. And, every state is guaranteed a certain percentage of any new money that is appropriated above the FY 2000 level. This means that states with large senior populations will begin to receive their fair share of future Title III funding.

This legislation also ensures that Older Americans Act funds are more equitably distributed between urban and rural areas. Not only must particular attention be paid to low-income minority individuals, it also must be paid to older individuals residing in rural areas.

Specifically, this bill requires that the state plan shall provide assurances that the special needs of older individuals residing in rural areas will be taken into consideration and shall describe how those needs have been met and how funds have been allocated to meet those needs.

Finally, our bill reforms the Senior Community Service Employment Program (Title V) by instituting much-needed performance standards. And, when I say these standards are needed, I mean they are needed.

This business of Washington-based organizations receiving Title V funds year in and year out without even a small amount of accountability is over once this bill is signed into law.

For far too long ten national organizations have been receiving 78 percent of Title V funding with no questions asked because appropriations language has consistently superseded the authority statute.

This means that only a mere 22 percent goes to state agencies. It also means that states have very little authority to direct national organizations to serve seniors in certain parts of their states. In fact, states are often left to fill in the gaps with very few resources.

Our legislation begins to address this problem by ensuring that states will receive the bulk of any new money that is appropriated above what is needed to match the national organizations' and state agencies' FY 2000 ''level of effort.''

Specifically, the first $35 million in funds above the FY 2000 ''level of effort'' will be allocated 75 percent to the state agencies and 25 percent to the national organizations. New funding above the first $35 million will be allocated 50% to state agencies and 50 percent to national organizations.

The bill also requires national organizations and states to work together to ensure the equitable distribution of employment positions within the state.

More importantly, and for the first time ever, we require all Title V grantees to meet strict performance standards. And before a grant applicant may be selected, the Secretary of Labor must conduct a records review to assess the applicant's qualifications for administering federal funds.

Specifically, the bill requires that the performance of all Title V grantees will be evaluated annually on a national basis and state basis. Performance of both types of grantees, national organizations and state agencies, will be judged regardless of whether the grantees operate the program directly, or through contracts or agreements with other agencies. And, grantees must agree to an evaluation of their performance as a condition of the grant.

When reviewing the applicant's overall responsibility to administer federal funds, the Secretary of Labor is also authorized to consider any information, including the organization's history in the management of other grants.

Our hope is that this will cut down on the number of troubling audit reports that have been piling up at the Department of Labor's Inspector General's Office. The quicker we can get the bad actors out of this program, the better off all the participants will be.

Let me just say that as a young-older American myself, if doesn't take much imagination to see a need for the programs of the Older Americans Act.

For millions of older Americans something as simple as a home delivered meal, a place to socialize, or a helping hand around the house, can make all the difference in the world to he enjoyment of life in one's later years. Our legislation represents one small step in making this a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support the millions of older Americans that have contributed so much to our country and its greatness. Vote ''yes'' for America's seniors by voting ''yes'' on

the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2614, CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill before us today is a mix of modest, but important policy changes, some unfortunate new directions in tax policy, and what can best be termed ''housekeeping'' items.

There is, however, one especially important provision in this bill, which is the Extraterritorial Income Exclusion, or EIE, also known as the Foreign Sales Corporation replacement. This provision, necessitated by actions taken by the European Union before the World Trade Organization, is essential to preserving the ability to compete effectively of U.S. companies and U.S. workers.

If we are to succeed and thrive in international commerce, we must not impose punitive taxes on our own competitors. Absent the EIE, our tax code would do just that.

We must be clear about this, however. While we believe our new system will be found to be WTO compliant, there are no assurances. And we will not know for some months.

I want to assure both our friends of the European Union, and our companies that are looking to the Congress to resolve this satisfactorily, that if our new system is found wanting, then the next Congress and the next Administration will work quickly to find another.

If the EIE regime is found wanting, there may be no alternative but to adopt a fully territorial tax regime. That means, in short, a U.S. tax system that only collects tax on income earned in the U.S. I, for one, would welcome this, as should all U.S. companies and their workers, because this would cause a dramatic improvement in their ability to compete internationally. It would be ironic, indeed, if the net result of the Europeans' complaint is to leave U.S. companies stronger internationally than they were before.

For now, however, I hope the Congress passes this bill, with its FSC replacement. I hope the President signs it. And I hope the WTO finds the new system satisfactory, so we can provide some certainty to our companies as to the tax law. We can then consider at a later date whether, when, or how to enact a territorial system.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 2000

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before you today in support of S. 2413, the Bulletproof Vest Reauthorization Act of 2000. This very effective, bipartisan legislation, introduced by Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, passed the Senate by unanimous consent and is identical to H.R. 4033, legislation which I sponsored.

As Members will recall, this chamber passed H.R. 4033, the House Bulletproof Vest Reauthorization bill, back in July of this year by an overwhelming majority vote of 413–3. At that time, I gave a more lengthy statement on the issue of bulletproof vests. Due to time constraints, I will abbreviate my remarks today.

As I have said before, I firmly believe that when a police officer is issued a badge and a gun, they should also be issued a bulletproof vest. When police officers put their lives on the line everyday protecting our neighborhoods—they deserve the highest level of protection and security, which only a bulletproof vest can provide.

I introduced the original Bulletproof Vest Authorization bill in the 105th Congress, which was signed into law by the President. This very successful and popular program authorized $25 million each year through Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 to assist law enforcement officers in purchasing body armor. The program proved to be more popular than initially expected, and we soon found out that $25 million each year was not adequate to fulfill the goal of providing every law enforcement officer with body armor.

The bill before us today makes three major improvements to the existing Bulletproof Vest Program. First, the authorization will be doubled from $25 to $50 million each year through Fiscal Year 2004. Extending the authorization is critical in enabling officers across the nation to participate in the Bulletproof Vest Program, which has been proven to save lives. Second, language was included in the bill which guarantees smaller jurisdictions a fair portion of federal funding. Finally, this legislation improves the stab-proof standard for corrections officers who depend on these vests to protect them while on the job.

The stab-proof issue is especially important to me and my District. A constituent of mine, Corrections Officer Fred Baker was stabbed to death while on duty at the Bayside State Prison. Officer Baker was not wearing a vest at the time. We can only speculate as to whether his life would have been spared had he been given an opportunity to wear a vest, but many of us believe that had he been given that opportunity, Officer Baker would be alive today and his wife and child would still have a husband and father to come home to. If Officer Baker had the chance to wear a vest, I am sure that he would not have hesitated to put that vest on.

The legislation before us today will help ensure law enforcement offices receive federal assistance in purchasing body armor. It is critical that Members again vote in favor of this legislation.

CONCERNING VIOLENCE IN MIDDLE EAST

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my vote today on H. Con. Res. 426 is not a vote ''against'' anything. It is a vote ''for'' peace. I am convinced that a peaceful settlement of the longstanding differences between Israel and the Palestinian people can only be achieved through continuing the current dialogue between the parties. I also believe that the United States can play an important—and irreplaceable—role as an honest broker of peace.

Israel has been a good friend and ally to the U.S. and I support continuation of that special relationship and our long-standing commitment to her freedom and security.

However, I am also steadfast in my support of the United States' commitment to be an honest broker of peace in the Middle East.

It is because of this position that I am so uncomfortable with the tone of this resolution. While it is understandable that the House may wish to express grave concerns about the violence currently taking place in the region, those concerns must be expressed in a way that does not cause either party to doubt the United States' neutrality in the negotiations nor its commitment to achieving outcomes acceptable to both parties. This resolution does not do so.

I am equally concerned about the House's persistent efforts to intrude into the peace process from a distance. Diplomacy is a delicate endeavor. For House Members to appear to take sides would seem to undermine—rather than further—our hopes for peace. A resolution such as this seems much too blunt an instrument to deliver the outcome we all profess to desire.

ERIE CANALWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, Congressman JAMES WALSH and Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, directed the National Parks Service to study the merits of the Erie Canal System's federal designation. In 1998, the study concluded that the system did in fact have great historical significance and recommended the canal for National Heritage Corridor status. Legislation was thus drafted and presented on the House floor on October 3, 2000. I support H.R. 5375 because I too, feel that the Erie Canal represents a key component of not only New York State's history, but the history of the United States, as well.

The Erie Canal was originally built to provide a waterway that would link the Great Lakes with the eastern seaboard. Completed in 1825, the canal was the first of its kind and proved to be the working model used in future canal construction throughout the United States. This manmade waterway helped to transform the economy of the Northeast and Midwest states along the Great Lakes. The construction of the canalway helped to accelerate shipping and trade in these areas, which in turn helped to establish flourishing metropolitan areas such as New York City, Albany, Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo, not to mention the development and growth witnessed in Mid-western shipping centers, such as Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago.

Recently the residents of Buffalo and Western New York have realized that our city can once again generate economic investment from its position as the western terminus of the Erie Canal. The Erie Canal as the centerpiece of the City's Inner Harbor development. A major focus of the Inner Harbor project is to once again center the region's transportation system at Buffalo's waterfront. I have worked to bring over $35 million in federal dollars to the Inner Harbor to fund transportation related infrastructure improvements. The designation of the Erie Canal is a National Heritage Corridor would further enhance the attraction of the Inner Harbor site both locally and nationally.

The significant National Heritage Corridor designation would allow Congress to provide federal resources and technical assistance for canalside communities from Buffalo to Albany to establish projects involving interpretive centers, historic preservation and economic development.

This is the perfect time to approve this legislation. The year 2000 marks the 175th Anniversary of New York State's creation and stewardship of the Erie Canalway for commerce, transportation, and recreational purposes, establishing the network which made New York the ''Empire State'' and the nation's premier commercial and financial center.

HONORING WILSON MICHAEL SCOTT UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of October the House of Representatives will lose a loyal, long time employee to a much deserved retirement. Wilson Michael Scott, known as Mike, will be retiring after more than thirty years of working at the House Recording Studio. Mike's career with the House started in November of 1969 as a radio production technician. Mike was here when the House began televising its proceedings in March of 1979 and played an integral role in the launch of that project. Mike retires as the Technical Director of the House Recording Studio. His technical knowledge and expertise will be greatly missed by this institution.

Although Mike is one of the many staffers who work behind the scenes to ensure the smooth operations of the House, many may recognize him as the gentleman receiving extra portions of barbecued ribs and greens every Thursday in the Capitol Carry Out.

Mike has a colorful sense of humor which has helped keep his co-workers alert during late night sessions. Upon his departure, he will leave many fond and wonderful memories with those who had the honor to work with him during his career.

Mike will return to his farm in Marion, Virginia to spend more time with his wife, Carol, daughters, Barit and Tracey, and his 1952 Ford tractor.

We would like to take this opportunity to wish Mike Scott godspeed and much happiness for many years in his well-earned retirement.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of S. 1438. As a cosponsor of H.R. 2710, the National Law Enforcement Museum Act, the House companion bill to S. 1438, I am extremely pleased that House of Representatives is considering S. 1438, legislation which authorizes the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to construct a National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia.

Fittingly, this Museum will be built directly across the street from the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. Dedicated in 1991, the three-acre park is highlighted by the names of more than 15,000 federal, state and local law enforcement officers who have courageously and selflessly sacrificed their lives in the line of duty. They paid the ultimate price to protect us and enforce the laws which bind our society together.

I am glad that we are taking a step closer today to preserving the history of all of America's law enforcement officers' heroic service and sacrifice for future generations.

HONORING SERGEANT FRANKLIN A. BIVIGHOUSE

HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Franklin A. Bivighouse, who is retiring after 25 years from the Telford Borough Police Department in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

Franklin Bivighouse began his law enforcement career in 1971 with the Franconia Township Police Department and continued his service with Lower Salford Township Police Department until 1975. He was hired by the Telford Borough Police Department on July 21, 1975 and served Telford into the 21st Century.

During his tenure with the Telford Borough Police Department, Sergeant Bivighouse received many accolades for his outstanding service. On December 24, 1976, he rescued a man who was trapped in a burning automobile and was honored by the Chapel of Four Chaplains as well as local civic groups. He also received the Silver Star for Bravery from the American Federation of Police.

Sergeant Bivighouse has been an active within the Montgomery County community as a member of the Fraternal Order of Police, Montgomery County Lodge #14 and the Pennsylvania DUI Association. He also served as the Telford Borough Police Department Director.

It is an honor and privilege to recognize Franklin Bivighouse as he retires from the Telford Borough Police Department, and I congratulate him on 25 years of extraordinary service to the people of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, the recent change in government in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has been cited by some as a testament to the policy of the United States and NATO in ending the rule of Slobodan Milosevic. While I applaud the change, we must not forget the serious charges made by our government against Milosevic. Led by our country, NATO leveled charges against Milosevic as a war criminal, guilty of genocide and other atrocities, to justify military action and economic sanctions.

Milosevic must be brought to trial before an international court. The allegations of genocide are so serious they must be fully investigated, and if found to be true, he must be brought to justice. When this body passed the FY 01 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, we deliberately included language to make U.S. assistance to Serbia contingent on certification the Yugoslav government is cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia including access for investigators, the provision of documents and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension.

Clearly, our intent is to see alleged war criminals prosecuted. Our willingness to provide assistance to the Republic of Serbia is based on that threshold, and should serve as a strong barometer for the new government of President Vojislav Kostunica. The true test of Kostunica's cooperation and reentry into the community of nations will be whether he fully cooperates.

I call upon the Congressional leadership and the Administration to urge that in our discussions with President Kostunica, we insist on the surrender of Milosevic for trial before an international body. Any action less than this

will suggest our initial charges were without merit. If that is the case, those who made them should be asked to account for their statements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was in New York, and unable to be present for the following votes, had I been present I would have voted as follows:

October 24: rollcall No. 541, "no"; rollcall No. 542 "yes"; rollcall No. 543, "no".

October 25: rollcall No. 544, "yes"; rollcall No. 545, "no"; rollcall No. 546, "yes"; rollcall No. 547, "yes"; rollcall No. 548, "yes"; rollcall No. 549, "yes"; rollcall No. 550, "yes"; rollcall No. 551, "no"; rollcall No. 552, "yes".

October 26: rollcall No. 553, "no"; rollcall No. 554, "yes"; rollcall No. 555, "no"; rollcall No. 556, "no".

THE HERITAGE OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the industrial and cultural coal-mining heritage of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

This Congress recently passed legislation to create the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area in Lackawanna, Luzerne, Susquehanna and Wayne counties in Pennsylvania, and the President signed it into law on October 6. Together with the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor and the Schuylkill National Heritage Corridor, this designation honors the coal-mining heritage of the people of the region and their contribution to powering the industrial Revolution and helping the United States win two world wars.

For the benefit of other members of the House of Representatives who may not be familiar with this rich heritage and its legacy, I would now like to read into the RECORD a short statement composed by a friend of mine, Mr. Richard Morgan of Shamokin, Pennsylvania.

Northeastern Pennsylvania has been well blessed with quality people. Thousands of immigrants came to our section of Pennsylvania from the world over.

Our neighbors became blended together as one. We came to share our lives in a manner that was beyond the belief of outsiders, who had never experienced the unique joy we found in each other. The rich cultural fabric that resulted is second to none.

The severe economic conditions that have been present for generations in the hard coal regions, have caused most of our sons and daughters to spread themselves, their talents, and their deeply ingrained coal cracker lifestyles far and wide across America.

Other communities throughout America have benefited by our loss. Our young people were the greatest gifts we had to give our country, even greater than the Anthracite natural resource that was stripped from our region to provide fuel and energy for the Industrial Revolution.

We who remain in the region, are proud of the achievements of those who have left us for greener fields, green fields that are no longer to be found in the old hometowns, and around the half-doubles they reluctantly left behind, but which they have never forgotten.

The sound moral values that they learned from their immigrant families, will remain with them forever, wherever they may come to hang their hats.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of this Congress, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues not only the positive parts of the anthracite coal's legacy to Northeastern Pennsylvania, but also another part of the legacy that can still be seen today: the need for a comprehensive reclamation of the mine-scarred land.

The federal Office of Surface Mining has estimated that the restoration of all the land and water in the anthracite region would cost more than $2 billion, but until this year, the anthracite region has received only about $10 million annually from the federal government to restore abandoned mine lands. At that level of funding, we will have a critical environmental problem in place for two centuries.

Let us not forget that this is fundamentally an issue of fairness. Pennsylvania anthracite coal fueled the Industrial Revolution that made America the superpower it is today. Unfortunately, the physical scars left by the Industrial Revolution of the 19th and 20th Centuries have decreased our competitiveness in the Information Age of the 21th Century. As Mr. Morgan eloquently points out, this has had the effect of forcing many of our young people to look elsewhere for opportunities.

In the same way that the federal government has made a commitment to restoring the Everglades in Florida, a similar comprehensive approach is needed to restore the anthracite region in Pennsylvania.

Restoring the anthracite region is also consistent with the growing consensus that it is better to clean up and reuse formerly polluted "brownfields" for industrial development than to wipe out more of America's disappearing "greenfields," the untouched open spaces that are so important to our quality of life.

For these reasons, joined by Congressmen SHERWOOD, HOLDEN and GEKAS, my three colleagues from Pennsylvania who represent the anthracite region, I have sponsored the Anthracite Region Redevelopment Act (H.R. 4314), to create a new bond program that would provide $1.2 billion in 30-year tax-credit bonds to finance a comprehensive environmental cleanup of the region.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to hail from the hard-coal region of eastern Pennsylvania. As Mr. Morgan's statement illustrates well, in the richness of our cultural fabric, our work ethic and strong values, our love of country, in all these we are second to none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote #551. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

Additionally, I was not present during rollcall vote #552. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

THE GOVERNMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMISSION ACT

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, "We know from past experience how difficult it is to curb the momentum of expanding government activity and we know that this portends the continuation of levels of taxation higher than we all want to bear. We are trying to get this message across: we want to pause in this headlong rush toward even bigger government."—Wilbur Mills

The former statement made 32 years ago by my predecessor in the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman Wilbur Mills, continues to hold as much truth today as it ever did in 1969. Our federal surplus, and ensuing spending frenzy, have created an even greater urgency that we recognize the importance of a restrained and focused government.

Bloated federal agencies have increasingly taken more American taxpayer dollars and spent those dollars not wisely, but wastefully. Despite the good intentions of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, misuse of taxpayers' money climbs ahead at an alarming pace. The Results Act was intended to help Congress in its oversight obligations by requiring federal agencies to set goals and use performance measures for management and budgeting.

Now, even the budget process is careening out of control. The annual congressional budget resolution has all but been cast aside. Congress spends with abandon. Not only is the surplus at risk, the entire process is at risk. On the other side of the coin, waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal government has never been greater. Recently, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology found that $65 billion has been wasted by the federal agencies of the executive branch, not to mention $245 billion in overdue taxes owed to Washington. A recent IRS report showed an estimated $7.8 billion in Earned Income Tax Credit claims for 1997 were erroneously paid.

It is for that reason I am reintroducing a bill put forth by my able predecessor, Chairman Wilbur Mills, which seeks to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission. Such a Commission would be created on a bipartisan basis and composed of members from the private sector. The Commission

would study and evaluate existing federal programs and activities for the purpose of determining three objectives: (1) To evaluate the effectiveness of each program or activity, relative to its costs; (2) to determine whether the program or activity should continue and at what level; and (3) to assign a relative priority level for the purpose of allocating Federal funds.

The Results Act has not met expectations partly because its task of self-analysis has effectively kept its potential low. The Government Program Evaluation Commission is unique in that it would create a truly independent commission on the outside looking in. I am introducing this bill at this late stage to highlight my concern in hopes that Congress will readdress this urgent problem in the future. A government with the most brilliant laws cannot be successful if it mismanages those laws. Chairman Mills' vision of a limited but highly effective government is a legacy I would like to impress upon my fellow Members as this Congress wraps up its business.

SUPPORT FOR THE NEW SERBIA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a member and former Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have followed Yugoslavia's violent demise this past decade very closely, by traveling there, by meeting officials from there here in Washington, by participating in dozens of Commission hearings on various aspects of the conflict.

Throughout this period, it has been obvious that, whatever ethnic animosities might have existed beforehand, the horrific aggression against innocent populations and, yes, genocide, was instigated by Slobodan Milosevic, deliberately, in order to maintain and enhance his power in Serbia. As his nationalist agenda was belatedly but forcefully rejected by the international community under U.S. leadership, Milosevic increasingly resorted to repression at home, against the people of Serbia. There has been opposition to Milosevic for a long time, but only this month did the people, the political opposition and independent forces join together and say ''enough is enough.'' I congratulate those brave Serbs who stood up to a regime that has lied to them, cheated them and denied them their rights for over a decade.

The changes taking place in Serbia are, however, good not only for Serbs but for all people in the region. Other problems exist, but, with Milosevic out of the way, the stage is set for long-term stability an economic recovery in southeastern Europe. It is now possible to make the progress we all want so that our troops, doing critical work there, can come home with mission accomplished. Whatever we felt about the deployment in the first place, we should all be able to agree on that.

For this reason, I support the decision of the President to provide quick support to the new Yugoslav President, Vojislav Kostunica, and his colleagues. The Conference Report on Foreign Operations Appropriations for fiscal year 2001 similarly reflects the general consensus that assistance needs to be provided to Yugoslavia quickly in order to solidify the gains being made by the Democratic Opposition of Serbia. The country is in a state of transition, and there is no question about the need to send a positive message.

Such a message, however, does not preclude a cautionary message. I believe there is a need to place some conditionality on assistance. Cooperation with the Tribunal in The Hague prosecuting war crimes, ending the support for nationalists in neighboring Bosnia and promoting the rule of law and tolerance

I agree that we should be flexible, and the conference report reflects a good compromise on the application of conditions. That said, I would like to make the following points. First, the large amount now allocated for Serbia should not come at the expense of ongoing funding for Croatia, Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria and others in the region who have worked with the international community all along, undertook major burdens themselves and need this assistance. Second, the five month window which exists before the conditions are applied should not lead to throwing all of this money at Belgrade rapidly beforehand, because the conditions may not be met. I could see this happening next February, in the event that insufficient progress has been achieved by that time. Let's hope that progress will take place allowing for certification in accordance with this bill. Third, progress in the rule of law must include addressing the hundreds of ethnic Albanians currently in Serbian prisons and encouraging president Kostunica to continue to look for ways to resolve this issue.

In conclusion, I believe a case can be made that the reformists coming into power at this time may not be able to surrender Slobodan Milosevic to the International Criminal Tribunal in The Hague. Sooner or later, however, they will need to do so. To do otherwise would not only be an injustice to the literally millions of victims in the former Yugoslavia. It would send the absolutely wrong message to Croatia, Bosnia and Montenegro all of whom are cooperating with the Tribunal. It would delay the time by which the people of Serbia will have to reckon with the hideous atrocities committed in their name this past decade, a reckoning which will be absolutely necessary for Serbia to make significant progress in building a society in which the rule of law is respected and tolerance of others is embedded.

It is important when discussing these issues to recall that there are also indictees beyond Milosevic living in Serbia. Let us recall exactly what these people are alleged to have done. Three individuals living now in Serbia were directly responsible for pulling over 200 people out of a hospital in Vukovar, Croatia, after the city had been surrendered and guarantees of safety were made, beating them severely and then executing them en masse in a field in late 1991. Another individual, the well known Ratko Mladic, was at the scene when as many as 7,000 Bosnians were similarly executed after being taken from the so-called ''safe haven'' of Srebrenica in 1995. Even if one could find some way to justify the conflicts surrounding these incidents—which I personally cannot do, but maybe some can—these acts were nevertheless heinous crimes, and we cannot put accountability for them at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to read the indictments issued by the Tribunal, particularly the indictments of those responsible for the massacres in Vukovar and Srebrenica. They are available at <www.un.org/icty.indictment>. It is too easy to put the issue of the Tribunal to the side in light of foreign policy objectives, but, if you read what happened, I believe you will agree that justice must remain a pillar of our policy in the Balkans.

RETIREMENT OF HON. TILLIE FOWLER

SPEECH OF

HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 24, 2000

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to express my appreciation for Congresswoman TILLIE FOWLER.

She has served her country and her Florida constituents remarkably during her time in Congress.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, we have worked together on projects and programs of particular benefit to the Navy.

This is to be expected: Both of us represent Navy towns and naval personnel.

But TILLIE FOWLER's dedication to American servicemen and women in whatever branch of the military is exemplary.

She has labored long and hard to ensure that every branch of service received the equipment they needed, the training they required and quality of life for themselves and families.

I don't know what she will do in the future. I do know I hope she continues in some form of public service. And if it happens to be in a defense related area, I will look forward to the opportunity to continue helping build a better, more secure future for this great nation. Mrs. Sisisky and I wish TILLIE and her family our very, very best in the days ahead. We will miss her.

HONORING ANN FORKIN

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise before you to congratulate Ann Forkin on her retirement after 22 years of service at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Ann has been an invaluable asset to the Stony Brook community. In 1981, she was appointed as the first and to this point, the only Director of the Office of Conferences and Special Events.

In her 18 years as Director, she managed and orchestrated over 20 commencement ceremonies. On the day of the first commencement she planned, Mother Nature did

not cooperate, and it rained. The following year, she devised plans for a ceremony in the sun, rain or drizzle. Ann made sure that no weather condition hindered this commencement ceremony or any ceremony thereafter.

Ann will be truly missed by the faculty, staff and students of SUNY Stony Brook.

IN MEMORY OF AL HADLEY

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Al Hadley, a person who was one of the most influential men in my life, and, I am positive, hundreds of other lives.

''Skipper'' Al Hadley died this week at the age of 96 years young. As my Sea Scout, BSA, Scoutmaster, he bestowed upon me a lifelong love of the ocean and a respect for myself and all life. He taught me to challenge myself beyond my expectations and instilled in me the values of patriotism and public service.

Skipper was a lifelong friend and mentor who dedicated himself to our youth. He stayed involved in Sea Scouts long after his two sons were grown, and even after he retired. When I was a Scout, we restored a 36-foot World War II surplus Navy boat, which we sailed to Catalina Island on many a weekend. We pitted our seamanship skills against other Scouts from across California at the annual Rendezvous.

Each year, we left the sea for a survival hike in the desert, living off only what we found on the land. Not surprisingly, the Boy Scouts of America awarded Skipper Hadley numerous awards and recognitions over the years.

Many of those Scouts with whom I sailed with many years ago remain friends today. Skipper came to visit me at the Capitol after I was elected to Congress. His oldest son Pete, who recently retired as a colonel in the Army, remained in contact throughout the years.

Skipper Hadley will remain a role model for me until the day I die. Mr. Speaker, Skipper Hadley is survived by his wife, Cecelia; sons, Pete and David; five grandchildren; and one great-grandchild. I know my colleagues will join me in sending condolences to Skipper's family, and in thanking Skipper for upholding the ideals of a Scout leader; for molding generations of strong, motivated men and women; and for being a guiding light on the sea of life.

HONORING REVEREND CARLETON GILES FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, It is with great pleasure that I today join the congregation of the First Baptist Church in Milford, Connecticut as they pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Milford community and my dear friend—Reverend Carleton Giles. Throughout this past month, which the First Baptist Church has designated as ''Pastor's Anniversary Month,'' the congregation and Milford residents have gathered on several occasions to honor Reverend Giles' tenth anniversary as their pastor.

For many years, Reverend Giles has been an outstanding leader in the Milford community. As a pastor, teacher and police officer, he was shown unparalled commitment and dedication to all members of the community. With his extensive record of service, Reverend Giles has led an impressive and unqiue career—one which has made a real difference in the lives of many.

The clergy has always played a vital role in our community and Reverend Giles is a sterling example. His commitment to the service of our community through religious leadership that has brought him to this day is admired by many and rivaled by few. His involvement, not only with the congregation of the First Baptist Church, but with the entire community, has produced a legacy that will last for years. For ten years, Reverend Giles has ministered to the spiritual needs of hundreds in the Milford community—strengthening our bonds of faith and helping to build stronger neighborhoods of which we can all be proud.

In addition to his duties at the First Baptist Church, Reverend Giles has served as a law enforcement officer for the City of Norwalk for the past twenty years. Responsible for the implementation of drug and gang prevention programs such as D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T, Reverend Giles has had a profound impact on Norwalk's young people. Because of his good work, our children are learning the dangers of drugs, gangs, and youth violence. Reverend Giles' efforts have gone a long way in opening the doors of communication between students and local law enforcement officials, a crucial link in the fight to end youth violence.

Even with the incredible responsibilities Reverend Giles takes on in his professional career, he has still found time to serve on several community organizations, including the Interdenominational Ministers Alliance of Greater Bridgeport and Vicinity, Milford's Board of Police Commissioners, and New Haven's Annual Yom Hashoah Community Observance in remembrance of the Holocaust. I have had the privilege of having him serve on my Military Advisory Committee where he has taken the time to interview students from around the Third Congressional District who are interested in attending our nation's military academies.

I am proud to stand today and join Reverend Giles' wife, Stephany, family, friends, and the First Baptist Church of Milford in extending my sincere thanks and appreciation for his outstanding leadership and invaluable contributions to our community. My sincere congratulations, Reverend Giles, on your tenth anniversary and best wishes for continued success.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2614, CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 2614. I am deeply disturbed that this legislation was assembled by the Republican leadership without consultation with either the President or the Democrats in Congress. It is a partisan package of tax breaks for a variety of special interests. It ignores the needs of middle-class families and does not appropriately deal with the struggles of rural and teaching hospitals under the Medicare program.

This legislation does not contain the bipartisan school construction tax credit bond provision that would provide $25 billion in interest-free school construction bonds to help our crumbling schools. Instead it provides far less help to school districts, while giving the greatest tax cuts to wealthy bondholders, not average taxpayers.

This bill also fails to address the marriage penalty and reform of the estate tax to protect small businesses and family farms. Both are tax cut priorities around which there is broad bipartisan agreement.

H.R. 2614 does not provide an adequate tax solution for people who lack health insurance. Instead, it offers a sham deduction that could lead to many families paying more for the health insurance that they already have. According to the Joint Tax Committee, the deduction for buying health insurance will only succeed in helping about 5 percent of the 43 million uninsured purchase health insurance. Furthermore, this provision could lead employers to either cut back their contribution to health insurance premiums or drop coverage completely for many employees. In short, this tax deduction is very costly at $10 billion per year, yet has very little positive impact.

While this bill would increase the minimum wage 50 cents in 2001 and another 50 cents in 2002, all other provisions to help workers by altering overtime and other protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been dropped. Instead, the bill contains numerous small business and special interest tax breaks—such as $25 billion for an increase in the business meals deduction, repeal of 4.3 cents of the diesel fuel excise tax for railroads at a cost of $1.58 billion and a $250 million tax break for timber companies.

Instead of providing relief for those health care providers who really suffered harm from the 1997 Balanced Budget cuts this legislation would pass along 41 percent of the increase in Medicare spending to HMOs. This money could otherwise be directed toward beneficiary and health care providers needs. There is not even a guarantee that HMOs will stay in the communities they now serve. Each dollar that goes to the HMO industry in this bill is a dollar that won't go to improve coverage for a Medicare beneficiary or go to help a rural hospital remain open.

I cannot support this inappropriate use of increased Medicare dollars. I support meaningful assistance to health care providers and targeted managed care payment increases to low-reimbursement counties, like many in Wisconsin, in exchange for their commitment to remain in the communities they serve for at least three years and not abandon seniors like so many have.

This Congress has failed to pass any meaningful health reform, such as the Patients' Bill of Rights or a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and instead has chosen to provide tax breaks for special interests and millions of dollars in Medicare spending to HMOs. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2614, CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2614. While I believe that there are many good provisions in this bill, I must object to it because it does not restore Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) benefits to legal immigrant women and children. In 1995, Congress imposed a 5-year ban on providing Medicaid and CHIP coverage to recently qualified immigrants. In 1996, Congress passed an immigration bill that split families; threw out due process; and took away discretion. But, worst of all, Congress took away compassion.

So, I'm not here just as a Member of Congress or as the Chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Health Task Force. I'm here as an American upset with the laws that discriminate against my fellow human beings. Today we stand before you to defend the women and children who fled tyranny and poverty only to be denied the health care afforded other Americans. We are talking about people that came here legally, play by the rules, and pay taxes. I firmly believe that we should include a provision that give states the option to provide SCHIP and Medicaid benefits to lawfully present immigrant low-income pregnant women and children. Children and pregnant women who are denied coverage through the SCHIP and Medicaid 5-year ban usually can't get other vital health care coverage. As a matter of decency, as a matter of economics, as a matter of public health, legal immigrant children and pregnant women deserve the same access to essential health care coverage offered to citizens. For pregnant women and their children, regular prenatal care and early intervention saves lives and dollars.

Children who have routine office visits and immunizations grow to be healthy adults with less medical complications. Children monitored by pediatricians are less likely to be victimized by chronic and communicable diseases. Preventive care minimizes emergency room visits, a costly and inefficient way of providing health care. Remember, diseases do not ask to see a passport. The 5-year ban on providing Medicaid and CHIP coverage has been the greatest barrier to health care for legal immigrants. It's time to make the system fair for everyone.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ONGOING U.S. CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON LAOS WITH THE APPROACHING 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the deteriorating political, economic and security situation in Laos which remains under the brutal control of one of the world's last remaining Stalinist regimes. More is needed to promote democracy, basic human liberties and human rights—and to stop the serious, ongoing intervention by Vietnam's military and security forces in the internal affairs of Laos. This is needed to serve the interests of the American people and the freedom-loving people of Laos, Vietnam and Thailand.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Center for Public Policy Analysis and its Executive Director, Mr. Philip Smith, as well as Colonel Wangyee Vang of the Lao Veterans of America for their leadership in helping to convene the U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos. Many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have participated in this important forum series on Capitol Hill over the course of the 106th Congress. It has helped to develop enhanced awareness and understanding of the serious developments in Laos by policymakers. I am proud to have participated in a number of these events, along with my staff assistant, Paul Berkowitz. In December of 1999, at one of the Congressional Forum sessions, I was pleased to participate along with Major General Vang Pao and other distinguished guests, and presented a joint report about our Congressional Staff Delegation research mission to Southeast Asia in the summer of 1999. In our report, issued jointly by the International Relations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we discussed the serious ongoing plight of the Hmong and Lao people still suffering in Laos. Other speakers and participants at the forum series on Laos included distinguished Members and staff from many offices including: Representatives DANA ROHRABACHER, GEORGE RADANOVICH and WILLIAM DELAHUNT, of the House International Relations Committee, on which I serve as Chairman, as well as Chairman JESSE HELMS, Senators BOB SMITH, RUSSELL FEINGOLD, PAUL WELLSTONE, Representatives MARK GREEN, PATRICK KENNEDY, CALVIN DOOLEY and the late Bruce Vento, who passed away earlier this month. Congressman Vento's leadership on human rights and with the forum series on Laos will, indeed, be sadly missed by so many in this Chamber and in the Laotian community.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congressional Forum series on Laos is making a significant impact in helping to provide vital information and to formulating policy toward Laos. It has helped generate numerous breaking stories in news services around the world, including the Washington Post, Washington Times, Agence France, Associated Press, the South China Morning Post and others. Radio Free Asia, Lao Service, as well as the Voice of America have also provided coverage. Historic legislation on Laos has also been enacted with the important information that has come from these Forums in Congress including H. Con. Res. 169, condemning, for the first time, the Communist regime in Laos for its human rights violations and other matters. I was proud to have worked with Representatives GEORGE RADANOVICH, MARK GREEN and former Congressman Bruce Vento to help pass this important legislation in the International Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, thus far, distinguished panelists and participants in the Congressional Forum on Laos have also included important Laotian and Hmong leaders as well as Lao experts from around the world, including: T. Kumar, Asia Director for Amnesty International; Markram Ouaiss, The National Democratic Institute's (NDI) Senior Program Officer for Asia; Dr. Jane Hamilton-Merritt, Noble Prize nominee and distinguished Lao and Hmong scholar; Dr. Chou Norinh, of the United League for Democracy in Laos, and distinguished professor at Assumption University, Bangkok, Thailand; Dr. Bounchaloune Phouthakanthy, of the University of Quebec, and Secretary General, United Lao Association of Canada; Dr. Khamphay Abbai of Australia; Dr. Bounthone Chanthavixay, with the World Wide Coordinating Committee on Laos, Hagen, Germany, and former Lao student protest leader in Eastern Europe; His Royal Highness Prince Sayavong, of the Lao Royal Family, in France; Major General Vang Pao, Hmong leader; Colonel Wangyee Vang, President of the Lao Veterans of America; Thongsavanh Phongsavanh, of the Lao Representatives Abroad Council; General Thonglit Chokhbenbun of France; Thongkhoune Phathana, President, The Laos Institute For Democracy; Ms. Sothida Bounthapanya Lao Progressive Party; The Lan Xang Foundation, of Atlanta, Georgia; Col. Ngeunsamilth Sasorith, France, President, of the Paris-based,

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to thank all of the Members of Congress, staff and participants from around the United States and the world who have made the U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos such an important success in the 106th Congress. The winds of intense turmoil and change are now blowing in Laos. The United States, with the help of the U.S. Congress, needs to do more to support democracy and free and fair elections in Laos during the upcoming vote in 2002.

Mr. Speaker, toward this end, on December 1st, while the Communist Regime in Laos celebrates its dark anniversary of totalitarian dictatorship, it is important to note that a major installment of the Congressional Forum on Laos will be held in the U.S. House of Representatives with witnesses and participants from around the world, including the slated

testimony of a group of student demonstrators who escaped from Vientiane, Laos recently and were just granted political asylum several days ago in America. A special ceremony will follow in Congress, during the evening, to mark the grim oppression of the Laotian people after 25 years of Communism. Laotian victims of communist oppression will share their testimony. I encourage my colleagues to continue to aggressively support these important activities and the efforts of Laotian people in their struggle to bring freedom, democracy and human rights to Laos.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN BURMA

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 27, 2000

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, ethnic and religious minorities around the world suffer because many governments fail to protect fundamental human freedoms such as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly. Or, a government fails to concede to the will of the people and imposes its will upon the people. When a government fails to uphold international human rights standards, to respect the wishes of the people expressed through voting or other legitimate mechanisms, or to protect people's basic freedoms from violations, individuals and groups often are harassed, imprisoned, tortured, and even killed. Serious violence and human rights abuses have occurred in Burma through the actions of the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC). On September 26, 2000, I chaired the Congressional Human Rights Caucus Briefing on Human Rights Concerns in Burma. I would like to submit for the RECORD the testimony of Mr. David Eubank, Saw Htoo Htoo Lay, Pastor Edmund Htokut, Saw Ka Law Lah, Mr. Stephen Dun, and Major Larry J. Redmon.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID EUBANK BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS, SEPTEMBER 26, 2000

Thank you for this opportunity to share with you about the situation in Burma, and for the opportunity to ask for action to restore democracy in Burma, protect minority rights, and provide immediate humanitarian assistance for the Internally Displaced People (IDP).

CURRENT SITUATION IN BURMA

The dictators of Burma, the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), continue to oppress the people of Burma, reject the 1990 democratic elections, hold over 1,300 political prisoners (55 of whom are members-elect of parliament), and brutally violate the human rights of ethnic minority peoples as well as ethnic Burmans. This has resulted in over 1 million refugees that have fled Burma since 1990, and 2 million Internally Displaced People (1 million ethnic Burmans are displaced for government projects, 1 million are ethnic minority peoples displaced by the attacks of the Burma Army and SPDC forced relocation programs.) The ethnic minority IDPs in particular are in immediate need of help. They face starvation, disease and the constant threat of attack by the Burma Army. Those who have been able to escape the SPDC forced relocation sites, are scattered in jungle hiding places, living in fear. If discovered they are brutally attacked by the Burma Army. Their home villages have been plundered and burned and the Burma Army has scattered land mines in and around their villages to strike terror and discourage their return. (In last year alone there were over 1,500 new landmine victims.) The IDPs live in fear with very little hope. HIV infection is on the rise with over 440,000 infected and little State response.

Narcotics production and export has increased with profits from the heroin and amphetamine traffic being shared with the SPDC. In 1999, over 500 million amphetamine tablets were smuggled into Thailand. Most of these were produced in the 55 amphetamine laboratories across the border in eastern Burma. 1,750 tons of opium was also produced making Burma the worlds number two producer of opium and heroin. The SPDC has been closely involved with groups that produce and traffic narcotics, helping in 2000 alone, to move over 100,000 form one group to a area adjacent to the Thai border, thus creating a major increase of narcotic traffic into Thailand.

The U.S. Department of State 1999 Country Report on Human Rights, the 2000 Annual Report on Religious Freedom, as well as current Amnesty International and International Labor Organization reports all condemn the human rights record of Burma and appeal for change.

RATIONALE FOR ACTION

(1) The people of Burma are oppressed, tortured, and murdered by the dictator's army, and this is wrong.

(2) There was a free and fair election in 1990 and the results should be recognized and democracy restored.

(3) The dictatorship allows narcotics production and prospers from its sale.

(4) Burma is a client state of China and in return for weapons and other military hardware, allows China to establish SIGINT facilities and naval installations in Burma. This is not good for the people of Burma or for regional security.

(5) The people of Burma, in particular the Kachin, Karien, Shan and Karenni, helped the allies drive the Japanese Army out of Burma during WWII. They deserve our friendship and help.

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED

(1) Immediate humanitarian assistance to the 1 million ethnic minority Internally Displaced Persons of Burma (IDP), Assistance includes medicine, food, clothing, shelter, and education supplies.

(2) Immediate security for these IDPs. This requires support of the pro-democracy resistance force who make aid delivery and security possible, or international intervention to protect the IDPs or both, international military intervention to protect the IDPs, or both.

(3) Call for tripartite dialogue between the SPDC, the Ethnic Groups and the Burma Democracy groups.

(4) Implement increased political, economic, and if necessary, military (indirect by support of resistance forces, or direct by international intervention) pressure until the dictators restore democracy, human rights, and minority political rights.

(5) Bring those guilty of war crimes in Burma to justice.

TESTIMONY OF SAW HTOO HTOO LAY

Mr. Chairman, I am honored and grateful for this opportunity to present the current human rights situation in Burma to the congressional human rights caucus.

I. THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION

Most of the recent attention on Burma's human rights situation has only looked at the SPDC military junta's persecution of the National League for Democracy. While this is bad, the human rights situation of ordinary villagers is much worse. In our Karen areas and also in Karenni and Shan areas of eastern Burma, the SPDC is doing everything it can to gain complete control by subjugating the entire civilian population. They use what they call the Four Cuts policy—to cut off supplies of food, funds, recruits and intelligence to resistance forces by destroying villages, farms and food supplies until the civilians are so destitute and starving that they could not possibly support any opposition group. As far as the junta is concerned, the suffering and death which this inflicts on millions of villagers is not a problem, because they would really like to see the end of the Karen, Karenni and Shan peoples.

Since 1996, the junta has systematically destroyed at least 1,500 villages in Shan State, displacing over 300,000 people; 200 villages in Karenni (Kayah) State, displacing at least 50,000 people; and at least 300 or 400 villages in our Karen areas stretching from Pegu Division and Karen State in the north to Tenasserim Division in the far south of Burma. Hundreds of thousands of our Karen people have been displaced by these operations since 1997, and they remain displaced today.

II. THE POLITICAL SITUATION

The political situation between the SPDC and the National League for Democracy (NLD) in Rangoon remains at a stalemate, with the junta refusing to reform or to participate in any meaningful dialogue with any democracy advocates and vowing to crush all opposition. The KNU and most other groups in the country are calling for tripartite dialogue involving the SPDC, the NLD, and the non-Burman ethnic leadership which represents the non-Burman half of the country's population. However, the SPDC has shown no willingness to engage in any such dialogue.

The junta claims falsely that it has already brought peace and unity to the country by signing military ceasefires with many of the ethnic-based armed opposition groups. Firstly, it is important to point out that none of the 'ceasefire deals' are peace treaties. They are simply temporary deals whereby the two military forces agree not to shoot at each other. No political issues have been addressed in any of these ceasefire deals, and most of the opposition groups who have signed them are not happy with the results. In most of the ceasefire areas, SPDC human rights abuses have continued.

The SPDC now claims that the Karen are the only group left fighting the junta, but this is also not true; in addition to the KNU, the Karenni National Progressive Party, the Shan State Army, the Chin National Front, and several other groups continue to fight actively against the military regime. At present, the junta is refusing to negotiate at all unless opposition groups agree to surrender unconditionally beforehand.

The KNU recognizes the suffering brought on the villagers by the current state of civil war and is determined to resolve this conflict by means of negotiation. However, we are not prepared to surrender unconditionally as demanded by the SPDC, because the result would only be endless suffering for the Karen people

TESTIMONY OF EDMOND HTOKUT

My name is Edmond Htokut. I am a pastor, I am working and living together with displaced person.

We know that only very few people in the USA know about Burma and what is happening in Burma now. As for us Karen people who have been suffering from all kinds of atrocities under the Burmese military regime which is being recognized as one of the most brutal and most oppressive regime in the world we received very little international attention, interest and awareness. Therefore I would like to take this opportunity to give you some information about our people, our life and situation.

The church in Burma Christians from every group face forced persecution, destroying houses, schools, bibles and churchs. It is not only Christians who are persecuted but Muslims and even Buddhists if they protest of the dictators actions. As a Christian pastor I will focus on the persecution my people face. It is important to remember our brothers and sisters of all faiths and ethnic groups who suffer under the SPDC.

Consequently many civilians were forced to leave their villages and resettle in places totally under military control. Due to the atrocities committed by the military group, the villagers dare not go back to rebuild their homes, schools and churches. But were forced to flee into neighboring country for survival and some are scattered in every corner and being separated from their churches. Those are the ones who do not live in the refugee camps. They are living in the jungle and do plantation. Some places are they lived two or three families and some are seven to ten families. They are living quietly in fear and anxiously.

They have not protection, no healthcare and no churches and no schools. They lost all their rights. When we tried to meet them we went to very difficult because land mines are around the area and the way we tried to go carefully to meet the people hiding in the jungle. When they meet us they are very afraid because they believe nobody. At the time I told them ''I am not a soldier. I am not a political man. I am a servant of Christ and God send me for help you. What can I do for you.'' They told me ''we need medicine, we need some clothes, some food, we need security. We want to go back home, go back to our own land''. I answered them ''I don't know but don't be anxious. Believe God. God can do every things. Now over 56 countries pray for you. I hope we can go back home soon.''

We are attempting to bring love and relief assistance to all internally Displaced Persons regardless of religion, ethnicity or political bias. But there are still many needs to be met and most of all the need for help of international community to change the political situation in Burma. For this is the real cause or the real source of all the problems.

We need the help of the international community, please for our people, our country. Help us in ways and means as you can. Please pray that God will intervene and change the situation in Burma so we will have peace and return to our own land. In God we trust.

Thank you so much.

TESTIMONY OF SAW KA LAW LAH

REFUGEES

For Decades, wave after wave of Burmese refugees have fled war and oppression in their native land to seek uncertain exile in neighboring countries. The toll in human suffering is incalculable, and the continual mass migrations have created serious regional disruptions and tensions.

Around 300,000 Burmese are now refugees in Thailand, Bangladesh, and India. As many as one million Burmese people have become internally displaced because of the Burmese army attacks and forced relocations aimed at cutting local links to armed resistance groups or seizing their lands for state-run farming and logging.

After the bloody suppression of the 1988 pro-democracy movement, thousands of students and political activists evaded army round-ups and escaped to Thailand and India. Ethnic minority peoples, comprising about 40% of Burma's population, are special targets for abuse. Their indigenous lands along Burma's frontiers have for decades been consumed by rebellions that have flared and simmered in a quest for autonomy or independence.

Many villagers have been forced to move to new ''satellite towns'' that often lack services or communications and are sometimes located on disease-prone and infertile lands. Localized protests against such actions have been reported, but Burma's civilian population is basically defenseless against the regime's well-armed and fast-growing army.

Mr. Chairman:

1. My earnest request is to consider the above mentioned refugee problems and extend your protection for all the refugees along the Burma border and for all internally displaced people.

2. The Government of Burma may be considered guilty of a crime against humanity, punishable under international law.

EDUCATION

In Burma the law is what the generals say it is. It can and does change from day to day. There is no freedom of expression. Nearly all Burma's universities and colleges have been closed since student protests in Dec. 1996. There are two types of schools in Burma; one is for the children of the military members and is well funded. The other is for civilians and is poorly supported. Civilian schools have insufficient teachers and lack funds.

All curriculums, both civilian and military, must be approved by the military and student activities are very closely monitored by military intelligence. Ethnic people are not allowed to teach in their own language in schools. In some rural areas even primary schools are not allowed to open. The Burmese soldiers come regularly to burn down all villages, schools, and churches. They even told villagers not to open any schools if they want to live in peace. But most of the internally displaced people build schools whenever they have a chance.

In refugee camps there are schools from nursery school through high school. We do not have qualified teachers and lack teaching materials, but most of the students are very keen to learn. In Karenni and Karen camps there are nearly thirty thousand students and one thousand teachers.

To upgrade our education some further study programs are needed for students who have finished high school. They need to have an education so that they can help to fill the gaps and rebuild their country in the coming future.

What we need for IDP schools in Karen and Karenni areas:

1. Basic school supplies and text books.
2. Salaries for teachers.
3. Scholarship programs.
4. Travel passes.
5. Good communications programs.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN DUN

Mr. Chairman, Thank you for giving me a chance to again represent to you the situation in Burma.

My colleagues have vividly described the different problematic situations leaving no doubt that the military regime has, and continues to, systematically oppress all minorities in Burma, whether ethnic or religious using it's military force.

I am a Karen who was born in Rangoon and had to flee with my parents to the border because of this type of oppression. I grew up on the mountains bordering Thailand & Burma and witnessed and experienced the seasonal military attacks of the then called State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC), the ruling military junta. I have had close friends and relatives killed and as well as my home destroyed on three occasions.

The reason that this military regime is able to continue their hold on to power is because external interests focused on the region. A few of these instances are as follows. Jane's Intelligence review has been the main source for all of the following information.

CHINA

While Burma remains shunned by the West, the country's two giant neighbors, India and China, are jockeying for influence in Rangoon. Since the beginning of the year, India's army chief, General Ved Prakash Malik, has made two trips to Burma and his Burma counterpart, General Maung Aye, has visited both India and China.

These top-level exchanges have highlighted Burma's importance in the strategic competition between Beijing and New Delhi. China enjoys a considerable head start in the race to woo Rangoon's military leaders.

Since 1988, Burma has become China's closest ally in South-east Asia, a major recipient of Chinese military hardware and a potential springboard for projecting Chinese military power in the region.

During General Maung Aye's trip to Beijing in June to mark 50 years of diplomatic ties, has host, Chinese Vice-President Hu Jintao, noted that strengthening Sino-Burma relations was ''an important part of China's diplomacy concerning its surrounding areas''.

Burma emerged as a key Chinese ally on August 6, 1988, when the two countries signed an agreement establishing official trade across the common border—hitherto—isolated Burma's first such agreement with a neighbor. Significantly, the signing took place while Burma was in turmoil.

China was eager to find a trading outlet to the Indian Ocean for its landlocked inland provinces of Yunnan and Sichuan, via Burma. The Burma rail-heads of Myitkyina and Lashio in north-eastern Burma, as well as the Irrawaddy River, were potential conduits.

By 1990, trade between the two countries was flourishing and Burma had become China's principal political and military ally in South-east Asia. China poured arms into Burma to shore up the military government.

The isolation and condemnation experienced by both countries in the wake of the Rangoon massacre of 1988 and the violent suppression of the Tiananmen Square protests the following year helped to draw them closer together.

But China's calculations were also strategic. Close to the key shipping lands of the Indian Ocean and South-east Asia, Burma could help China to extend its military reach into a region of vital importance to Asian

By late 1991, Chinese experts were helping to upgrade Burma's infrastructure, including

its badly-maintained roads and railways. Chinese military advisers also arrived that year, the first foreign military personnel to be stationed in Burma since the 1950s.

In August 1993, Indian coastguards caught three boats ''fishing'' close to the Andamans, where last year the Indian navy established a new Far Eastern Naval Command in a move viewed as an attempt to counter Chinese influence in Burma. The trawlers were flying Burma flags, but the crew of 55 was Chinese. There was no fishing equipment on board—only radio-communication and depth-sounding equipment. The Chinese embassy in New Delhi intervened and the crew was released.

Burma was becoming a de facto Chinese client state.

One of China's motives for arming Burma was to help safeguard the new trade routes through its potentially volatile neighbor.

Intelligence sources estimate the total value of Chinese arms deliveries in Burma in the 1990s at $1 billion to 2 billion, with most of them acquired at a discount or through barter deals or interest-free loans.

Chinese support for the upgrading of Burma's naval facilities included at least four electronic listening posts along the Bay of Bengal and in the Andaman Sea: Man-aung, Hainggyi, Zadetkyi island and the strategically-important Coco Islands just north of India's Andaman Islands.

Although China's presence in the Bay of Bengal is limited currently to instructors and technicians, the new radar equipment is Chinese-made and operated probably, at least in part, by Chinese technicians, enabling Beijing's intelligence agencies to monitor this sensitive maritime region. China and Burma have pledged to share intelligence of potential use to both countries.

ISRAEL, PAKISTAN AND SINGAPORE

Over the past 12 years Burma has been branded a pariah state by the West and made to endure a range of political, economic and military sanctions. The Burma armed forces (or Tatmadaw) have lost their access to the arms, training and military technology of most of their traditional suppliers.

Three countries were quick to come to the SLORC's assistance. The first was Singapore. Two shiploads of arms and ammunition were sent to Rangoon in October 1988 to fill an urgent order for mortars, small arms ammunition, recoilless rifle rounds and raw materials for Burma's arms factories. Israel too seemed prepared (through a Singaporean intermediary) to provide weapons to its old friend and ally (See JIR March 2000, pp 35–38). A shipment of captured Palestinian weapons and ammunition (mainly grenade launchers and recoilless guns) arrived in Burma in August 1989. Before the Israeli arms arrived, however, the SLORC received at least one shipment of arms and ammunition from Pakistan.

Pakistan seems also to have provided Burma with a wide range of military training. In the early 1990s there were reports that Pakistan had helped members of the Tatmadaw learn to operate and maintain those Chinese weapon systems and items of equipment also held in Pakistan's inventory. There were also reports that Pakistan Army instructors were based in Burma for a period to help train Burma special forces and airborne personnel.

While these reports remain unconfirmed, they are given greater credence as a number of Burma Army officers are currently in Pakistan undergoing artillery and armour training, and attending Pakistan's Staff Colleges. The BAF and Burma Navy also have officers undergoing training in Pakistan. It is possible that Pakistani military personnel have also been sent to Burma to help the Tatmadaw learn to operate and maintain its new K–8 jet trainers, and possibly even the 155mm artillery pieces that the SPDC acquired from Israel last year.

STATEMENT OF LARRY J. REDMON

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct honor and pleasure to appear before this panel of the US Congress today. My name is Larry Redmon, I am also a Major in the U.S. Army Special Forces currently serving with the 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne) at Fort Lewis, Washington.

Insurgencies form for many reasons. One common reason is when a government fails to meet the social, political, economic, military or psychological needs of the people. Based upon my study and observations, I have concluded that some of the following help explain the insurgency in Burma: the government is unresponsive to the aspirations of the people; the government is tyrannical, repressive, and corrupt; the government has inefficient leadership; and the government is unwilling to tolerate responsible opposition. The widespread economic poverty; and failure of the inept, ultra-nationalistic leaders to develop a viable economy are also leading causes for these movements.

The Burmese military has largely disassociated itself from the people and is feared and looked upon as more of a weapon of tyranny. Psychologically, there is a lack of faith in the current government and widespread belief in injustice of the current system and its leaders. So these groups are in fact insurgent organizations that are fighting a war against the Government of Burma. However, it is my understanding that these insurgent organizations do not advocate an overthrow but rather a change to democracy with limited autonomy by the various groups. One hundred and eleven delegates from fourteen ethnic groups signed the Mae Raw Tha Agreement in Jan 1997. These delegates all agreed to a type of federation with shared power based upon the Swiss model. No one group wants sole power, they simply want a better way of life and change to democracy.

I am reminded that over 200 years ago a group of insurgents who sought change for in fairness for more participation in their own governmental affairs were also labeled rebels and insurgents, the American Colonists. The colonists fought a very bloody and brutal war because they too wanted change and a voice in government. The ethnic minority groups of Burma seek the same.

While some of these groups do traffic in drugs, some, such as the Karen, are not involved with drug production. Some groups rely on legitimate means such as logging or taxing goods that travel through their areas to develop income. The income generated is used to finance the war, but it is also used to pay for education, roads, schools and temples. In short, the money is used to build a better way of life for their people, a way of life that the Burmese Government has thus far been unable or unwilling to provide. Based on my discussion with a leader of the Shan State Army these groups believe they have no real choice, but to rely on income from the drug trade. The Shan leader I spoke with candidly stated that if he could get income by another means he would gladly switch. He realizes that drug production is not good for his cause and he also knows that it keeps his cause from being legitimized by the international community, but so far he has not received financial assistance from any source.

These groups are fighting a war of survival. Some of these groups are at the very point of extinction. Based upon my study and observation, the SPDC is winning this war through its mass terror and massive human rights abuses. The SPDC practices mass terror by employing SS-type death squads called the ''Saa Tho Lo'' or Guerrilla Retaliation Units. These units often appear in the villages during the night and spread mass terror by abducting those who are suspected of associating with the KNLA or KNU. Often those abducted are killed very brutally, often beheaded or otherwise mutilated. The Karen Human Rights organization has eyewitness proof that since these death-squads first appeared in Sept 1998 and up to May 1999, they have committed over 100 murders among the Karen people.

The Tatmadaw itself has systematically raped and tortured villagers for not being able to pay cash or provide their rice quotas. They use forced labor for porters and labor for their army. They demand quotas in labor from villages, often small boys and even old men. If these individuals refuse or are unable to keep up with the Army; are killed or left to rot, on the trail.

I learned that the SPDC will enter the homes of their own citizens and take young boys at night and force their induction into the Army. This January, I interviewed one such 15-year-old Burmese boy. He recently had defected to the Karen and was being helped in a Karen reeducation center. He told me that when he was 13, he had been taken during the night from his parents in Rangoon. He has not seen them since. During my interview, this boy never smiled or laughed, instead projecting only a solemn look of despair reflecting the loss of his childhood.

My observations and study confirm the findings of the Department of State that the SPDC engages in a variety of human rights abuses, such as forced relocation, religious and ethnic persecution, extra-judicial killings, heavy crop quotas, cash extortion, arrest and detention, rape and murder. The SPDC has attacked and burned villages of the ethnic minorities. The displaced persons are forced into the jungle or driven by force across the border into Thailand where they become refugees. Approximately one million refugees of various ethnic groups

His Majesty, the King of Thailand, and the Royal Thai Government have shown a tremendous amount of charity, love and generosity to these refugees, but given the current economic crisis and severity of the situation they can hardly do more. Once these ethnic groups are forced across the border by the SPDC, they are not left alone, the SPDC continues to terrorize these people by attacking them across the border, thereby violating Thailand's sovereignty. The Thai Army has lost many soldiers trying to protect these people. In 1998, the Thai Army had over twenty soldiers killed while trying to protect the Mae La refugee camp.

Human Rights abuses by the SPDC on the ethnic peoples are just a small part of a much larger problem. The SPDC has realized that they cannot gain international aid or support by their brutal tactics so they have turned to drug production to finance their army and country. The SPDC is producing heroin and methamphetamine, which is being sent to Southeast Asia and to the rest of the world. Thailand has been forced to direct many of the Army's already thin resources to fight this trafficking.

I believe that more humanitarian aid, assistance, and support to the Thai Government, a proven ally and friend to the United States, is urgently needed. We can try to influence and become more involved in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). The United States and other members of ASEAN should pressure Burma for dialogue and raise these issues through all available international forums. We could possibly re-evaluate our recognition of the Government of Burma. We could also support the formation of an international investigative body, sanctioned by the UN and ASEAN, that would investigate and document human rights violations by the Burmese Regime and use it as evidence in an International Tribunal.

I finally believe it is in our best national interest for the United States to use all reasonable means to restore democracy to the people of Burma. As long as the brutal regime continues to hold power in Burma, the region will remain unstable thus causing tensions with the Kingdom of Thailand and the rest of Southeast Asia. In my view, we simply can't allow this to continue. Rather, we have a moral responsibility to the people of Burma, to the displaced ethnic minorities, and to the country of Thailand to take appropriate action now.

On January 6, 1941, President Franklin Roosevelt said, ''Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights and to keep them. Our strength is our unity to that purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.''

Recommended Actions, September 26, 2000, Burma Ethnic Delegation (Karen National Union, Karenni National Progressive Party

1. Provide immediate relief (medical, food, shelter, clothing) to the Internally Displaced Persons (IDP). Relief can be coordinated and sent through ethnic IDP relief organizations.

2. Provide security for the IDP's from the attacks of the SPDC army.

3. Continue the assistance to refugees in camps and provide assistance to all refugees not yet in camps or with no access to camps.

4. Increase assistance for education programs for IDP and refugees schools and provide for schooling and education abroad.

5. Implement a counter narcotics program in Burma that in return for cessation of narcotics production and trafficking will provide for the following;

a. Provide for a crop substitution and economic development program for the opium growing and amphetamine producing groups such as the Shan, Kokang and Wa. This should be done directly with these groups and not through the SPDC.

b. Provide relief and educational support for these groups.

c. Provide for training and supply of ethnic counter narcotics forces to enforce the counter narcotic program.

6. Establish a tri-partite dialogue between the SPDC, Burma democracy groups and ethnic groups. Through the Ethnic Nationalities Seminar of 1997 and the National Solidarity Seminar of 1998, the Burman and ethnic democracy groups have agreed on a framework for a democratic Burma. Their appeals for dialogue with the SPDC so far have been rejected.

7. Take the necessary economic, political and military actions to restore democracy and all human rights in Burma. This can be done indirectly by fully supporting the democratic resistance or directly by international intervention or both. The 10 ethnic democratic groups still resisting the SPDC (KNU, KNPP, NUPA, ALP, SSA, CNF, LDF, WNO, PHLO, PSLO), field between 14,000 and 15,000 groups. They are motivated and with support could easily increase in number, helping to provide security for the IDP's and helping to bring the SPDC to dialogue. Cease fire groups such as the KIO and the USWP have over 40,000 troops. And with support could be reunited with the pro democracy groups. With more support Burman pro democracy forces and ethnic forces could better unite.

8. Help establish a safe area for defectors from the Burma army and implement a program to receive these soldiers. There are thousands of Burma army soldiers who would leave their commands if there was a safe place for them.

9. Establish a war crimes tribunal for Burma to bring the perpetrators of war crimes and other human rights violations to justice. With the consent of Congress, this administration and the next, should setup a task force to monitor the crimes against humanity that the military regime in Burma is committing. What, Where When, to whom, by whom and under whose command atrocities were committed. Also posting the results of the findings on a .gov website will further establish credibility to the SPDC's part in the crime. This will be the building blocks for either prosecution by the international war crimes tribunal or a human rights commission so justice can be served.

10. That Congress request that the next Administration appoint an interagency task force to:

a. Assess the implications of China's actions in Burma.

b. Develop a plan for bringing about democracy in Burma.

c. Present the assessment and plan to the appropriate Congressional intelligence committee(s) before the end of 2001.

11. With the urging of Congress, the current and next Administration should actively discourage Pakistan, Israel, Singapore and China from providing military assistance to Burma.

12. Increase Sanctions against SPDC and continue to encourage other countries to do the same. Make all investment in Burma by US companies illegal. For example bring a close to UNOCAL's operations in Burma. Over 40% of foreign investment goes to the military a military whose only enemy is its own people.

13. Continue to recognize the dedication and courage of Burma democracy leaders such as Aung San Su Kyi.

SALUTING TEXAS ROSE FESTIVAL QUEEN AND DUCHESS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to the queen of the 2000 Texas Rose Festival, Caroline Malone Key, and to Tiffany Love Mea, who served as duchess of the rose growers during the festival which was held October 19–22 in Tyler, TX—the ''Rose Capital of the Nation.''

Miss Key is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William O. Key of Tyler. Her family has been actively involved in the Rose Festival for many years and in service to the community, and Caroline has participated in the Rose Festival in various capacities in previous years. She is a freshman at Millsaps College in Jackson, MS. A native of Tyler, she attended All Saints Episcopal School, where she was active in student affairs. Her community services activities include St. Louis School, Habitat for Humanity, Bellwood Lake Clean-Up, Young Life, Tyler Rose Museum, Discovery Science Place and Tyler Day Nursery.

Miss Mea is the daughter of Pamela Jenkins of Tyler and Joseph C. Mea of Lindale. Her father is owner of Mea Nursery of Lindale, where Tiffany grew up learning about the industry and developing a special appreciation for roses. She attended All Saints Episcopal School in Tyler and is a 1999 graduate of San Marcos Baptist Academy. She is an honor student at St. Edward's University in Austin, where she is majoring in communications production, and is involved in Hunger Awareness and Habitat for Humanity. As duchess, Tiffany also will serve as an ambassador to Tyler, representing the area and its rose industry throughout the year.

Inspired by the Tyler Garden Club and begun in 1933, the Texas Rose Festival represents the spirit that brings Tyler together as a community. Tyler is home to the Nation's largest municipal rose garden and museum. Approximately one-fifth of all commercial rose bushes produced in the United States are grown in Smith County, while over one-half of the Nation's rose bushes are packaged and shipped from this area. Each year more than 100,000 people from around the world visit the Tyler Rose Garden and Museum. The Rose Garden blooms from late April until frost with over 30,000 rose bushes exhibiting approximately 450 varieties of roses. The Museum features memorabilia of past festivals, including hand-sewn, jeweled costumes dating as far back as 1935. James W. Arnold is the 2000 festival president.

The Texas Rose Festival attracts local citizens and visitors from throughout the country and is a showcase for Tyler's hospitality as well as its vibrant rose industry. The success of the Rose Festival is a reflection of the dedication, hard work and community spirit of hundreds of citizens and local businesses in Tyler. It is a source of tremendous civic pride for Tyler and East Texas, and it has evolved into a premiere event that is known throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have participated in the Rose Festival for many years, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend all those whose efforts have made it possible and to congratulate Caroline Key, Rose Festival Queen for 2000, and Tiffany Mea, Duchess of the Rose Growers.

IN HONOR OF NANCY DODD

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the life of a woman who was a pioneer and an activist in many ways. Nancy W. Dodd was a woman who devoted her life to helping

individuals and families cope with alcoholism and abuse, and has touched more lives than we can count. On September 5, 2000, Nancy passed away in her home after a long illness.

Nancy was born in Dallas, TX, in 1935 and 1965, she moved to Salinas, CA. It was here that she founded, with her husband, the Sun Street Centers. At Sun Street Centers, which still thrives today, Nancy began a new approach to alcohol recovery where, within the context of a residential treatment facility, she worked with the families of those she cared for in order to overcome alcoholism. This treatment model continues to be used on a state and national level in helping the individuals and families that are affected by alcoholism. The Sun Street Centers have served more than 60,000 people in Monterey County, to date. Ms. Dodd was also active in Al-Anon for 36 years, and served as the Alcohol Program Administrator for San Benito County, California. It was in this role that she created the Community Recovery Center for that county, serving similar needs as her Sun Street Centers.

Recently, as a tribute to her impact on the Monterey County community, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors named a currently developing community center The Nancy Dodd Community Center. In the resolution for this act, they praised her as "* * * A leader in the alcohol family recovery field" and proclaimed the new center's name "* * * In recognition of her dedication and service to the community".

As an educator on the subject of treatment, Nancy lectured at colleges and universities throughout California, and was a frequent participant in the Episcopal Cursillo. As a member of the Good Shepard Episcopal Church she served as a junior warden, among other roles. She was a member and former president of the Democratic Women's Club of Monterey County, and a former board member and officer of the Women's Crisis Center and the Family Resource Center.

Nancy W. Dodd was a vibrant and energetic voice in the community. She will be sorely missed by her husband, Martin; her two sons, Martin Dodd III of Berkeley, CA, and Wesley Dodd of Clovis, CA.; two daughters, Elaine Dodd and Cheryl Merrill, of Salinas, CA; two sisters, Janice Seldomridge of Savannah, GA., and Penny Sieg of Jacksonville, FL; nine grandchildren; and many nieces and nephews.

TRIBUTE TO THE ALPENA KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS ON THE OCCASION OF THE COUNCIL'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus, an organization that has been called "the strong right arm of the Catholic Church," was founded in 1882 in the basement of a church in New Haven, CT.

The importance of this unique fellowship of men, gathered together to do good works in their community, was quickly recognized, and men came together in other communities to form their own local groups. In 1900 a council of 30 members was formed in Alpena, MI, in my congressional district.

I recently had an opportunity to join the members of the Alpena Knights of Columbus Council 529 for their 100th anniversary. Now 500 members strong, this council personifies the strength and viability of the Knights of Columbus, which has grown to more than 1.6 million members worldwide.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Alpena council personifies other councils. This is most true in the good works the council does. It sponsors activities for both boys and girls, buying jerseys for teams in such sports as baseball, hockey and soccer teams. It supports Boysville, a camp in Clinton, MI, and it provides assistance to the families of its members, a hallmark of Knights of Columbus councils everywhere.

Where this council differs from others, Mr. Speaker, is in the nature of its single biggest fundraiser, its annual Wild Game Dinner, which is held the last Friday in January. The council puts its best northern Michigan culinary foot forward with a game feast of salmon and trout, of deer, moose and elk, of rabbit and muskrat. Approximately 500 diners are expected each year, and the council can expand its charitable fund by about $50,000 annually from this event alone.

I had the pleasure of addressing members of the Alpena council recently, and I spoke of our own efforts here in Congress to bring a sense of religious commitment to our public service through the Congressional Prayer Breakfast. We, too, are a body brought together to do good works on behalf of others. It remains my fervent hope that, despite the widely divergent views on every issue that are brought to the House floor, we will be kept humble, ever conscious of our commitment to service, and ever focused on working together, even when we disagree.

I pray the next 100 years of the Alpena Knights of Columbus will find their membership ranks filled, their good works expanded, and their example of fellowship and public service a bright beacon for individuals, the private sector and public servants like us.

WOLCOTT FIRE COMPANY NO. 3 CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, over the past fifty years there have been many significant events in the Town of Wolcott, a community in my Connecticut congressional district, but this October 27th will be a date that will be especially noted for what it means in the lives of so many past and present residents of the Town. On that day, Friday, October 27, 2000, Wolcott Volunteer Fire Department Company No. 3 celebrates its golden anniversary—50 years of dedicated service to the Town of Wolcott and surrounding communities.

Fifty years ago, the Town fire department foresaw Wolcott's potential for growth that has ultimately been realized. Despite very limited resources, dedicated volunteers moved ahead to create a third fire company within the department. Indeed, resources could not have been more limited, with the only equipment available being an old ambulance converted to an emergency truck, and $1.38 in the treasury, much of that raised from a penny collection. The members of the Company however, were extremely dedicated to their task. A year later the company acquired its first real fire truck, a well used 1919 American LaFrance, purchased from the neighboring city of Waterbury for $300.00. The fire station was a converted local garage.

As the years passed, and as the community grew, so did the role of Company No. 3. The members continued to pull together, some literally mortgaging their homes to raise funds for their efforts. A new station was built by members of the Company and other townspeople, with much of the labor and materials being donated. Other emergency vehicles were added to the company. Training and equipment maintenance took not only a lot of time, but also a lot of money. Fundraisers of every kind were held to help offset the costs of the equipment. After just ten years, the Company purchased its first new truck for $16,700, obtained through local fundraising efforts as well as a mortgage on the fire house.

In the ensuing years, other trucks and emergency vehicles were purchased, additions to the station were made, and the company endured numerous challenges that only served to make it a stronger and more cohesive organization. The outcome is an organization whose character is steeped in dedication, loyalty and commitment to serve the Wolcott community.

The members of the Company, past and present, have made sacrifices above and beyond the call of duty that have set an example for all firefighters to follow.

Mr. Speaker, Wolcott Volunteer Fire Department Company No. 3 deserves wide recognition, and I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in congratulating all past and present members of Company No. 3, and thanking them for a job well done!

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES A. GARNEY

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor an exceptional leader and friend to our Kansas City community and our country. This year the Metropolitan Lutheran Ministries of Greater Kansas City will recognize Charles A. Garney as a Friends in Deed 2000. Charles Garney has an extensive history of civic pride and investment into our community. He has shown outstanding dedication as a business leader, philanthropist and advocate for the poor and disadvantaged of metropolitan Kansas City.

Charles Garney is the founder, Chairman of the Board, and Chief Executive Officer of

Garney Companies, Inc., a heavy utility construction company with its headquarters in Kansas City, Missouri. He is also the founder, Chairman of the Board, and Chief Executive Officer of Briarcliff Development Company, headquartered in Kansas City as well. Charles Garney and his companies have played an integral role in shaping the Kansas City skyline. He is responsible for preserving and promoting one of Kansas City's most notable neighborhoods in the historic Northeast area where he has made his home and been recognized as the Northlander of the Year by his neighbors.

Outside of his burgeoning businesses, Charles Garney has played an active role in Kansas City's civic, social, and philanthropic communities. Mr. Garney has consistently dedicated his time and efforts to countless organizations such as Metropolitan Lutheran Ministries, which improve the lives of others and make Kansas City a better place to live. He is the past President of the Kansas City Area Economic Development Council, past President of the Kansas City Crime Commission, and Director of the City of Fountains Foundation to name only a few. Mr. Garney is a member of several distinguished charitable and professional boards and committees as well. Charles Garney's commitment has been recognized as the Missourian of the Year, he has received the Citizen of the Year Award from Baker University, the Distinguished Citizen of the Kansas City Community Award by Park College, and he is listed in ''Ingram's Magazine'' as one of Kansas City's hundred most influential people from 1990 to 1997.

Throughout his professional and personal career Charles Garney has been a great friend to his neighbors in the Kansas City community. He has shared his success with the city which raised him, and his devotion as an example to us all. Charles exemplifies the core values that we all strive for: commitment to the community, to family and to making a difference in the lives of others. I am honored to acknowledge Charles A. Garney for his successful efforts and service to Kansas City. I know that he is joined in receiving this award by his wife Patty, his six daughters, and their extended family. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Metropolitan Lutheran Ministries Friends In Deed 2000, Charles A. Garney.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 2000, S. 1438, a bill to establish a National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia was passed in the House.

H.R. 2710 and its companion legislation, S. 1438, would establish a National Law Enforcement Museum next to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in the District of Columbia. I believe that this museum will be a fitting tribute to those who serve and protect our communities and nation on a daily basis. Currently, there are about 74,000 federal, state and law enforcement officers who risk their lives to ensure that citizens are safe and protected. In fact, members of my own family have served and I feel especially proud to be a cosponsor and ardent supporter of this museum.

The museum will help to educate the public about the law enforcement profession and the great personal risks many officers encounter daily. An integral part of the success of law enforcement is public support; support that will grow as the public gains a better understanding of the law enforcement profession through information provided at the museum. The museum will have an accompanying research facility that will be instrumental in creating a safer and more stable environment for all, as research conducted there will be utilized by policy makers as well as officers themselves to improve both the effectiveness of legislation and law enforcement techniques.

RETIREMENT OF NEW MEXICO STATE HISTORIAN ROBERT J. TORREZ

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert J. Torrez, the New Mexico State Historian and one of New Mexico's most recognized, respected and honored historians, recently announced his retirement to be effective December 22, 2000. Mr. Torrez has served in his official position with New Mexico's state government since 1987.

During his years as State Historian, Mr. Torrez has made many noteworthy contributions to support greater awareness of the richness and depth of the more than four and a half centuries of New Mexico history—a written record of history in the United States that has few, if any, direct parallels. And a record that continues to grow as New Mexico continues to make its unique contributions to our country.

One of the areas in which Mr. Torrez has focused his scholarship is the history of New Mexico's judicial institutions and how those institutions responded to crime, punishment and other legal dilemmas under the Spanish, Mexican and American governments. He has written many articles on the subject and has pointed out the effectiveness of the Spanish and Mexican systems in dealing with crimes in the context of not only providing justice, but also community-wide resolution and acceptance of the application of justice through those systems in ways that also preserved the integrity of the individuals and families involved in progressive ways. He has long-running regular column that is published in the monthly public employee-oriented newspaper, Round the Roundhouse, that has pointed out many little-known aspect of New Mexico's history.

Mr. Torrez is a recognized expert on one of New Mexico's—and the Southwest's—most challenging issues. And it is an issue that is not only close to my heart but touches on the soul of every traditional Hispanic community in New Mexico: the question of New Mexico's land grants. Those grants made by Spanish and Mexican governments were ostensibly protected by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that ended the United States' war with Mexico in 1848. Mr. Torrez has presented countless lectures and discussions concerning this matter and he served as a member of the Guadalupe Hidalgo Task Force created under the auspices of the New Mexico Attorney General's Office in order to assist the United States General Accounting Office conduct their ongoing study of New Mexico's grants.

Mr. Torrez has also contributed significantly tothe preservation of New Mexico's historical documents and cultural propoerties. As only one notable example, in 1988, he worked with the New Mexico Historical Records Advisory Board to obtain a grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. He then ensured that the grant funds were applied to a much-needed project for locating and identifying historical records throughout New Mexico and then assessing their condition and making recommendations for maintaining and preserving them for posterity. The result was a report, New Mexico's Historical Records—An Assessment, that was published and circulated throughout the State in 1990.

Despite his widespread recognition and his scholarly position, Mr. Torrez has also deliberately chosen to remain accessible to the many citizens struggling to understand their family, cultural and state history. It is part of his commitment to promoting the understanding and dissemination of the history that he clearly so deeply loves. And as a consequence, he is not only widely recognized and warmly received wherever he travels in the state, but is also deeply appreciated as a living, breathing cultural treasure in our State. I, my wife, Jill, adn countless other New Mexicans join in extending our sincere thanks and congratulations to Mr. Robert Torrez for his years and dedication and commitment to the history of our Land of Enchantment. We know and are glad that he will be able to continue his work from the comfort of his well-deserved and more leisurely state of retired public servant. One who has exemplified the highest standards of public service. We wish him continued rewards in the years to come.

MAINE WOMEN'S FUND

HON. THOMAS H. ALLEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, October 2, the Maine Women's Fund held its annual ''Evening to Honor Maine Women and Girls'' and celebrated the Fund's tenth anniversary year.

At this year's dinner, the Maine Women's Fund honored four women for their extraordinary efforts to eliminate gender barriers.

Odelle Bowman, of Portland, uses theater to teach life and social skills and strengthen self-esteem for at-risk young girls through ''A Company of Girls,'' sponsored by the East End Children's Workshop. Many of the girls are from low-income single parent families, many

have survived a traumatic past, almost half are young women of color, and many are refugees. The productions are different and challenging. They range from Romeo and Juliet to a play deconstructing the Cinderella myth. Odelle produces all productions for ''A Company of Girls,'' from lighting and costumes to directing and coaching.

Elise Brown, of Liberty, is a firefighter with the Portland Fire Department, as well as a Captain and training officer with the Liberty Volunteer Fire Department. Elise taught a carpentry course for Women Unlimited, where women learned carpentry, and also were encouraged to challenge traditional gender barriers in employment. She has been the positive role model many women long for as they explore areas outside the realm of presumed acceptability. Elise has built wooden boats, a post and beam barn and managed a vegetable farm. As assistant to the Director of the Miane Women's Development Institute, she designed and developed a database system, was responsible for the bookkeeping, correspondence and grant requests.

As Co-Director of Portland Adult Education, Larinda Meade of Portland has changed the lives of thousands of women, many among the state's poorest citizens. She has been a classroom teacher, an educational counselor, an administrator of a statewide literacy program, a Dean of Women, and since 1990, co-director of Maine's largest and most diverse public school education program. She has worked to establish a ''first-of-its kind'' Family Workshop on Munjoy Hill. Larinda has served on the board and as President of Women Unlimited, on the Advisory Council for the Maine Centers for Women, Work and Community and is a founding member of the Coalition for Women in Trades and Technology.

Dancer, dramatist, poet, athlete, artist, and feminist activist Caitlin Schick of Mount Desert Island has accomplished a great deal in her eighteen years. As a poet, her work often deals with subject of eating disorders, loving oneself, speaking up. As an artist, her paintings are striking. One painting is of a woman's face with phrases behind it such as ''we can never be beautiful enough * * * we can never be enough * * * we can never be good enough.'' Caitlin wrote and starred in a skit for National AIDS Day, which dealt with sexual issues facing young people.

I salute the contributions of this year's honorees and appreciate the work of the Maine Women's Fund in advancing the cause of gender equality.

TRIBUTE TO DAN MOODY, JR.

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Dan Moody, Junior of Austin, Texas who died on Friday, the 27th of October. His death was an enormous loss, not just to me as his close friend, but also to all of humanity.

Dan Moody was a man of the highest intellect and integrity of any person I've known in my life. He graduated from the University of Texas Law School with the highest grade point average of anyone in the history of the school in 1951. Yet he never had the characteristics of a bookworm, rather he was always a down to earth, fun loving, rounded human being. He was almost always right, yet never overbearing or arrogant in his position. He walked through life with respect for every human being.

He was the son of Texas' youngest Governor, Dan Moody, a man who had the courage to fight and defeat the Ku Klux Klan in a court of law. He clearly passed on his courage and integrity to his son, Dan Moody, Jr. To all of his friends, his loyalty was exceeded only by his care and compassion. His word was sanctified bond and he was always prepared to give of himself to others wherever there was a need. I extolled him in life as I do now in death. His country and I will miss him greatly and I'm sure that all of my colleagues join me in extending our sympathies to his marvelous wife, Ann, his daughter Martha, and his son Charles.

TRIBUTE TO OLA MAE FORD

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Ola Mae Ford, a native of Macon who lives in Fort Hill in what is affectionately referred to as ''the house by the side of the road.'' Her house has this designation because she cooks incredibly delicious food every day, and people travel from all parts of the state to sit at her table and share her hospitality. She has been cooking all of her life, but her training at Albany State University and Atlanta University helped sharpen those skills that she used for 36 years as a Home Economics Teacher at Ballard Hudson Senior High School.

Ms. Ford served as Advisor to the Future Teachers of America and was a member of the National Education and Professional Standards Commission. She has been actively involved with the American Red Cross, both locally and nationally, as well as the March of Dimes, the Central Georgia Health Agency, the Georgia State Health Planning Council, the American Legion's Auxiliary Girls' State Program, and the Southwest Optimist Club. She was appointed by two of Georgia's governors to serve on the Council of Maternal and Infant Health for twelve years.

Presently, she continues to enthusiastically work to improve the lives of the people of Georgia by staying involved with many boards, such as the Board of Directors for Meals on Wheels, Bibb County Home Makers, Friends of the Ocmulgee Monument, Advisory Council for Neighborhood Health Care and President of the Fort Hill Neighborhood Association.

Her life and work are centered around providing the generous gift of hospitality. I congratulate her on all of her life long efforts to build better communities and help others. I want to recognize the positive impact she has made on the lives of so many people. Her work and her contributions are important, and I want to salute her as an outstanding citizen of Georgia's Eighth District.

OMNIBUS INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to H.R. 5528, The Omnibus Indian Advancement Act, because this bill does not protect Marin and Sonoma Counties in California from casino development.

Section XIV of the bill, which discusses the restoration of the Coast Miwok tribe in the Sixth Congressional District of California, rightfully restores the Miwoks' tribal status but does not protect Marin and Sonoma Counties from gambling. That is not acceptable.

In June, H.R. 946, The Graton Rancheria Restoration Act, my bill to restore the Miwoks' status and protect the community from casino development unanimously passed the House.

Now, in the last days of the session in the dark of night this hastily written omnibus bill that undoes the work of this House and does not protect my constituents is brought to the floor. In their effort to finish up their work for the year, the authors of this bill have hung Marin and Sonoma Counties out to dry and undone my work.

An act of Congress took away the Miwoks' status nearly 40 years ago. Now the Miwoks' need an act of Congress to restore their status and to provide them the health and education benefits they deserve.

By working with the tribe, the community and the House Resources Committee, I passed H.R. 946 that carefully balanced the needs of the Miwoks and the needs of the community. Under the bill I wrote and this House passed, everyone would have come out a winner.

Now, without notice, the other body has undone this House's strongly supported efforts on behalf of the Coast Miwoks.

If this bill becomes law, there will be nothing stopping the Coast Miwoks from building a Vegas-style casino in the rolling hills of Marin and Sonoma counties—no matter how much the community objects.

Under current federal law, Indian gaming is prohibited except in states, like California, that allow gambling. In those states, governors are obligated under federal law to negotiate a compact with any recognized tribe that wants to start gaming.

As everyone knows, federal law has precedence over state law in all circumstances. Therefore, without a specific federal prohibition against Miwok gaming, like the one contained in my bill, H.R. 946, the Graton Rancheria Restoration Act, at any point the Miwok could set up gaming in the North Bay; all they would have to do is ask and the governor would be obligated to negotiate a gambling compact with them.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents strongly oppose gaming. As their representative, I strongly oppose this bill. The pressure to wrap up

work for the session is no reason to ignore my communities' needs.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT POLLUTION

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article written by former Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr. The Honorable Bob Kasten served in both the House of Representatives (1975–81) and the Senate (1981–93).

Mr. Kasten writes to remind us of the fact that the Federal Government is the largest polluter in the United States. He brings to our attention anecdotes from the states, which illustrate the states' difficulties enforcing local environmental laws on the federal government. He writes about the federal government's lack of accountability in cleaning up its own toxic waste sites and its attempts to push cleanup responsibility and costs to local levels of government and to private landowners.

According to a Boston Globe article last year, ''federal agencies have contaminated more than 60,000 sites across the country and the cost of cleaning up the worst sites is officially expected to approach $300 billion, nearly five times the price of similar destruction caused by private companies.'' In contrast, private Superfund site clean up is estimated at a fraction of the federal government at $57 billion. The article goes on to say that the EPA Inspector General has found that, federal agencies are increasingly violating the law, with 27 percent of all government facilities out of compliance in 1996, the latest year figures available, compared to 10 percent in 1992.

Department of Energy and Department of Defense environmental clean up budgets are routinely last priorities in the appropriations processes. For example, this year I worked to cut construction funding in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for the DOE's National Ignition Facility (NIF)—a bottomless money pit that the GAO has determined to be mired in waste and technological difficulties—and suggested that this funding be transferred to the DOE's waste management account, where I believe the money could be put to better use.

The final appropriations bill increased the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management fund by $490 million dollars. In comparison, the NIF project, which is 100 percent over budget and 6 years behind schedule, was appropriated $130 million for FY 2001. The NIF boondoggle was granted nearly one-third of the total increase of the environmental clean up budget. Clearly the federal government has other agendas than the environment.

We need to look more closely at Federal Government's own environmental problems. The State and Federal Government can work together to modernize environmental laws, streamline the bureaucratic process, and focus less on punishment and more on figuring out the best way to reach high environmental standards and compliance.

AMERICA'S LARGEST POLLUTER—GUESS WHO

(By Sen. Robert W. Kasten, Jr.)

Here is a question that really ought to be put to both the presidential candidates, but especially Vice President Gore, in the final weeks of the campaign: Can you tell us who the largest polluter in the country is? And—important follow-up—if you are elected president, what would you plan to do about this defiler of our planet's future?

The answer, as market environmentalist Becky Norton Dunlop notes in her forthcoming book, Clearing the Air, will surprise many Americans. It isn't Exxon, duPont, or even, with respectful apologies to Ronald Reagan, trees—although trees are, as Reagan said, a major source of certain ''pollutants.''

Rather, as Dunlop notes, the largest polluter in the United States is: the United States government. Federal vehicles are not only numerous, but, in many cases, don't meet Federal clean air standards. Temporary bureaucrats who commute to major federal centers, especially in Washington, D.C., often do so in vehicles that aren't locally registered, and thus don't meet area pollution requirements.

There are even a large number of federally-protected toxic waste sites. And of course, the Federal government's sorry effort to blame land-owners who didn't pollute for the chemicals put on their property by others is a major reason why the vast majority of Superfund sites around the country haven't been cleaned up.

Dunlop knows about Federal pollution first-hand. As Secretary of Natural Resources for the state of Virginia from 1994 to 1998, she had to go to court against the Gore-Clinton Environmental Protection Agency to stop some Federal agencies from polluting, or protecting polluters being harbored because they were Federal contractors. For this, she won the ire of some extremists for whom environmentalism means not making the air, water, and soil cleaner, but expanding the federal government's ability to strong-arm states, cities, companies, and private citizens.

Even some environmentalists are starting to realize the irony, as Scott Harper of the Virginian-Pilot put it recently, that if you're looking for the biggest polluter of all, ''it's government—the same authority that's supposed to protect the environment.'' The Boston Globe did a whole series on the issue of government pollution in 1999. This summer, USA Today did an expose on Federal agency pollution dating back to the 1940s, a series that has led to Senate hearings this fall. But you don't have to go back to the history books to find Federal polluting. It's going on right now, under the man supposed to be the environmental vice president, Al Gore.

Now, to be sure, one reason the Federal government is the largest polluter is its sheer size. The Federal government owns more vehicles, buys more products, employs more commuters, and does a lot of other things in much greater volume than any company. (That the Federal government is so vast is, in

But size isn't the only reason government pollutes so much. Far from it. A major contributing reason is that Federal authorities frequently attempt to shift the expense for cleaning up their pollution to other levels of government, or to private landowners—allowing federal agencies themselves to continue polluting while blaming others.

As Dunlop recounts, for instance, in the mid 1990s, the EPA, run by former Gore aide Carol Browner, tried to prevent the state of Virginia from making the Federal government clean up one of the worst toxic waste sites in the country. Avtex fibers. The plant had been kept open thanks to Colin Powell and the Bush administration because it was producing valuable products for the Federal government. That's understandable.

What was wrong was the effort by the Clinton Administration to avoid making the party responsible for the pollution, namely Uncle Sam, from paying for the cleanup. ''Can you imagine,'' as Dunlop notes, ''if the guilty party had been a major corporation?''

EPA ultimately paid a huge fine to Virginia in the Avtex case but only after a legal struggle. Today, Browner brazenly takes credit for having cleaned up the site.

The government as a polluter is a vital issue all by itself. But in an election where trust, character, and taking responsibility have become part of the debate, it may be especially important.

Wasn't it Al Gore who was led an exhaustive review of everything the Federal bureaucracy does, the ill-starred ''re-inventing government'' crusade? How does Gore square this effort and mission, and his vaunted attention to detail, with the fact that he apparently paid little attention to the polluting activities and policies of governmental itself?

Here we see the intersection of something Al Gore claims to revere, namely clean air and water, with the place where he and Bill Clinton have had the most direct control, the federal executive branch. And instead of a record to be proud of, the story of EPA in the 1990s is one of political vendettas, bad science, and ''the buck stops over there.''

I'm no Jim Lehrer or Larry King, but if I were, I know that I would point this out. It isn't a nit-picking question, and it isn't a personal attack—instead it goes to policy and the future. And it would sure be interesting what Al Gore has to say.

Mr. Kasten served Wisconsin in the House of Representatives (1975–81) and U.S. Senate (1981–93) and is an advisor to the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution.

HONORING RON HASKINS

HON. JIM McCRERY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Speaker, as the 106th Congress draws to a close, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Mr. Ron Haskins, the Staff Director of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources. Much to my regret, Ron will be leaving the Subcommittee at the end of the year. I know he will be sorely missed by this Member, and by the many other Members and staff who have had the opportunity to work with him during his time on Capitol Hill.

Over the years, Ron has been a key asset on the Ways and Means Committee. As a member of the Human Resources Subcommittee, I have had the honor of working closely with Ron on some of the major social policy issues affecting our country. His in-depth understanding of the issues, combined with his keen ability to digest the diverse perspectives of Committee Members, have allowed him to help identify areas of compromise and agreement on difficult issues.

As the Subcommittee's new Staff Director in 1995, Ron immediately employed his strong grasp of the nation's welfare system by working with then-Chairman CLAY SHAW, and other Members of the Committee, to craft the 1996 Welfare Reform Act—the most significant change in social policy in this country in the last 60 years. Thanks to Ron's tireless efforts, millions of American families are breaking a cycle of dependency and are working and gaining independence in our nation's economy.

As Ron moves on to other opportunities in his life, I join my colleagues in thanking Ron for his service to the Committee and to the country, for his good counsel, and for his energetic presence. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

SUPPORT FOR LIBERTY DAY CELEBRATION IN KANSAS

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the celebration of Liberty Day in my home state of Kansas.

Liberty Day is a non-partisan statewide celebration of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. It is celebrated annually on March 16th, the birthday of James Madison, the ''father of our Constitution.'' On this day, and throughout the year, elected and previously elected officials volunteer their time to speak to students about how our country was established, how our system of government operates, what it means to be an American, and what our rights and responsibilities are as citizens of this great country. This year, Liberty Day was observed in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio and Wyoming. In Kansas, March 16, 2000, was proclaimed as Liberty Day by Governor Bill Graves, who urged all Kansans to join in the observance.

On October 10th of this year, I was pleased to join with my colleagues in voting in favor of H. Con. Res. 376, expressing the sense of Congress regarding support of the recognition of a Liberty Day. This resolution was approved by a voice vote of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives for the 106th Congress, it has been my honor to have the opportunity to distribute hundreds of copies of the Constitution to constituents who have visited my office, Kansans who have attended my regularly-scheduled community office hours in the Third District, and secondary school teachers, study group leaders, and ministers who have contacted me asking for copies of the Constitution for distribution. I welcome this opportunity to share with you my support for this worthy endeavor, which will bring the living words of our Constitution closer to the minds and hearts of Kansans who, as I do, revere its meaning in our lives today.

HONORING GIL CORONADO

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I honor the achievements of a fellow Texan who has been serving as a key appointee in the Clinton Administration for the past six years. Gil Coronado is one of San Antonio's favorite sons, and is currently serving as the ninth Director of the Selective Service System. He is also the first Hispanic Director in the Agency's 60-year history.

Since his nomination by President Clinton and Senate confirmation in October 1994, Director Coronado has been leading this small but vital Federal agency into the 21st Century with unprecedented modernization and innovation, through the institution of on-line registration and registration by telephone. Nearly three-quarters of a million men have registered on-line to date.

More than half of all registrations today are electronic and the ratio of electronic registrations vs. paper registrations increases monthly, making it faster and easier for America's young men to comply with the registration requirement. These improvements also make it less costly to administer, something for which this body has a great appreciation.

Gil Coronado's influence as Director extends beyond Texas and Washington, D.C. Through his tireless advocacy in encouraging state and local government support of the Federal registration program, the number of states enacting laws that directly support the Military Selective Service Act has risen from 18 to 28 since 1994. This year two states—Oklahoma and Delaware—became the first states to link Selective Service registration with application for state drivers' licenses.

Gil Coronado is dedicated to making sure that our nation's young men are reminded about their civic and legal obligation to register.

Gil Coronado is a tremendous role model. He was born in Corpus Christi and grew up in the barrios of San Antonio. Orphaned at the age of five, his youthful years sometimes found him on the wrong side of the law. He dropped out of high school and was a member of Hispanic gangs. But he soon followed a more productive path in life, leading to great personal achievement and dedicated public service.

He enlisted in the military when he was only 16 by being more patriotic than honest about his age, earned a GED diploma, a college degree, and devoted a total of 30 years to a distinguished Air Force career, retiring as a Colonel with over 35 awards and decorations including the Legion of Merit and Bronze Star. A long-time crusader for Hispanic issues, he advocated creating National Hispanic Heritage Month, designated by the Congress in 1988.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the service and accomplishments of one of its most effective appointees, Selective Service System Director Gil Coronado. His selfless contributions to our great nation, from his years as a very young airman to the approaching conclusion of his current assignment as the longest serving SSS Director since General Lewis B. Hershey, are inspirational to us all. In every respect, Gil Coronado is a patriot, a good friend, and a great American.

A TRIBUTE HONORING MR. JOSEPH ACOSTA ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special American citizen, Mr. Joseph Acosta of San Gabriel California who celebrates his 90th Birthday today. Mr. Acosta is the quintessential example of a devoted American family man, who has led an exemplary life of service to God, family and country, and who is deserving of our highest commendation and gratitude.

Joe Acosta is a simple man, a quiet man, a man of great character. Born on October 28, 1910 in Sonora, Mexico, he moved at the tender age of three, along with his beloved parents Joseph and Teresa Acosta, and his siblings to the United States, where the family settled in Tucson, Arizona.

Like many new immigrant families working the great agricultural fields of the southwest, Joe had to leave school early in life in order to help the family survive. He took upon his shoulders the hard and grueling work, without complaint, in order that he and his seven brothers and sisters could have a better opportunity to seek the American dream.

Perhaps his greatest achievement, but certainly most fortuitous happenstance was meeting, courting and marrying the lovely and charming Cecelia Palomares, scion of one of California's proud pioneer families. United in Holy Matrimony on September 26, 1936, Joe and Cecelia Acosta recently celebrated their 64th Wedding Anniversary, a milestone reached by few couples. Together they raised a fine family consisting of two sons, Robert and Vincent Acosta, and a daughter Patricia Acosta Williams. They enjoy six grandchildren and fourteen great-grandchildren, with two more on the way!

Attaining American citizenship in 1937, Joe Acosta was part of the ''Greatest Generation'' that contributed to the triumph of freedom over tyranny during World War II. While he did not serve in the military, he worked sixteen-hour days in the rubber industry to provide materiel for the war effort. Later, the great skills he exhibited in his work brought his company profits exceeding seventy thousand dollars per month that helped usher in a period of unprecedented prosperity for the United States and created the great middle class of Americans.

Through their courage, effort and devotion, Joe and Cecelia, Acosta achieved the American dream for their family. They are proud homeowners and citizens of San Gabriel, California, and devoted parishioners of San Gabriel Mission Catholic Church. Along with the multitudes of simple, quiet unsung heroes, who contributed so enormously to the collective greatness of American society, Joe Acosta has done his part. In the warm embrace of his loving family, he has earned the pleasures of a long retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to Joseph Acosta, faithful servant of God, honorable citizen of the United States, proud and devoted husband and father. From the hallowed halls of Congress we say to you Joe, ''Well Done! God bless you and your family. And God bless America!''

COMMENDING THE BROOKLYN CENTER, MINNESOTA LIONS CLUB FOR 46 YEARS OF SUPPORTING COMMUNITY NEEDS

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I proudly salute a remarkable organization in my district which has been working hard for nearly half a century to raise badly needed resources to fund countless community efforts and held people in need.

For 46 years, the Brooklyn Center, Minnesota, Lions Club has always been there to help with a wide variety of critical needs. There are no words to adequately convey my admiration and thanks for all that the Brooklyn Center Lions have accomplished through their inspiring public service.

Mr. Speaker, it is organizations like the Brooklyn Center Lions Club which keep our country strong. As a fellow Lion, I want to salute the Brooklyn Center Lions who quietly volunteer their time, energy and talent to meet pressing demands in their community. I also applaud the Brooklyn Center Rotary Club for honoring the Brooklyn Center Lions last week.

Mr. Speaker, the great city of Brooklyn Center is greater because of the many important contributions of the Brooklyn Center Lions over the last four decades. The Lions live by the motto ''We Serve,'' and the Brooklyn Center Lions personify community service.

In 1999 alone, Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Center Lions donated $30,203 to the city to provide extra special help wherever and whenever needed. Over the years, the size and scope of the Lions' generosity paints a vivid picture of public service. Through the years, the Lions have donated $160,000 to the city, $125,000 to the schools and $110,000 to youth sports.

Since I was first elected to Congress, I have made expanded opportunities for people with disabilities one of my highest priorities. The Lions of Brooklyn Center share that passion and know that our nation is underutilizing a very talented and hard-working population by not offering more people with disabilities the opportunity to contribute. That's why the Brooklyn Center Lions built ramps for people in wheelchairs so they can lead more independent, fulfilling lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Lions Club in Brooklyn Center each and every year comes through with funds to get civic projects off the ground. The Lions Club lifts spirits by supporting the hometown Earle Brown Days, concerts, special festivals and the Park and Recreation Department's annual Halloween party.

The Brooklyn Center Lions have donated money for a training tower for the Brooklyn Center Fire Department, bikes for the Brooklyn Center Police Department's bike patrol, fitness equipment for police officers and the picnic shelter in Lions Park.

Mr. Speaker, the needs of children are always foremost in the minds of Brooklyn Center Lions Club members. Memories will last a lifetime for all the elementary school students who were able to travel to the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum because of the generosity of the Lions. The club gives to the Brooklyn Center Charitable Foundation to help children get coats, gloves and school supplies.

Clubs like the Lions of Brooklyn Center, Minnesota, are the lifeblood of our communities. That is literally the case with the Lions of Brooklyn Center when they support events like the American Cancer Society's ''Relay for Life.'' The Brooklyn Center Lions for almost half a century have rung bells with the Salvation Army, gathered food for the hungry and helped clean up the city parks.

Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Center Lions truly represent the best in public service, and I am very proud to represent them in Congress. The Brooklyn Center Lions are a model for the nation and a great community resource.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting the tremendous public service performed by the Brooklyn Center Lions for 46 years! Thank you, Lions, for all you have done and will continue to do in the years ahead.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of section 1012 of the Launching Our Communities Access to Local Television Act of 2000, title X of the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and related agencies appropriations conference report. Section 1012 provides for independent testing of terrestrial technologies in the 12 GHz band. My support for this section is conditioned on the understanding that this provision will not add any delay to any current FCC proceeding.

The Satellite Home Viewer's Improvement Act (''SHVIA''), which we passed a year ago, required the FCC to act on applications to provide local television service in unserved and underserved areas. We gave the FCC one year to make its determinations regarding these applications, which at that time had already been pending before the FCC for nearly one year. I am highly aware of the need for local television and broadband services that can be provided by new terrestrial wireless technologies. The deadline for FCC action under SHVIA is fast approaching and I expect the FCC to act on the applications by November 29, 2000 as required. The residents of my rural district have waited too long for service that matches that which is available in our nation's more populated area.

VICTIMS OF TERRORISM CLAIMS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, following enactment of the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act, to provide payment by the U.S. Government to persons holding final judgments pursuant to the 1996 Anti-Terrorism Act against the governments of Iran and Cuba for complicity in terrorist acts, many questions have been raised about the impact of this legislation on other pending claims, especially those of the families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 against Libya.

In this regard, I wish to reaffirm the statement contained in the Conference Report to the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Act of 2000, which provides that ''The Committee intends that this legislation will similarly help other pending and future Antiterrorism Act plaintiffs as and when U.S. courts issue judgments against the foreign state sponsors of specific terrorist acts. The Committee shares the particular interest of the sponsors of this legislation in ensuring that the families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 should be able to collect damages promptly if they can demonstrate to the satisfaction of a U.S. court that Libya is indeed responsible for that heinous bombing.''

The families of the victims of Pam Am Flight 103 were instrumental in their pursuit of justice in supporting enactment of the 1996 Anti-Terrorism Act. Because of this law, U.S. courts are now empowered to take jurisdiction over claims against foreign governments accused of state sponsored terrorism. We continuously have these families in our minds, as well as their loved ones who died in what President Clinton justly called a ''direct attack on America''.

It was the intention of the 106th Congress, in enacting The Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act that these same enforcement of judgment opportunities should apply equally to any final judgments that may be obtained by the families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 in pending or future litigation, if they so desire to pursue that civil course of action, along with our nation's own efforts to bring all those responsible to justice.

IN HONOR OF CARL REINER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the comedic legend, Carl Reiner, and in recognition of his remarkable achievement of being awarded the Mark Twain Prize for American Humor. A writer, performer, humorist, producer and director, his range of talent and contributions to American television are without bounds.

Reiner, now 78, has had a lengthy and multi-faceted career. In 1950 Reiner joined Sid Caesar's ''Your Show of Shows,'' the precursor to sketch-comedies such as the ''Carol

Burnette Show'' and ''Saturday Night Live.'' There he honed his comedic talents with other giants of laughter, like the legendary Mel Brooks, and began the writing for which he gained his unique reputation. After the show left the air in 1954, Reiner went to work writing TV pilots. Seven years later, CBS bought the ''Dick Van Dyke Show,'' one of televisions first and best sitcoms. Reiner went on to win 11 Emmy awards for the show.

Throughout the sixties, Reiner wrote semi-autobiographical comic novels, as well as short stories; his current collection is titled, ''How Paul Robeson Saved My Life.'' He has produced comic television shows and movies, and most recently, he created the hysterical comedy album, ''The Two-Thousand-Year-Old Man,'' with Mel Brooks.

Despite Carl Reiner's unmistakable gift for comedy, he remains a man of family, and a ''normal'' one, at that. He is married to Estelle Reiner, and is a loving father of three. Carl Reiner's universal appeal can, at least in part, be attributed to his straight sense of humor, unmarred by the vulgar and raunchy comedy too often presented just to make a buck. Of course, Reiner has said, ''If it's funnier than it is dirty, then let's have it.''

Let us recognize and honor the man who has shaped so much of our shared American culture since the early fifties. A television and comic pioneer, Carl Reiner has become a legend in his own time. I congratulate his distinct genius and commend him on receiving the Mark Twain Prize for American Humor.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4942, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 2000

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote against the fiscal year 2001 Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill because language has been included in the conference report which, instead of solving the problem of the sale of Social Security numbers over the Internet, actually shields those who sell Social Security numbers. As the original sponsor of H.R. 4311, The Identity Theft Prevention Act, I well know the opportunity that the sale of Social Security Numbers gives to identity theft criminals.

The move to outlaw the sale of Social Security Numbers gained momentum when a New Hampshire woman, Amy Boyer, was stalked and killed by a man who purchased her Social Security number over the Internet. But, instead of incorporating language into the conference report that would outlaw the purchase or sale of Social Security Numbers, the leadership has done just the opposite.

In the provision that I voted against today, for the first time ever in law, banks, hospitals, and credit bureaus are explicitly allowed to sell our Social Security numbers.

The bill does nothing to restrict the purchase of Social Security numbers or restrict the use of it by people who obtain it over the Internet. Members of Amy Boyer's family are angry at what has happened to their original proposal, and have asked that Amy's name not be associated with it.

The proposal is opposed by numerous consumer, civil liberties and privacy organizations, including Consumer Action, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, the ACLU, Phyllis Schlafly's Eagle Forum, the Electronic Privacy Information Center, the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

For this reason, I was unable to support the 2001 Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations bill.

CURRENT SHORTAGE OF INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise because of the current shortage of influenza vaccinations available to the general public for the upcoming flu season. I am very concerned about not only the availability of vaccinations, but about possible price manipulations regarding their availability.

Health care officials state that vaccinations are most effective, if received in early October, yet because of shortages many people must now wait until the end of November. I am extremely concerned for our nation's at-risk populations, in particular the elderly and chronically ill who rely on these immunizations. These individuals will be receiving their flu shots almost two months later than the recommended time frame. This is unacceptable.

While most states have a limited supply of vaccines for state and local health care agencies, some private health care providers—assuming they are capable of paying a premium price—seem to be experiencing no trouble receiving supplies. This has been raising questions among my constituents, many of whom rely on discounted flu shots offered by public health providers.

I have requested that Federal Trade Commission Chairman Robert Pitofsky investigate cases where companies may be selling to the highest bidder. One such example is the contrast between California and Maine. California contracted in February with a company called General Injectable Vaccines for $17.99 per vial—and has received only one-third of their shipment. Maine contracted in June and July with the same company at $39.00 per vial and received both shipments within two months.

In addition I have called on Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, to provide answers as to when this vaccine shortage was first realized by the government, why we were not better prepared, and what steps are being taken to ensure this shortage is never repeated.

We must do all we can to ensure on time delivery of vaccines for all in need, not just the privileged few. We cannot allow the availability and distribution problems we are experiencing this year to be repeated on an annual basis. Congress should take an active role in ensuring timely and affordable delivery of these vital vaccinations. The health and well being of our country depends on it.

TRIBUTE TO DON HARE, MICHIGAN DIRECTOR FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribune to both a public program and a state administrator of that program, a man who has put a warm, human face on a grant process that has been of vast importance to my northern Michigan congressional district.

Donald Hare, Michigan Director for Rural Development, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, was appointed to his post by President Clinton in 1993. Working out of Lansing, Don could well have focused his attention on Detroit and the other major metropolitan areas of the state. He understood from the outset, however, that the first word of the name of his agency, ''rural,'' meant that his focus should be on the many, many small communities that dot both the upper and lower peninsulas of Michigan.

Don Hare will be retiring at year's end. After almost a decade of working so closely with this dedicated public servant, I wanted to take a few minutes to tell you and our House colleagues about his work on behalf of the people of Michigan.

Let me give you a picture of my district, Mr. Speaker. Sprawling over roughly 24,000 square miles, it has many cities, towns and villages that organized and built their community infrastructure more than 100 years ago. Many of these communities built and still use water systems utilizing wooden piping! After 100 years, they must be re-built. These communities need financial assistance to renew these basic services, which maintain a community's quality of life and enable it to flourish and grow.

Prior to his Rural Development appointment, Don had served 18 years as chief of staff to Congressman Bob Traxler. He brought to the Rural Development job a clear understanding of the role of government in assisting people in basic yet profound ways. There is little glamour in providing grants to build a new sewer system, yet there is little future for a community that is unable to meet current standards in providing this service. Don understood this and has been of the greatest service to Michigan residents in meeting such challenges.

Don has always gone the extra mile to assist my constituents. In a figurative sense, he has always made himself available to me, my staff and community leaders to answer questions and resolve problems on grant issues. In a very literal sense, however, Don has often traveled many hours to come up to my northern Michigan district to take part in closing ceremonies and to make clear to grant recipients that the agency he has represented was more than a faceless bureaucracy.

In fiscal year 1999, Rural Development provided $95 million to my district in grants and loans for housing, community facilities, guaranteed loans for businesses, and water and sewer projects. For an area devastated economically by the closing of K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base and the shutdown of a major copper mine with the loss of 1,200 good-paying jobs, these grants and loans have been essential to build industrial parks, maintain fire services, upgrade housing and help pull up by the bootstraps our small business. Don Hare has recognized that this federal funding allows the communities of northern Michigan to help themselves to rebuild, recover and grow.

Don has built a great staff. I look forward to a continued positive working relationship with them after Don retires, but I and my own staff will certainly miss him and his great understanding of our concerns and needs in northern Michigan. I wish Don and his wife Rita all the best in the coming years.

IN HONOR OF DONALD CHAPIN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the life of Donald ''Dudley'' Chapin Sr., who passed away September 25, 2000. Mr. Chapin was a veteran, volunteer, and builder who will be fondly remembered by many on the Central Coast of California.

Born on June 5, 1925, in Salinas, California, Mr. Chapin co-founded Chapin & Clark with his partner Bob Clark in 1963. He later went on to co-found Don Chapin Inc., a general engineering contracting company, with his son Don Chapin Jr. in 1978. Don Chapin Inc. has performed work on thousands of jobs in the past two decades, including major work at the Salinas and Watsonville airports, and currently employs about 200 people.

Mr. Chapin served in the Army Air Corps, during World War II in the Pacific Theater. Deeply moved by his experiences in the Army, he was active in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and served as commander of the American Legion in Watsonville. In addition to his service to veterans, he also volunteered for the Salsipuedes Fire Board and the Santa Cruz County Fair.

Donald Chapin was a man whose building projects will leave a lasting imprint on the layout of cities such as Salinas and Watsonville, and whose life will leave an equal imprint on those who knew him. He will be sorely missed by his wife of 49 years, Grace; is son, Don Jr. of Salinas; his daughters, Marilyn Valentine of Denver, Janet Snoddlery of Porterville, Carol Howard of Salinas and Sharon Holmes of Aromas; three brothers, Ben Chapin of Santa Clara, Rap Chapin of Santa Rosa and Richard Chapin of Payson, Arizona; three sisters, Marge Cerletti and Mary Pedrone of Santa Clara, and Betty Shaeffer of Paso Robles; 12 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

4TH ANNUAL WESTFIELD WORKS WONDERS

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an event in my state of Connecticut that benefits so many, many people.

On Sunday, November 19, 2000, from 6:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., the Westfields Shoppingtowns, a group of regional shopping malls, will hold its fourth annual Westfield Works Wonders. This event has raised nearly $825,000 in the last three years. The proceeds are donated to Connecticut's schools, hospitals and charities across the state. The goal for next month's event is to raise an additional $400,000, for a four year total of about $1.2 million.

This is a tremendous effort on the part of the member malls in Meriden, Enfield, Trumbull and Milford. The management of Westfields Shoppingtowns are to be commended for taking up this cause and providing the leadership necessary to achieve it. Of course, it is the more than 6,000 retail and food service employees at the malls and the estimated 138,000 shoppers who will attend the event that deserve at least as much of the credit. In addition, a force of thousands of volunteers from over 375 participating non-profit organizations have worked for months to sell the tickets for this special evening of giving.

For the small price of $5.00 per ticket, shoppers enjoy special discounts, in-store promotions, prize giveaways, entertainment, celebrity appearances, refreshments, free gift wrapping and other benefits. All ticket proceeds are then donated to the nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, in the hectic, day to day activities that occupy so many of us today, it is refreshing to know that so many of our fellow citizens are devoted to helping others in their communities. I ask that you and all Members of Congress join with me in congratulating everyone involved with Westfield Works Wonders, and express our hope for a most successful event.

IN MEMORY OF ELVIN RILEY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 28, 2000

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege today to pay tribute to the life of an outstanding citizen of the Fourth District of Texas, the late Elvin E. Riley Jr., of Winona, who died on September 21 at the age of 76.

Elvin was born in Houston and lived in Winona most of his life. He served as a corporal in the U.S. Army during World War II and received the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. He was a salesman for American Hospital Supply for twenty years and was a member of First United Methodist Church in Winona.

Survivors include his wife of 55 years, Minnie ''Mick'' Riley of Winona; daughter, Kathleen Riley of Dallas; daughter and son-in-law, Jeanelle and Dave Maland of Tyler; three granddaughters; two grandsons; two stepgrandsons; and two great-granddaughters.

I knew Elvin as a dear friend, a supporter and a great patriot. He received the Purple Heart—an honor launched by George Washington to recognize those who gave above and beyond and wore the scar of battle. Elvin will be missed by his family and many friends in Winona. He was devoted to his family, his community and to his country, and as we adjourn today, let us do so in his memory.