

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, November 3, 2000

The House met at 9 a.m.

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

God of all grace, You have called men and women from across this Nation to assemble and serve as the 106th Congress.

Be with each and every Member now and through the coming weeks.

Those who serve here in the House of Representatives feel privileged to serve. They believe in serving the people of this Nation; they really serve You.

Guide them with Your spirit of wisdom and understanding.

In all circumstances, be close to them with Your abiding presence and the gift of peace.

When they are tested or called to suffer a little, let them know, You, Yourself, will restore, confirm, strengthen and establish them as Your very own.

To You be dominion and power 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. PEASE. 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. PEASE. 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 253, nays 46, not voting 134, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Barrett (NE)	Boehlert
Andrews	Barrett (WI)	Boehner
Armey	Bartlett	Bonilla
Baca	Bass	Bonior
Bachus	Bereuter	Bono
Baker	Berkley	Boyd
Baldacci	Biggert	Brady (TX)
Baldwin	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Bliley	Bryant
Barr	Blunt	Burr

Buyer	Houghton
Callahan	Hoyer
Camp	Hunter
Canady	Hyde
Cannon	Inslee
Cardin	Isakson
Castle	Istook
Chabot	Jackson (IL)
Chambliss	Jenkins
Chenoweth-Hage	John
Coble	Johnson (CT)
Coburn	Johnson, E. B.
Combest	Jones (NC)
Cooksey	Jones (OH)
Cox	Kanjorski
Coyne	Kaptur
Cramer	Kelly
Cubin	Kildee
Cummings	Kind (WI)
Cunningham	Kingston
Davis (FL)	Kleczka
Davis (VA)	Knollenberg
Deal	Kolbe
DeLauro	Kucinich
DeLay	Kuykendall
DeMint	LaHood
Deutsch	Lampson
Diaz-Balart	Largent
Doggett	Larson
Doyle	LaTourette
Dreier	Levin
Duncan	Lewis (CA)
Edwards	Lewis (KY)
Ehrlich	Linder
Engel	Lowe
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)
Etheridge	Lucas (OK)
Evans	Luther
Everett	Maloney (CT)
Fletcher	Manzullo
Foley	Mascara
Fossella	Matsui
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)
Frost	McCrery
Gallely	McHugh
Gekas	McInnis
Gibbons	McKeon
Gilchrest	McKinney
Gillmor	McNulty
Gilman	Metcalf
Gonzalez	Mica
Goode	Millender-
Goodlatte	McDonald
Goodling	Miller (FL)
Gordon	Minge
Goss	Mink
Graham	Moakley
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)
Green (WI)	Morella
Gutknecht	Murtha
Hall (TX)	Myrick
Hastert	Nadler
Hastings (WA)	Napolitano
Hayes	Ney
Hayworth	Northup
Heger	Norwood
Hill (IN)	Nussle
Hilleary	Ortiz
Hinojosa	Oxley
Hobson	Packard
Hoeffel	Paul
Hoekstra	Payne
Holden	Pease
Hooley	Petri
Horn	Phelps

NAYS—46

Aderholt	Costello	Hulshof
Berry	Crane	Jefferson
Blagojevich	Crowley	LaFalce
Borski	DeFazio	Latham
Brady (PA)	English	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Hilliard	Lipinski
Condit	Holt	LoBiondo

Pickering	Markey	Olver	Strickland
Pitts	McDermott	Pallone	Tauscher
Portman	McGovern	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Quinn	McIntyre	Pastor	Thompson (CA)
Radanovich	Meeks (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
Rahall	Menendez	Ramstad	Weller
Rangel	Moore	Rothman	Wicker
Regula	Moran (KS)	Sabo	
Reynolds	Obey	Stenholm	
Rivers			
Roemer			
Rogan	Ackerman	Ford	Owens
Rogers	Allen	Fowler	Pelosi
Rohrabacher	Archer	Frank (MA)	Peterson (PA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Baird	Franks (NJ)	Pickett
Roukema	Ballenger	Ganske	Pombo
Roybal-Allard	Barton	Gejdenson	Pomeroy
Royce	Becerra	Gephardt	Porter
Ryan (WI)	Bentsen	Granger	Price (NC)
Ryun (KS)	Berman	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Sandlin	Bilbray	Gutierrez	Reyes
Sanford	Bishop	Hall (OH)	Riley
Sawyer	Blumenauer	Hansen	Rodriguez
Saxton	Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Rush
Scarborough	Boucher	Hefley	Salmon
Schakowsky	Brown (FL)	Hill (MT)	Sanchez
Scott	Burton	Hinchee	Sanders
Sensenbrenner	Calvert	Hostettler	Schaffer
Sessions	Campbell	Hutchinson	Serrano
Shadegg	Capps	Jackson-Lee	Shays
Shaw	Carson	(TX)	Slaughter
Sherman	Clay	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)
Sherwood	Clayton	Kasich	Spratt
Shimkus	Clement	Kennedy	Stabenow
Shows	Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Stark
Shuster	Collins	King (NY)	Stupak
Simpson	Conyers	Klink	Sweeney
Sisisky	Cook	Lantos	Talent
Skeen	Danner	Lazio	Tancredo
Skelton	Davis (IL)	Leach	Tauzin
Smith (MI)	DeGette	Lee	Taylor (NC)
Smith (NJ)	Delahunt	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Smith (TX)	Dickey	Maloney (NY)	Tierney
Snyder	Dicks	Martinez	Towns
Souder	Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Turner
Spence	Dixon	McCollum	Visclosky
Stearns	Dooley	McIntosh	Waters
Stump	Doolittle	Meehan	Watts (OK)
Sununu	Dunn	Meek (FL)	Waxman
Tanner	Ehlers	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Terry	Emerson	Miller, George	Wexler
Thomas	Ewing	Mollohan	Weygand
Thornberry	Farr	Neal	Whitfield
Thune	Fattah	Nethercutt	Wise
Thurman	Filner	Oberstar	Wolf
Tiahrt	Forbes	Ose	Young (AK)
Toomey			
Trafficant			
Udall (NM)			
Upton			
Velázquez			
Vitter			
Walden			
Walsh			
Wamp			
Watkins			
Watt (NC)			
Weiner			
Weldon (PA)			
Wilson			
Woolsey			
Wu			
Wynn			
Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—134

□ 0923  
Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 593, on November 3, 2000 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 593, I was in my congressional district on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY 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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2796,  
WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT  
ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 665 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 665

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only on this resolution.

H. Res. 656 provides for consideration of S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. In addition, the rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. This is the standard rule for this type of conference report, and it is without controversy as far as I know. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

The Water Resources Development Act, more commonly known as WRDA, is a critically important vehicle for environmental restoration projects. This year's bill is particularly noteworthy because it includes a plan to restore the Nation's Everglades in Florida. This restoration effort is the largest, most comprehensive restoration program ever attempted.

Not too long ago, most folks would have predicted it would be impossible to craft a restoration plan that gets it right and also wins the support of every major stakeholder involved in the Everglades. But that is exactly what this Congress has done. It is precisely the model for how we should deal with all of our environmental issues.

We drop the posturing. We quit using the trite catch phrases. We bring peo-

ple together, and we actually sit down at the table and rationally discuss the issues and work in good faith for the greater good based on science-based principles.

I am not entirely naive, and I understand that the reason it worked with the Everglades is that the parties realized that this was too important to let go further amuck. But this precisely is my point.

All environmental issues are important and should deserve the same attention and the same approach. We should not sacrifice the environment anywhere for short-term gain. I hope that the folks out there who make a living doing so will learn the lesson of the Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, folks on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about a do-nothing Congress. I note that President Clinton asserted recently that this has been one of the most productive sessions ever, which I think is a real tribute to our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER), frankly a direct disavowal of the statements of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), Minority Leader, that we are a do-nothing Congress.

But today's action is yet another in a very, very long list of examples that prove the Republican Congress delivers on Americans priorities. The challenge this Congress faced was to craft the plan that truly improves the hydrology and the hydroperiods and restores the unique natural environment of the Everglades, along with the other partners involved, the state of Florida and the interests that are involved in the areas of the Everglades.

The costs of doing nothing were far too great. The magnificent Everglades have suffered through years of neglect and misunderstanding. Doing nothing would have ensured disaster. Disaster, incidentally, had begun spreading to Florida Bay and even to the nearby coral reefs, which are unique in themselves.

Even so, as is often the case, the impulse to do something can often lead to unintended consequences. So, technically, we faced an incredible challenge. As daunting as the engineering problems are, even more so is the challenge of getting various stakeholders who often would not even speak to each other to find common ground. That is the snapshot of the immense challenge that we faced at the beginning of this process.

Well, here we are with a conference report, a final agreement. So it bears asking how we have tackled what Florida Governor Jeb Bush has now termed "perhaps the defining environmental issue of this new century". I think it is the defining issue. The Everglades bill is simply at the top of a very long list of environmental achievement for this Congress.

A lot of folks deserve our thanks for getting us here. The State of Florida

and Governor Jeb Bush have demonstrated an unmistakable commitment to this effort and led at every point in the process. The Clinton administration also deserves our praise.

In terms of steering the proposal through Congress, our two Senators deserve an inordinate amount of praise and recognition. In the House, the entire delegation supported the effort. But the House efforts were kept on track by the patience, perseverance and able leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), our delegation chairman.

□ 0930

I do not believe it is an understatement to say that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) was the key to our efforts here in the House. Anyone who cares about the Everglades should extend their gratitude to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I think he has done an extraordinary job.

It goes without saying that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) did an impressive job of stewardship on the Everglades, as well. This is, after all, where the bill comes from. And I want to commend them for their leadership in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, all these folks and many more deserve our thanks for making this historic achievement possible. This is a noncontroversial rule. It is an historic environmental restoration bill. As far as I know, it has bipartisan support.

I encourage my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the standard rule for consideration of a conference report in the House and is of no controversy. This conference report for the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 has been a matter of little controversy over the past few days, as the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has sought assurances from his leadership that funding for additional environmental infrastructure spending would be included in the Labor, HHS appropriations conference report.

I am supposing, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we are now considering this rule, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has received these assurances and whenever the Congress actually considers the Labor, HHS conference report, next week, Thanksgiving, Christmas, whenever that might be, the funding he has sought will be provided for in it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill in large part because of the funding in it for the restoration of the Florida Everglades. This project is one that has

long been sought by environmentalists and Floridians of all stripes, Republicans and Democrats alike.

This project is not a partisan project and no one should assume that it has come about because of the influence of any one Member of Congress. Rather, this is a project that has been a long time in the making on a bipartisan basis and should receive bipartisan support here today.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report; and I support the efforts of the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I only hope he enjoys the same kind of support from the Republican leadership and the assurances he has received will be fulfilled when we return after the election.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the dean of the Florida delegation and the person who is most responsible for crafting the mechanics that have brought this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in extremely strong support of this rule and this legislation to finally address the critical needs of the Florida Everglades, the most unique ecosystem anywhere on the face of this planet that is in danger of being lost for eternity.

We are at a critical mass in the issue of the Everglades, but today I think is going to be one of the better days in the House. On a very strong bipartisan basis, we are going to make an overt effort to begin to recover and protect the Florida Everglades.

The Everglades is home to some 68 endangered species of wildlife and plant life. Not only that, the issue of water in our part of Florida is extremely critical, water for people, water for agriculture, water for industry, water that today is running off at a billion gallons a day into the Gulf of Mexico, water that we are losing that is essential to the preservation of the Everglades and to the use of the people in Florida.

We have been appropriating money for the Everglades ever since 1993. We have appropriated over \$1.3 billion for the Everglades, but there has not been a real plan. There has not been real management. Today we create legislation that will bring about a real plan that will bring about real management. We have already appropriated for this fiscal year \$218.2 million. The Congress has already expressed its determination to save the Everglades, but we needed this plan along with the funding. And so, today we have the plan. I am satisfied that it will pass with a large vote.

I want to compliment my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this House and our colleagues in the other body and, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) said, the administration. Because it has been a total cooperative work effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just in a few closing comments thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for the strong leadership that he has provided on this historic legislation to preserve and protect the Everglades and to echo his comment about the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who is the chairman of the Florida Delegation. He has been just outstanding in his leadership in keeping the delegation together and keeping this issue alive as we worked through the trials and tribulations of this Congress. He has been a dynamic leader. And I will say that, if anybody gets a lot of credit today, it should be the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). But so should all the members of our delegation, Republicans and Democrats, who have worked together as a solid team to make this happen.

The Governor of Florida, Governor Jeb Bush, has walked the halls of the Congress trying to create and to sustain support for this Everglades project. The Governor of Florida and the legislature in Florida all deserve tremendous credit for where we are arriving today. And, of course, the State of Florida will pay 50 percent of all of the costs involved in this project. It is a 50-50 deal despite the fact that the Florida Everglades is unique to the entire world.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to be where we are, that we are going to pass this rule, and that we are going to pass this legislation and we are going to take a major important step toward the preservation of the Florida Everglades, the most unique ecosystem anywhere on the face of this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support this historic legislation to restore one of our nation's greatest environmental and ecological treasures, the Florida Everglades.

The Florida Everglades is unlike any other ecosystem in the world. It is comprised of more than 18,000 square miles of fresh water marshes spanning from Lake Okeechobee in the north to the Florida Keys in the south. Larger in land mass than Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Delaware combined, it is home to more than 60 individual endangered or threatened species of plants and animals, most or all of which will be come extinct without action.

Unfortunately, the Florida Everglades are dying. In response to flood concerns threatening the southern half of the state, a flood control plan was developed in the 1940s. The plan would soon establish hundreds of miles of canals and levees to ensure proper drainage. It worked too well. Fifty years later, almost half of the Everglades have been lost. Life-giving fresh water has been diverted out

to sea, and the delicate balance of fresh and salt water that is unique to the Everglades has been upset. Without immediate action, the ecosystem as we know it will be unrecoverable. Furthermore, the Florida Aquifer faces the threat of saltwater intrusion, compromising the already scarce supply of potable water to the residents of South Florida.

However, with the action of the Congress today, we can begin to reverse the damage and restore this pristine ecosystem. The restoration plan developed to address this crisis is the culmination of years of research by state and federal scientists, private environmental and agricultural experts and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The restoration plan is comprised of 68 individual projects to be completed by the Corps of Engineers over the next 30 years at a total cost of over \$7 billion, to be divided equally with the state of Florida. The bill we approve today is the first step toward implementation of the restoration plan. It authorizes \$1.2 billion for 10 initial projects and four pilot projects to test new technology critical to the restoration. Once completed, the plan will restore more than 1.7 billion gallons of fresh water per day, replicating the original sheet flow of water through the natural system. This massive undertaking is the largest environmental restoration plan in history and comes at a cost not to be dismissed. However, the fact remains that without this plan, the Everglades will die.

As Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked hard to protect the Florida Everglades. My committee has included, to date, \$730,000,000 in Department of Interior funding for the Everglades and \$142,360,000 in the Energy and Water Appropriation for Everglades related projects. These funds have gone toward land acquisition and critical projects that began the journey toward recovery of this ecosystem. The State of Florida has matched every dollar with water reuse and recovery projects and the most ambitious land acquisition agenda of any State in history.

Mr. Speaker, the Everglades restoration plan enjoys the support of the entire Florida Congressional delegation, the Governor of Florida, the Administration, and nearly every major environmental and agricultural organization in Florida, as well as the Seminole Tribe and the Miccosukee Tribe of Florida. Without this plan and without action by this Congress, we threaten the existence of one of our greatest national treasures. Let's do the right thing and restore the Everglades so that future generations of Americans can know and enjoy this natural wonder.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could rise today and offer my unqualified support for the conference WRDA bill that is before us today. But I want to be clear that the version that came out of the House I thought had a lot of good provisions in it that have been watered down now. Changes were made on the Senate side, however, that I think set us back in two major areas of concern.

One is the much needed comprehensive Corps reform that I think is desperately needed for that embattled agency.

Earlier this year, I, along with a few other of my colleagues, introduced comprehensive Corps reform, H.R. 4879. This was not an anti-Corps reform bill that we introduced. It merely reflected the need for some change for the embattled agency to lift the cloud that currently hangs over it.

The original WRDA coming out of the House contained some pilot projects for important independent peer reviews that I think is needed in order to let the sun shine in on the Corps' water resource projects.

Unfortunately, instead of adopting the pilot language in the conference report, they instead stripped it out of the language and, in fact, ordered another couple of studies for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct over the next couple of years, one involving independent peer review mind you.

The problem I have with that, however, is that the National Academy of Science has already devoted years of study to this and, in fact, last year already released a comprehensive review and recommendations for Corps reform in the "New Directions and Water Resources Planning" for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

It was this study that came out last year that provided the basis of much of what was contained in my comprehensive Corps reform bill. I do not think it is necessary for us to be allocating a few million more dollars for the National Academy of Sciences to continue their study on Corps reform when, in fact, they have already done it in depth with great analysis and with a lot of fine recommendations that we need to move forward on.

There are, however, some good provisions in this bill regarding Corps reform. One provision requires enhanced public participation in the review of feasibility studies and Corps projects and also one that directs the Secretary to design mitigation projects using contemporary understanding of science and mitigating adverse environmental effects, which was, language that was included in the Corps reform bill that we had introduced earlier this year.

So I think we still need to do more work. I do not think now is the time to conduct more studies with the National Academy of Sciences.

But the other provision of this, Mr. Speaker, relates to how we can better preserve and protect another vitally important natural resource in this country, the Mississippi River Basin. And with that, we are very pleased that we were able to keep in the conference report a scientific modeling program on sedimentation and nutrient flows for the Mississippi River Basin.

Any expert on the river will tell you that problem is the number one danger

facing that important ecosystem. In fact, it is North America's largest migratory route, as well as providing incredibly important functions relating to commercial navigation, tourism, and recreation activities.

I think having the scientific modeling program in place is an important first step in being able to direct targeted resources in a more cost-effective manner in order to preserve this important natural resource.

Unfortunately, again the language on the House was not adopted. The Senate, in fact, included a 50-50 cost share with States, which many of us think is going to put the modeling program in danger. Hopefully, the States will recognize the need to participate. But many of the people who we got feedback from at the State level were concerned about the 50-50 cost-share that is ultimately included in this bill. We are just going to have to wait and see how that plays out.

But finally this WRDA bill has good language in regards to a lower Mississippi River resource assessment, basically directing an assessment on information needed for river-related management, habitat needs, the need for river-related recreation and access in the lower part of the Mississippi River Basin.

We have a very successful Environmental Management Program that affects the Upper Mississippi River with habitat restoration, and long-term resource monitoring. Now is the time to start treating the Mississippi as the continuous ecosystem that it is and take a holistic approach. I believe this Lower Mississippi River resources assessment is the first step to extend EMP to lower regions of the River so we have a comprehensive and holistic approach to river management.

Finally, I want to commend the leadership on the House, the chair and the ranking members of the appropriate committees for the work they have put into this important bill and especially the attention that has been given on the House side in regards to steps we can take for Corps reform and how we can better manage and preserve and protect the Mississippi River Basin.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the west coast of Florida (Mr. MILLER) my close colleague and distinguished friend.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the west coast of Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the 106th Congress, it is really a pleasure to have such a significant piece of legislation that has very wide bipartisan support. This is a bill that is especially concerned about the Everglades issue that has the support of the administration and Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, it made it very difficult to pass legislation, because the way it is set up we go to subcommittee and full committee and the floor of the House, and we have to get a conference where the House and the Senate agree and get an agreement with the agencies of the Federal Government. It is indeed a very complex challenge. But we are here today with final passage of a very, very significant piece of legislation, the most significant environmental bill I think in many a year to reverse a half century of environmental damages done to the Florida Everglades.

I want to give compliments and thanks to the leadership that has brought this forward, Senators MACK and GRAHAM on the Senate side and Senator BOB SMITH, the chairman of that committee.

On the House side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the ranking member, and the chairman of the subcommittee on the House side. And within the Florida Delegation, again all the Republicans and Democrats have come together, but the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who is the chairman of the Florida delegation, has really led the effort to make sure that it is being pushed forward, pushing the Senate leadership, pushing our leadership, pushing the committee chairman to get to this bill. It is too important to not let die. We need it. Thank goodness we are going to end the 106th Congress or come close to ending it with such a significant piece of legislation.

To my conservative colleagues, there is a concern because of the total cost of it because it is billions of dollars over several decades. But, first of all, it is a split. The Federal Government will pick up about 50 percent. The State and local government will pick up about 50 percent.

□ 0945

There were safeguards built in so that the money will not get totally out of control.

The reason we are doing this is the Federal government, through the Corps of Engineers some 50 years ago, started digging these dikes and canals and environmentally caused the problem.

Since they caused the problem, they have to be part of the solution. That is the reason we are here today, is they are going to have to remove some 240 miles of levees and canals that were built over the past decades that have now diverted 2 billion gallons of water that should flow to the Everglades that now is pushed through the Caloosahatchee River or the Saint Lucie Inlet, pushing the water into the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico.

We need to allow that to flow into the Everglades, just as Marjory Stoneman Douglas wrote in her classic book 50 years ago, *River of Grass*. We need to make sure that fresh water flows through there.

We are never going to get total restoration, because a lot of it is now in agricultural use, a lot is already developed. But we can at least bring it back as best we can to how a century ago it was that river of grass.

I am pleased to have this before us, and I complement the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I hope we have a unanimous vote on this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend everybody involved, and the powerful leaders, the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. YOUNG and Mr. GOSS.

I serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, formerly known as the Committee on Public Works. I can remember the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) as a member of the Committee on Public Works bringing forth the idea of cleaning up the Everglades and cleaning up those systems that contribute, ultimately, to the destination points where the accumulation of these things happened.

I have also watched in the Congress the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), and I think he has done a good job in bringing the Everglades program forward. I want to compliment those two gentlemen for the bipartisanship that happened here.

Back when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) was talking about the Everglades, I was talking about the upper Ohio Valley and the Pennsylvania steel mills, the Gary, Indiana, and Chicago area, and all of those rivers polluted by the steel industry that ultimately led that contaminant downstream into points where the impact of contamination made it now so terrible that the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. SHAW and Mr. DEUTSCH, and everybody else had to deal with that issue in their home State.

Mr. Speaker, I was able to get the Mahoning River in Youngstown, Ohio, designated and authorized as one of only five rivers in America eligible for environmental dredging.

Here is the problem we face: Florida can evidently afford this 50 percent match to clean up the Everglades, but the city of Youngstown in the Mahoning Valley, depressed, cannot afford the 50 percent match.

Here is the dilemma. While we continue to have the upper river system contaminants continuing to flow, cleaning up the ultimate depositories do not ultimately serve the best interests of America.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the

gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). They have been great leaders on this issue.

But I am appealing that we must reduce and if necessary eliminate the matching monies necessary for economically depressed communities who have contaminated rivers who will continue to contaminate the Everglades and the depositories of our great Nation.

That issue, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), must be addressed. My local community cannot meet the match. I have been getting all the monies for the studies, everything the Army Corps of Engineers has done. But I think we need relief to those upper systems who are continuing to contaminate those systems we clean up.

I say to the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. SHAW and Mr. DEUTSCH, congratulations, and I hope they will help me in the future to eliminate or reduce the local match for impacted areas like ours that cannot afford to clean up those contaminated rivers.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the distinguished chairman of the Florida delegation, a man to whom many nice and well-deserved compliments have been paid in getting us to this point.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I very much appreciate the work of this great body.

Mr. Speaker, as extraordinary as it has been to see traditional adversaries come together this year on comprehensive Everglades restoration legislation contained in the Water Resources Development Act, something else is going on here which I think is very special and I think is very worthwhile noting.

Skeptics have been saying, and they have been at our heels in recent weeks, we will not get it done. To them I say, we will. Some have gone around the country saying a Republican Congress cannot work with a Democrat administration to produce good policy for the American people. We have and we will. Others have lost patience and doubted our ability to lead and get this done in this short span of time. Well, we have proven them wrong, also.

The fact is this: When both parties come to the table with sincere good-faith efforts to get something done without hidden agendas and with eyes towards the next generation and not just the next election, building upon relationships of good will, not destroying them, we can do good things for our country and for the entire globe.

We all recognize the importance of this legacy, not only on the land and water, but on the people who live in Florida and visit this national treasure, and want to make sure that it is there for future generations.

My colleagues know, I have worked my entire career and will continue to work to build bridges across the aisle. There is no better example of doing that, as I am looking at my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and looking at my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), whose congressional districts share the Everglades, to say that this is certainly a very fine moment.

I have offered several bills on the environment, but none makes me prouder to have my name on it than the comprehensive Everglades restoration bill, because I have been looking after this piece of my backyard for my entire life.

I am eager to see this legislation pass, not because the base Everglades bill has my name on it, but because it is the right thing to do and because a broad cross-section of Americans have put their support and their hard work into getting us to this day.

I urge the passage of this resolution, this rule, and also push for the passage of the underlying bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), my friend and colleague from the east coast, who also has been very instrumental in pulling all the parties together in an amicable way to reach this solution.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this rule to the floor. Of course, I urge all Members to support this very important landmark legislation. It is one of the proudest moments that I will probably have here on the floor is to see the Florida delegation unanimous on an issue of importance to our State and to our Nation.

Many people look at the Everglades and say it is Florida's issue, it is Florida's problem. But it is America's crown jewel. It is something we share not only with ourselves as natives of Florida, but also those 45-plus million visitors who come to Florida for the pristine wonderment of whether it be our oceans, our Everglades, our Keys, or our panhandle.

Marjory Stoneman Douglas penned a novel, the *River of Grass*, about the wonders of the Everglades. Back in the thirties when candidates were running for office, one notably Mr. Broward, who became Governor, used to say the slogan, elect me Governor and I will drain that swamp, known as the Everglades, so we will have development.

How wrong they were then, how right we are today, to reverse decades of abuse and neglect of our national park; to start paving the way, if you will, and maybe that is not the correct expression, paving the way, but creating the dynamics by which we can reengineer Florida's multitude of plumbing

projects in order to make the Everglades once again the clean and pristine waterway and natural habitat that it is and should be.

The delegation has been led by so many champions, too many to mention, back in the days of the governorship of BOB GRAHAM, now Senator, CONNIE MACK, and others.

We are truly a bipartisan State as it relates to the Everglades. Lawton Chiles, in his memory, would be so proud today to know after the years he served as our chief executive that one of his greatest efforts is now coming to fruition.

The chairman of Florida's delegation was mentioned. There is a lot to be said for seniority in this process. The 20 years of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) of service to Floridians, to those in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach County, the hallmark of his 20-year tenure here, results in this bill being brought to the floor because he pleaded with the Speaker and all parties at the table, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and others, to make sure that this bill became the final act of this final hour of the 106th Congress.

What a tribute and what a legacy to his grandchildren, 13 I believe now in number, maybe 11, two to come, 13 soon will know that their grandpoppy made possible this historic day on a Friday before we adjourn and return to our constituencies in Florida.

So I salute every Member, Democrat and Republican, in our delegation, every person who will vote for this bill, and I urge, I hope, a unanimous acceptance of the fact that we take on the national responsibility of our national park, the Everglades, by signalling to the world we are prepared to lead, we are prepared to clean up our act, and we are prepared to make it the great park that it truly is.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge adoption of this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out, I see my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), who did not speak on this. I have been privileged to have worked with him for a number of years on this, back and forth. The gentleman from Florida has the front door, I have the back door. Most people prefer to go in the front door, but the back door is equally good. We have gotten along very, very well over the years.

I think of the number of days I have actually been in the Everglades with BOB GRAHAM. I remember an occasion where I stood on the banks of the then straight Kissimmee Channel, and he said, we are going to put some wrinkles back in this. He got a truck, and we started pouring dirt back into the channel. I thought, this has got to be

against the law. We are all going to end up in deep trouble.

All of these programs that have taken so many people so much vision to work out the formula to get all of the interested parties going in the same direction have been referred to in this discussion. It is an extraordinary story, and I hope some day somebody will write the book. It will be a wonderful book about what Americans can do in this country when they work together.

I am very pleased to express my strong support for this good piece of bipartisan legislation, and I urge support for the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 665, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 31, 2000, at page H11624.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

□ 1000

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

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting, I believe, that the last major piece of legislation that is brought before the Congress before we return home for the election next Tuesday is the water resources bill, which includes the largest environmental restoration project in the history of the world, the restoration of the Everglades.

As the chairman of that conference, I can say with absolute certainty that we would not be here today doing this, if it were not for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman has been the ultimate driving force.

When we were negotiating and thought that we had our hands tied in our negotiations with the other body, looked like we were not going to get anywhere, it was the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. SHAW) who insisted that we stay at the table. And while there are many people on both sides of the aisle who deserve credit for this legislation, we would not be here today if it were not for the gentleman from Florida.

The conference report includes water resource development projects for America. It responds to the Nation's water infrastructure and environmental restoration needs. It includes important authorizations, modifications and improvements to the Army Corps of Engineers water resources programs and projects as well.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisles for working so hard for this environmental restoration and water resources bill. With its estimated total costs of \$7 billion, it invests in America's future by authorizing new projects for navigation, flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration, water supply, and recreation.

It fosters partnerships between Federal and non-Federal agencies. It authorizes 30 new water resource projects that have received or will receive favorable review from the Corps. It modifies over 50 existing water resources projects. It authorizes 58 new studies.

It includes the various policy and procedural reforms to improve public participation. It authorizes the environmental restoration projects and programs that address several national needs throughout the country, including, Illinois, Missouri, Mississippi, the Ohio rivers and the Lower Columbia Estuary, including Puget Sound and the Chesapeake Bay.

WRDA 2000 approves and authorizes the first increment of the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan, and it should be emphasized the text in this bill, which will become law, is the language that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) introduced in his bill, H.R. 5121, some time ago.

My colleagues should know, however, that the Senate conferees did not accept some of the critical, important provisions included in the bill that passed the House by a vote of 394-14.

While this is a good package on balance, it does fail to include environmental infrastructure projects under the Corps of Engineers jurisdiction. It also fails to include the text of the bill by the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) relating to cleanup of the San Gabriel and Central Basins and the text of the bill from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), H.R. 673, relating to water quality protection in the Florida Keys.

It was with great reluctance, but with a desire to ensure enactment of this legislation that the House conferees ultimately agreed to the Senate's request to delete these provisions. However, as part of that compromise,

there was also an agreement that these projects could or should be considered in the context of proposed legislation yet to move through the Congress if the so-called environmental infrastructure package also included important legislation addressing combined sewer overflow and sanitary overflows.

House conferees have lived up to that commitment submitting to the Committee on Appropriations a package of environmental infrastructure projects that passed the House overwhelmingly on October 19, as well as the broadly supported text of the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCHIA), the Wet Weather Water Quality Act which was reported by our committee on October 6.

Mr. Speaker, this environmental infrastructure legislation provides needed assistance to help communities throughout the Nation to keep raw sewage out of citizens' basements and backyards. It protects streams and rivers and bays, the Florida Keys, and the drinking water supply for over 1.3 million residents in California.

It is regrettable that we could not retain these provisions in this legislation today, but I am pleased with the assurances we received that they will be included as we wrap up our appropriations bill when we come back after the election.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not only to support this landmark legislation on the floor, but to work with our friends and the appropriators and the House and Senate leadership to ensure that the rest of the environmental infrastructure provisions in the conference are enacted before the end of the 106th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would note that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Congress is the most productive committee of the Congress, the most bipartisan committee of the Congress. This Congress has passed 109 pieces of legislation through the House and 42 pieces of legislation which are becoming law. So I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and our committee for their tremendous efforts so that our committee could, indeed, do the people's business in this Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. This conference report reflects the bipartisanship that is the hallmark of our success on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We invest in America's future by providing critical infrastructure, while working to restore, enhance and protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. SHUSTER). It seems appro-

priate that the last major authorization bill to pass this Congress would be under his leadership. His success in leading this committee on a bipartisan basis is well known.

He has earned a great reputation for that bipartisanship; and because of his great efforts and success throughout the past 6 years, certainly the people of our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and people throughout the United States of America are benefiting from the improved infrastructure. He has been a great chairman. He is one who I take great pride in serving.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a word, if I may, about the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), my subcommittee chairman, my good friend. There is, I think, very few people in this whole Congress, Mr. Speaker, who stand so firmly for the environment as the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); and no one I know in the entire Congress who is more willing to cross the aisle and do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, the projects included in the conference report form the water-based infrastructure that is a key component of the Nation's transportation system. Projects in the water resources bill also protect lives and property from floods and hurricanes, and they provide drinking water and electricity to our cities and factories.

Projects are the more visible aspect of the conference report, but there are also provisions that will improve the way in which the Corps implements its programs. I am disappointed that the conference report does not include the House-passed provisions concerning mitigation.

We should be requiring the Corps to be more aware earlier of possible adverse environmental impacts. I intend to revisit this issue in the next Congress.

The agreement also deletes House language that required the Secretary to establish a 3-year program of independent peer review of up to five projects.

While some have argued for a permanent peer review program, I believe that a pilot program would have allowed the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to evaluate its effectiveness.

Next Congress, those who advocate permanent peer review may prevail.

I strongly support the requirement to monitor the performance of up to five projects for 12 years. Today we authorize and construct projects, but we do not adequately follow up on whether the expected benefits are ever realized.

This monitoring will be an important tool in helping the Corps and the Congress produce a more effective Corps civil works program.

The conference report approves the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan as a framework for modification

and operational changes to the Central and South Florida project to restore, preserve, and protect the Everglades ecosystem. It also authorizes the first installment of the plan for \$1.4 billion. The total plan will cost at least \$7.8 billion and take 36 years to construct.

Since 1986, Mr. Speaker, Congress has tried to maintain a 2-year cycle to enact water resources legislation. Such a cycle is important to providing certainty and stability to the program. This conference report is a continuation of that process and should receive strong bipartisan support today in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, this comprehensive, bipartisan legislation will help save the Everglades, restore rivers and watersheds throughout the country, keep communities safe from floods and hurricanes, and repair and improve America's water transportation infrastructure, which is the lifeblood of our domestic and global economy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I can tell my colleagues that this legislation has been long in the making.

Our subcommittee held hearings throughout the year, as well as last year, on the bill's key issues and provisions. We have, on a bipartisan basis, reviewed hundreds of project requests and scores of important and timely water policy issues.

I think the committee leadership and the conferees have done a good job of balancing competing interest and treating Members and their constituents fairly.

Mr. Speaker, this is landmark legislation. It is our best hope to save the Everglades and to restore the balance between the human environment and the natural system in South Florida. The world is watching, and I am proud of what this institution has produced at this critical moment.

There are many players in this exciting drama. We owe a debt of gratitude to Governor Jeb Bush of Florida, the entire Florida legislature and the bipartisan Florida congressional delegation led by the tenaciousness of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). He is the prime motivator behind this legislation, and he is due a round of thanks.

Through their efforts, we are able to move forward with a consensus package that gives overall approval to the 36 year, \$7.8 billion plan and specifically authorizes \$1.4 billion in projects to get the water right.

I want to emphasize, as this legislation does itself, that the primary purpose of this landmark, unprecedented activity in the Everglades is to restore the natural system. We must continue to be reminded of that fundamental truth, and people like Bob Semple will be watching, as they should.

We are going to have to monitor this project closely and continue to review the science to ensure that it accomplishes this fundamental goal. Indeed, as the project moves forward, we may need more legislative safeguards, such as requiring explicitly that 50 percent of the restoration benefits be achieved by the time that 50 percent of the funds are spent. For now, this legislation sets us on the right path.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report does not include everything one would have hoped for as is to be expected with difficult compromises. For example, the Senate prevailed in deleting important provisions on environmental infrastructure for the Nation and regional environmental restoration for areas such as the Missouri River, the San Gabriel Basin in California, and the Florida Keys. Make no mistake about it, though, on balance, this conference report is a good, solid compromise that will advance ecosystem restoration and protection throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in not thanking all the staff of the House, Senate, and administration for their efforts to make this happen. In particular, I want to thank Sara Gray, a staff member in my office and then on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for her efforts relating to WRDA 2000. Sara, if you are taking a break now from your studying for law school exams and watching these proceedings, thanks for all you did to help the committee keep track of and review the many requests for projects and provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2796 is landmark environmental legislation. It did not come about by accident. It is by design by a painstaking bipartisan process.

Let me say also that the Everglades are a treasure not just for Florida, but for America; and we are preserving and enhancing that magnificent resource.

Finally, let me say as we come to the end of 6 years of bipartisanship on the subcommittee what a pleasure it has been to work with my colleague, the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), to fashion responsible legislation in a responsible way. It was a give and take, always with the best interest of America at heart.

It has been a rare privilege for me to chair this subcommittee and to work with such a distinguished man as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman

from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), you have been the best. And from this Member and all our colleagues, we owe a debt of gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his outstanding leadership.

□ 1015

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). All Members are reminded that their remarks should be directed to the Chair.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. Let me begin by congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), ranking members, for a fine job on this legislation, as on so many pieces of legislation that have come out of the generally bipartisan work of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I confess, I know very little about the Everglades. I am not going to speak about the Everglades. But I know a fair amount about the Port of New York and New Jersey. In this bill is some absolutely essential provisions for the Port of New York and New Jersey.

This bill authorizes funding to deepen the channels to Newark and Elizabeth and Howland Hook and Bayonne and, for the first time, to Brooklyn to 50 feet, so that we can accommodate the deeper superships that are coming in.

Mr. Speaker, the shipping companies are following the airlines and going to a hub and feeder port system. But there is going to be, in 15 years, one major port on the Eastern Seaboard, and that should be in the United States. We are in competition with Halifax as to which is going to be the major hub port on the Eastern Seaboard.

The provisions in this bill enabling us to get to 50 feet in the Port of New York and New Jersey will go a long way to making sure that we have the hub port on the American coast in New York and not in Halifax. That will be instrumental in hundreds of thousands of jobs and a great deal of maritime commerce in the United States, which is very important to us, obviously.

This bill is particularly important because it recognizes, confirms the report of the chief engineer for the Army Corps which, for the first time, recognizes the necessity or the possibility, even, of a major container shipping port in Brooklyn on the east side of the harbor instead of having the ports only on the west side.

If we are going to be the hub port and we are going to be able to take 14 million or 15 million TEUs or 16 million TEUs, if we are going to be able to go up to the forecast 15 million or 16 million or 17 million TEUs, twenty-foot equivalent units, in the next 20 or 30 years, as is forecast, we are going to need all the land available for ports on both sides of the harbor, in New York, and New Jersey and Bayonne and Howland Hook and Elizabeth and Newark and Brooklyn. This bill, for the first time, makes that possible.

We will need to do a lot of additional work and probably additional appropriations to make that happen, but this bill makes it possible. It is a very far-sighted piece of legislation. I am very appreciative of it. I rise in full support of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for expeditiously bringing us this bill today.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman SHAW) for his dogged determination in bringing this bill to the floor. We all love the Everglades. Without the gentleman's hard work and dedication, we would not be here today addressing this subject. I think the world should know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) had a lot to do with making this possible.

It is also important to my district, Mr. Speaker, Congress recognizes the importance of preserving and protecting our beaches from further erosion. This bill does that for the beaches on Long Beach Island.

New Jersey is the most densely populated State in the Nation with the coastal communities continuing to grow at a rapid pace. In addition, tourists double and sometimes triple the local population in the summer as people flock to the shore.

The continued economic health of the coastal communities depend on a sustainable shoreline that will protect existing homes and businesses from continued erosion and storm damage. The narrowing and lowering of beaches and dunes along Long Beach Island has reduced the storm protection that would otherwise have been available.

Major storms which occurred in March of 1984, October of 1991, January of 1992 and December of 1992 have taken their toll on our beaches. This continued storm damage has eroded the beaches completely in some areas

where the water is actually washing under homes.

The storms of 1992 qualified for disaster assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and many areas of the shoreline have not fully recovered even today.

We have been working on this project for 8 years with the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers. It is designed to repair Long Beach Island's beaches, to protect them for the next 50 years. Therefore, I would like to urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA, because of its vital importance in funding projects that will protect coastal communities from future storm damage throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for the important part that he played in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished vice chairman of our caucus.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), our ranking Democrat, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) for working together to bring this bill in the late stages of this Congress. It is an incredibly important piece of legislation which has been crafted which has been critical to help our country's waterways.

The country needs this legislation to improve our ports, our channels, our waterways and our environment. We also need it to reduce flooding, increase our competitiveness, and create more jobs. That is why it is critical to pass this Water Resources Development Act.

Now, this legislation could not arrive at a more critical time for the Port of New York and New Jersey, which generates 180,000 jobs and \$20 billion of economic activity. That is because right now in my own home district where the Port of Elizabeth and Newark, which is really where the greatest activity within the port region resides, our port is beginning to handle more traffic and cargo. It is creating more jobs.

But without the authorization for deeper channels contained in this bill, all of this recent growth is in jeopardy. Deepening the port means more trade and commerce with a better environment. Not deepening the port means commerce, goods and, most importantly, jobs generated by the port all being shipped to Canada. Consumers in the New Jersey, New York metropol-

itan area would have to pay more to get goods to their shelves.

Now, I am concerned the conference report does not include a provision giving the local sponsor of the Port Jersey Channel deepening credit for the work it has done and will do prior to the signing of its final agreement. But I plan to work with my colleagues to pass this provision before we adjourn.

In the past, WRDA has contained important provisions on sediment decontamination, the beneficial use of dredge material, and environmental dredging. That is because we know that commerce and the environment are not mutually exclusive issues. They are interdependent concerns that determine the quality of life for our constituents. So we can deepen the port of New York and New Jersey in an environmentally responsible way.

I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to make sure that growth takes place in the days ahead.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my good friend and classmate.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the conference report for S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act, and would like to emphasize my support specifically for the Everglades language.

As many of my colleagues have already stated during this debate, the Everglades provisions represent a major step toward restoration of this unique ecosystem. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, I have become involved in this restoration effort as it directly impacts the natural areas in Federal ownership, including Everglades National Park, Big Cypress Natural Preserve and several national wildlife refuges. Their future and that of the numerous species who make the Everglades their home depend upon the success of this effort. Only if the Corps of Engineers carries out their restoration initiative properly will they survive.

I might say that, in our committee, we have appropriated \$738 million as our share of this project with a total of about a \$1.35 billion thus far for the Federal Government.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for recognizing that the environment must be the primary beneficiary of the water made available through the comprehensive plan for the restoration.

The object of the plan is to restore, preserve, and protect the natural system while also meeting the water supply, flood protection and agriculture needs of the region. I might emphasize I think this is very commendable that the point of protecting the water supply for the Everglades is a primary objective here.

As we make our way through this massive ecosystem restoration, I intend to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we remain focused on the restoration of the natural areas.

I commend the Members on their bipartisan work in bringing this legislation to the floor today and urge the Members of the House to support and pass it.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), senior member of the committee.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for a colloquy so if he can hang around a minute. But I want to start out by saying that I am not surprised.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am at the gentleman's beck and call.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has basically been unparalleled. The reason for that is he is a brilliant Pitt man. The University of Pittsburgh almost whacked out Virginia Tech last week, and they are on the rise. But I want to pay special tribute to a Pittsburgh alum who has distinguished himself head and shoulders above most.

I want to also thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), and everyone involved here.

But as I talked on the rule, I talked about a problem that I think must be addressed by this committee. No matter how many ultimate depositories of water that are impacted upon by contaminated flow from upstream upriver contaminated points and sources of points, there will never be a cleanup of our environment.

Now, here is the trick bag I am in, Mr. Speaker. I have been able to get over a couple million dollars to start the cleanup of the Mahoning River that runs right through the middle of the third largest steel producing region in the world at one time, and the contaminants are 4 and 5 feet deep. They must be cleaned.

Now we are at the point where we need a 50 percent match. My depressed community cannot afford that match. So as a result, while we are cleaning up these down-river depositories, we continue to have the overflow from the contaminant source point contamination situation.

With that in mind, in the colloquy, I want to know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) is willing, even though he will not be chairman, he will be one of the most

powerful Members in this body, be willing to work with me next year to reduce and, when necessary because of such a depression, if necessary, to eliminate that match so as we could stop the continuing contamination of the Everglades and other points downstream?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always my pleasure to work with the former Pitt quarterback. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER). I take that as a yes answer. I will hold him to that.

I compliment everybody for this great bill. I support it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a distinguished member of our committee.

□ 1030

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment the chairman for getting this bill to the floor and also our leadership for having this bill on the floor today and having a vote on it.

I represent a district that has 200 miles of the Illinois River all along my district. This bill includes an authorization to really begin to clean up and fix up and stop the siltation that has occurred on the Illinois River that is inhibiting transportation, inhibiting recreation, and inhibiting the great aesthetic value that the Illinois River provides from Chicago all the way to Alton.

This is a very good project, and it is a project that has brought together a lot of agricultural interests, a lot of business interests, a lot of transportation interests, a lot of conservation interests. The Nature Conservancy has done a great job on the Illinois River. We have a great CREP program that sets aside land along the Illinois River. This really brings it all together.

I want to thank the Lieutenant Governor of our State, the Governor of our State, and all Members of our delegation who have supported this every effort. I appreciate again the opportunity to have this included in this important bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a valuable member from our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is unprecedented legislation in an unprecedented session. I want to congratulate the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER). I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) on a great job well done. They have set the pace in this session.

I rise in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act, this conference report. As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I was pleased to work with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to construct legislation to amend the Clean Water Act to establish a nationally consistent wet weather control standard for combined sewer and overflows.

This bill was drafted by the committee and is a combination of two bills that were introduced in the 106th Congress. I am pleased that language from a bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I introduced, the Combined Sewer Overflow Control and Partnership Act of 1999, is included.

I say to the chairman, the ranking member, those involved, this legislation is not the sexy material which we in the legislature like to talk about many times, but there are not too many communities throughout the land that have the wherewithal or the resources to deal with the problem of combined sewer overflows. They just do not have the dollars and yet they are supposed to comply with EPA regulations and standards. Some of those communities have already been fined. This is going to go a long way in cleaning up our water system in the United States.

The language that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I wrote authorizes \$1.5 billion for grant to municipalities and States for these projects. It authorizes \$45 million in grants for demonstration projects on the use of watershed management for wet weather control in urban areas and to determine the most effective management practices for wet weather flows. This is a tremendous victory for towns all over America.

The grant programs established in this legislation will finally give these towns, large and small, resources they need to clean up their sewer systems and to comply with the Clean Water Act.

Urban wet weather pollution affects every community in this Nation. Discharges from urban areas and sewer systems during wet weather occur in either one or a combination of forms, including combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows.

These discharges constitute the most pervasive, most costly municipal challenge to achieving the goals of the Clean Water Act. In other words, without this legislation, this is not going to get done. The problems are extremely

evasive, very broadly due to the intermittent and temporary nature of storm events that caused it.

The bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I introduced strengthens the Clean Water Act to address the highest priority municipal water quality issues by including targeted reforms that redirect the Environmental Protection Agency's wet weather program in hopes of yielding greater success.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this conference report. I again thank the chairman and thank the ranking member.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of our committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the chair of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for his leadership. And I wanted to reach across the aisle and thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and others who have worked so hard in making certain that today we saw this legislation before the Congress.

I particularly, as an observer of this process, want to pay thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). We have 435 Members, but to get something to final passage takes the perseverance and the dedication and commitment. I was in the legislature in Florida back some 20-some years ago, and they talked about saving the Everglades. I have been in the Congress for nearly 8 years, and they have talked about saving the Everglades. This today shows and demonstrates what the persistence of one individual can do and has done.

So I salute the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for his tremendous efforts. I think as we grow older we see how important it is that we preserve the natural treasures around us and certainly the Everglades is a national treasure. So today is an important day, an historic day. But one individual has helped make that possible. So I come to the floor to salute my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), again for making what others have talked about a reality.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this WRDA conference report. This bill has two very important authorization projects for the residents of Marin and Sonoma counties in my district in California.

Along with the committee's majority leadership, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and their staffs for all the work they have done, as well as my Bay Area colleague on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from

California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her assistance. It has taken some hard work of each of them and for the Petaluma community, but I am delighted that this conference report is a home run for my city. On behalf of the city government and my neighbors in Petaluma, I greatly appreciate the effort of the committee to work through a complex situation.

This new authorization for the Petaluma River Control Project will keep residents and businesses safe. It will also make affordable the protection that residents need without putting an unfair financial burden on the city.

I realize this authorization is not, however, all about me and about my city. This authorization is about the blueprint for restoring the Florida Everglades. The people I represent are very supportive of this restoration of such an important ecosystem, and we are looking forward to it being restored to its natural glory.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be fun to work together and vote together on a bipartisan issue. I thank my colleagues for my gift, and I thank them for making this possible for our Nation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) who has been tenacious in his efforts to protect the Great Lakes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his leadership on this legislation. Without his efforts, this bipartisan bill would not be on the floor today.

Water scarcity is becoming a worldwide problem. Over 166 million people in 18 countries are suffering from water shortages, and almost 270 million in 11 additional countries are considered water stressed. Experts predict that by 2025, one-fourth of the world will suffer from lack of water. Given the pressures of dropping water tables, present-day water usage cannot be sustained. Some are trying to change fresh water from a resource to a commodity.

Given these statistics, it is not surprising that there are now proposals to withdraw bulk quantities of water in the Great Lakes Basin. After all, the Great Lakes comprise one-fifth of the Earth's fresh water resources and contain over six quadrillion gallons of water.

This year, lake levels are at an all-time low, which is especially concerning after the wet summer we have had. The Detroit News reported that Lake Superior is seven inches below its long-term average, near lows not seen since 1920; Lake Michigan and Huron are six inches below average. Now is the time to work on this matter. Prudent management of our natural resources means looking ahead and planning for the future. We must be respon-

sible stewards of our environment to ensure that our children are not denied the resources that we are able to enjoy today.

For the past 15 years, the governors of the Great Lakes States, in consultation with the Canadian premiers, have effectively managed the Great Lakes Basin. Today we have the opportunity to protect regional control of the basin and ensure its long-term stability.

I have worked very diligently with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and Senator ABRAHAM in the other body to include language in this conference report which ensures that control of Great Lakes water remains in the hands of the Great Lakes governors. The language in this bill is the culmination of a great deal of work to assure that these waters are effectively protected.

I urge Members of the Great Lakes States and all Members of Congress to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for their hard work on this bill.

I would like to especially recognize the landmark legislation with respect to the Everglades on which my colleague from school and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) has been working on for a very long time. Hopefully, some day the Columbia River Gorge in the Pacific Northwest would receive some similar treatment as the Everglades are receiving today because the Columbia Gorge combines natural beauty along with being a commercially crucial transportation corridor. The major cities and towns of the Northwest depend on the Columbia River and that gorge. And yet the gorge is also an ecological singularity. It is truly unique and deserves special consideration. But that is in the future.

There are small parts of this bill which are absolutely vital to the Pacific Northwest. I cite, in particular, the work which is going to be done on the Astoria, Oregon East Mooring Basin. There is a causeway there which needs to be moved so that the breakwater which protects the east basin, the restoration work can continue. In this bill there is authorization to move that causeway so that the Corps of Engineers can continue to work on restoring the Mooring Basin's breakwater and that will preserve that Mooring Basin as an economic resource for the fishing families of the Pacific Northwest.

I thank the committee for its work.

□ 1045

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation. I want to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and particularly the Speaker of the House for bringing this important legislation to the floor. I also want to take a moment and salute my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). We know it was because of the gentleman from Florida's leadership that this legislation to restore the Everglades is on the House floor today. I want to salute the gentleman from Florida and thank him for his leadership.

It is the little things that mean a lot for a lot of communities. I want to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure under the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as this House for their bipartisan support for three things that matter a lot to the folks back home in Illinois, three projects that mean a lot to the communities that I represent.

I want to thank this House for their support in our efforts to restore the channel adjacent to Ballard's Island outside of Marseilles on the Illinois River. We, of course, recognize that in this legislation. You have also provided the opportunity for the Ottawa YMCA and its effort to serve thousands of Illinois Valley residents by allowing it to have an easement on property currently owned by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Last, I want to thank this body for transferring property currently owned by the Army Corps of Engineers to the Joliet Park District for a new headquarters. I urge bipartisan support for this legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the commitment that this bill represents today to a partnership that started many, many years ago in the State of Florida, the commitment to begin to return the Everglades to its natural splendor. Amid all the rancor and strife that has overwhelmed this House the last few days, I think it is important to stop and appreciate how we got to where we are in the Everglades. This is the product of years of cooperation between not just Republicans and Democrats but Floridians. Our Senator BOB GRAHAM, then Governor, started this effort. He and CONNIE MACK have represented a wonderful bipartisan commitment to get this done. And now the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) in the House together with our delegation as Floridians have worked together to produce this product. This is an excellent example of the partnership, and it is an excellent example of what happens when we come together as Floridians and now as Americans to protect a national treasure and begin a very difficult and long-term commitment towards restoring the splendor of the Everglades.

This is an important issue not just as far as preserving a natural resource, it is also a very important issue to Florida as far as water quality. The southern part of our State heavily depends upon the Everglades as an important source of drinking water and public health, and the country has come together to help us preserve that. We are very grateful.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and note that he is the Congressman who represents the National Park of the Everglades and has been a tenacious fighter for the Everglades in his 8 years here.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing Congress at its best. In fact, we are really witnessing government at its best and I think in many ways even America at its best. There has been a lot of praise that has been given on this House floor, and I want to add to that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), I think, has worked harder in his committee in terms of really trying to improve the lives of Americans in terms of infrastructure which is really what creates jobs and hopefully is what we do as Members of Congress. I really praise him for his work. I particularly also praise him for his insistence in terms of the other projects that he has been fighting for and not just in terms of the Everglades but in terms of other projects that are needed.

But in particular in terms of the Everglades, what I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated previously and understands is that as important as this authorization is, and this truly is historic legislation, there is more that needs to be done. The Keys wastewater treatment bill which is part of the package that the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned previously is part of the restoration efforts that we need to continue not just in the Everglades but in Florida Bay and throughout the area. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) as well has been a leader in terms of infrastructure on this bill and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) as the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) as the chairman have also been incredibly helpful. Praise has also I think been given and well deserved to the chairman of our delegation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

SHAW). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) really has taken an incredible leadership role on this issue. It is the base of the legislation, his bill. He has worked well with all of us and has been a leader through many troubled times in terms of this bill's trouble but finally literally as we pass it in hopefully a few minutes, maybe even unanimously, it will happen.

Let me also mention, and again it has been mentioned on this floor, the administration. President Clinton and Vice President GORE have made Everglades restoration their number one environmental infrastructure proposal. I cannot imagine how we would be here today without that commitment from the President and the Vice President. In the last 8 years, in the 8 years I have been in Congress, we have actually appropriated over \$1.2 billion during that period of time. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, obviously we could not have done that without his help, but this entire Congress deserves praise in terms of our efforts.

It has also been mentioned again just the bipartisan nature of this, and I think praise also goes to the last five Governors of the State of Florida, Governor GRAHAM, Governor Martinez, Governor Chiles, Governor McKay and Governor Bush, all of whom have been instrumental in terms of Everglades restoration. This is the largest environmental restoration project in the history of the world, \$7.8 billion. It authorizes immediately \$1.2 billion; it authorizes immediately 10 specific projects, including the C-14 basin storage reserve, reservoirs and Everglades agricultural area, four pilot projects as well. It is done in a design build concept which is really the state of the art in terms of these types of infrastructure projects. Congress will continue to be engaged throughout this entire process, which literally is a 36- to 38-year process.

This bill is really about the future. I doubt, although it is possible that some Members of this Chamber will still be serving in Congress 38 years from now. Hopefully each of us will still be alive 38 years from now and we will be able to see the fruits of our labor in terms of an ecosystem that has been restored. There is only one Everglades on the planet Earth. This is it. This is the Everglades. Everglades is an Indian word for river of grass. It is a 100-mile wide river, only about a foot deep, and flows into Florida Bay. That is why I was really saying America at its best, because we are really restoring an ecosystem. That is exactly what we are doing. We have made the turn already over the last 8 years; but now this plan in place, a really well thought out government at its best, policy-making at its best, has set a road map for us to actually come to that complete restoration which hopefully will occur over that period of time.

Many people have mentioned some personal things in terms of the Everglades. I live close to the Everglades, at my back door. As has been mentioned, all of Everglades National Park is in my district. I represent probably a majority of the Everglades as well. But I have spent time in the Everglades. I have taken my children to the Everglades. I have camped in the Everglades. I wish that each of my colleagues would have that experience as well. Because this is legislation that is not really for us, it is for our children and for our grandchildren as well. I urge its passage.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It is fitting that the last major vote that occurs in this Congress prior to the election will be this vote which comes from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Indeed our committee, this means that this will be the 42nd law which has been generated from our committee and sent to the President for his signature, and I am told that the President will sign it.

This committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, has been the most productive committee of the Congress and the most bipartisan. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

When this bill passes today, it will be sent over to the enrolling clerk, it will take several days for the final document to be enrolled, and then will be sent to the President for his signature. Certainly many people deserve credit; but I emphasize that, as the chairman of the conference, I can tell you with absolute certainty we would not be here today doing this if it were not for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who has been the driving force behind this historic legislation, the largest environmental restoration legislation in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) so he may close this historic debate.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for this outstanding piece of legislation. It helps Illinois and Chicago tremendously. I want to salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for the fantastic leadership that he has displayed with this committee over the course of the past 6 years. No matter

what happens on November 7, I sincerely look forward to working with him as closely as I have in the past 6 years, in fact, in the past 18 years that I have been on this committee. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for yielding to me.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I come to the Democrat side of the aisle this morning to close this argument, not to get in anybody's face but to demonstrate the solidarity of this great body and what we are experiencing today. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH); all of the Florida delegation; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS); of course the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI); the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); of course the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who has been absolutely there for us the entire way. There are just so many. The entire Florida delegation, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), there are just so many that have worked so hard to see that we got here this day. But we also have our heroes in Florida, many of them not with us.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) in ticking off the Members, former Members of this body as well as the former Governors who have worked so hard, Senator GRAHAM as Governor and as a Senator, Senator CONNIE MACK, former Senator and Governor Chiles, who really had a sensitivity toward the Everglades and to saving the Everglades, and, of course, Governor Jeb Bush who has been absolutely tireless in his efforts to pull together this legislation and communicating with the Speaker and the majority leader and other people to see that we got where we are today.

I have been confident the whole time that I have been working on this bill that we would be able to get to this day, and I have had that confidence because I have seen the bipartisan support that we have been able to generate; and the locomotive on this entire bill, of course, is the largest restoration, environmental restoration project in the history of the world. It started with the destruction of the Everglades. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) spoke of it earlier this morning during the debate on the rule, where Governor Broward, for whom my home county is named, ran on the platform that he was going to drain that swamp, the Everglades. We almost got there. Thank God we stopped it. We have had great cooperation from the Army Corps of Engineers through this whole project. Mr. Westfahl has been absolutely tireless in working with us. Secretary of Interior Mr. Babbitt has

been tremendously helpful and sensitive to the needs of Florida and to the needs of the Everglades. This destruction is not just down in the Everglades itself. It starts out up just south of Orlando, and it stretches down all the way through Florida Bay and off the Keys, the Florida Keys. The water has been rerouted in so many ways that the sheath flow has been almost completely destroyed. The salinity of Florida Bay goes up and down so that the natural grasses that are on the floor of the Florida Bay are in deep trouble. This makes all of the fish life, the shellfish and other fisheries that are in that area, puts them in grave danger and that could affect the whole fishing industry for the entire State of Florida. It is fitting and proper that the Federal Government at least pay half of the cost of the restoration of this great natural resource. But I think one of the great miracles of pulling this thing together is that all of the interests came together. The agricultural interest which was at complete odds with the environmental interest of the Everglades have come together with the environmentalists, the developers have come together as the municipalities. The Indian tribes that are there have signed on. It was just a tremendous job that has been done in bringing these people together.

This is a historic day. November 3 is the day that we took the first step in really restoring this great national treasure.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a great day for this country; it is a great day for Florida. I urge a "yes" vote.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support for the Water Resource Development Act Conference Report. The conference report authorizes various types of water resource development projects, including the Florida Everglades restoration project.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a project to create a riparian and pedestrian corridor from Lake Merritt to the Oakland Estuary. Lake Merritt is home to the nation's oldest nationally registered wildlife refuge and is the jewel of Oakland. This project will allow for natural tidal flows into the lake and channel area that will significantly improve water quality, support wetlands habitat and provide for more environmentally sensitive flood control in the Lake Merritt watershed. The proposed project is intended to result in a restoration of the area into a new urban greenbelt corridor, comparable to such places as San Antonio's Riverwalk.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative ELLEN TAUSCHER, her staff and the committee for their help in securing this project. I am confident that this important project will restore wildlife habitat, allow for natural tidal flows, but will also provide for a new significant recreational attraction and create jobs in small businesses surrounding the lake area.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are adopting today the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (WRDA). This important bill includes authorization of 50-

foot deepening projects for all of the major channels in the Port of New York and New Jersey (the "Port")—including the Arthur Kill Channel. These deepening projects are critical to the port's ability to handle the larger ships that are now calling on ports throughout the world. This deepening will enable the Port to remain competitive with other ports already equipped with deeper drafts and help to maintain and enhance our region as a hub for international trade.

The Port is the largest container port on the east coast, moving more than 2.3 million TEU's of containers annually and directly serving over 35 percent of the U.S. population. As a result of its strategic location in the middle of one of the nation's largest and most affluent consumer markets, the Port provides same day delivery of goods to more than 18 million people. Over the next 10 years, cargo volumes in the Port are expected to double and over the next 40 years, quadruple. The new generation of cargo ships will require greater depths to accommodate their enormous size and container capacity. Some portions of the Port are currently too shallow to accommodate most modern container and military ships. Given the increased competition from other ports, especially Halifax which has depths of 60 to 70 feet, this comprehensive deepening of the Port is imperative.

This project has enjoyed the support of the New York and New Jersey delegations as well as the Governors of both states. I'd like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for all of their hard work on this crucial bill. I commend all of my colleagues for coming together to pass this bill important not only to Staten Island and Brooklyn, but to our Nation as a whole.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. I rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act Conference Report, in particular, the section on the restoration of the Everglades. We are on the verge of passing historic legislation to restore America's Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, the Everglades are dying. All of us know that we must act now or we lose what is left of the Everglades within a few years. No one disputes that the Federal Government is largely responsible for the damage that was done to the Everglades. Fifty years ago, the Federal Government established the Everglades National Park but simultaneously, a series of canals, levees and other flood control structures constructed by the Southern and Central Florida Project disrupted the lifeblood of the Everglades—the flow of clean fresh water.

As a result of these 50 years of neglect and abuse, the State of Florida has lost 46 percent of its wetlands and 50 percent of its historic Everglades ecosystem. Sixty-eight plant and animal species have become threatened or endangered with extinction while urban and agricultural runoff have produced extensive water quality degradation throughout the region.

The Federal Government has a clear interest in restoring this ecosystem since a large portion of the lands owned or managed by the Federal Government will receive the benefits

of the restoration—4 national parks and 16 national wildlife refuges which make up half of the remaining Everglades. The need for action is clear. That is why I am so pleased that we are coming together to solve this problem. The legislation before us today represents an unprecedented compromise supported by the administration, the State of Florida, environmental groups, farmers, home builders, water utilities, Indian tribes and industry. These diverse groups represent every major constituency involved in the Everglades restoration. And they are all on board. Not because they all got what they wanted, but because they all understood the urgency of passing this legislation to save America's Everglades.

Mr. Speaker, America desperately needs this bill. I urge all my colleagues to join me to preserve America's Everglades and to ensure that one of the world's most endangered ecosystems is not lost.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the Senate has recognized the need to protect the Great Lakes water from diversion and export. Yesterday, the other body passed legislation that focuses on protecting this precious resource from foreign companies and countries who target the Great Lakes for their fresh, drinking water.

The Great Lakes is the largest body of fresh water, containing more than 20 percent of the planet's fresh water, and is the primary source of drinking water for millions of people. These lakes, however, are being targeted outside the continent because the global water demand is doubling every 21 years. The World Bank predicts that by the year 2025, more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages for drinking or sanitation.

Unfortunately, this legislation does not go far enough to ensure a federal role in protecting the Great Lakes from such threats. The language passed by the Senate is nonbinding and thus does not ensure a role for the Secretary of State or any other federal official or agency in devising and approving water conservation standards for the region.

Despite opposing arguments, water diversion from the Great Lakes must involve the federal government. Notably, only the federal government may enter into treaties with the Canadian government. Only the federal government may devise a uniform national policy on diversions. And, only the federal government may set and enforce policies on international waters that apply to four of the five Great Lakes. The federal government's role in this issue is clearly delineated and it must maintain a strong involvement to prevent future diversions.

This entire issue was spurred in 1998 when a Canadian company planned to ship 3 billion liters of water from Lake Superior over 5 years and sell it to Asia. That same year I authored legislation, that the House of Representatives passed, urging the United States government to oppose this action. While the permit was subsequently withdrawn, the House passage of my resolution could not stop future requests. In fact, the United States cannot stop diversions and withdrawals in Great Lakes water that is under the control of Canada.

Obviously, the federal governments of Canada and the United States must be involved to ensure that diversions from the Great Lakes

do not occur. The legislation that passed the Senate yesterday fails to include such a protection. It encourages the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to be included in developing conservation standards. But even if they are present during such discussions, their contribution is made only to existing United States federal law, not to that of Canadian federal law. Without similar restrictions in Canadian federal law, we may be confronting another company's request to remove Great Lakes water in the next few years. We cannot risk this real threat.

I thank the Senate for its consideration of this serious issue and hope that the next Congress may better protect the Great Lakes and the 35 million people who live within its basin.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Water Resource Development Act, which includes a provision to help restore Lake Mead and the Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands in southern Nevada.

The Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands is the only major drainage channel for the entire 1,600-square-mile Las Vegas Valley. On average, 153 million gallons of water, including harmful pollutants, flow each day through the Las Vegas Wash, then through the Las Vegas Wetlands eventually draining into Lake Mead, which is Las Vegas Valley's primary source of drinking water. Fortunately, the Las Vegas Wetlands filter out harmful pollutants before they enter into Lake Mead.

In 1972, the Las Vegas Valley had 135,552 people and 2,000 acres of wetlands. Today, the Valley has over 1.2 million people and only 200 acres of wetlands left. The Valley's tremendous growth has severely eroded the Las Vegas Wash and Wetlands. If left alone the wetlands will disappear, and Lake Mead will become badly polluted resulting in an environmental disaster threatening local fish and wildlife species and the health of area residents.

The future of Lake Mead and the Las Vegas Wash is the future of our community, so this is hugely important to southern Nevada.

I've grown up with Lake Mead and the Wash and I've seen over the years how they've become more and more polluted. Not only do we rely on Lake Mead and the Wash for clean drinking water, but they provide one of our greatest recreational and scenic areas. If we want our children to continue to have access to this tremendous asset, we have to come together now to save the Lake and restore the fragile Wash.

This important legislation authorizes \$10 million in funding for the implementation of a water resources plan adopted by the Las Vegas Wash Coordinating Committee. The plan directs federal, state, and local officials to work together to restore the wetlands at the Las Vegas Wash and to improve water quality at the Lake.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is crucial to the continued growth and environmental sustainment of southern Nevada. I praise the bipartisan efforts that created this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my strong support to S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000. I also would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member OBERSTAR as well as the

Chairman of the Water Resources and the Environment Committee, Mr. BOEHLERT, and the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. BORSKI, for their willingness to work with me on a title of this bill of great importance to my state of South Dakota and to the future of the Missouri River.

Title IX of the bill creates the Missouri River Restoration Program. The program takes a very thoughtful and practical approach to the vexing and growing problem of sediment accumulation in the Missouri River in South Dakota.

As my colleagues may be aware, the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the construction of six dams on the Missouri in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. These dams, a part of the Pick-Sloan program, have brought a number of benefits to the people in my state and to the states upstream and downstream from South Dakota.

However, the creations of these dams and vast reservoirs also dramatically changed the course of the river, and consequently, how the river interacts with the land and all things living along the river. One of the negative impacts has been the deposition of millions of tons of silt into the reservoirs. Prior to the construction of the dams, the sediment would have flowed down the river, eventually settling as the water approached the Gulf of Mexico. That is no longer the case; instead, the sediment is dropping out of suspension and accumulating in new areas.

That accumulation now is causing flooding in residential and commercial areas in places like Pierre and Fort Pierre, South Dakota. And the new shape of the river has caused increased erosion throughout the river system in South Dakota.

Places like Springfield and Yankton, located on or near Lewis and Clark Lake, have benefited greatly the recreational opportunities of the river since the construction of Gavins Point Dam. But the problem I described above threatens those benefits. And those threats have been well documented in a number of studies by independent groups and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The latest study was authorized in WRDA in 1999 at my request. Those studies have been instrumental in the development of this legislation.

Title IX will give power and resources the state, tribal, and local governments need to work with the Corps and other federal agencies to tackle these problems head-on. The restoration program creates a governing board made up of local interests as well as state and federal officials to develop a plan to reduce sedimentation at the source, develop ways to reduce the sediment, and preserve the health and viability of the river. The program is authorized at \$10 million per year for each of the next 5 years. Even though some of the identified solutions exceed this authorization level by almost twofold, the \$50 million total will allow for significant and important work to move forward.

I am confident that positive results will become obvious once this group goes to work. And as those results reveal themselves, I am hopeful that this body will be willing to consider changes in the legislation to ensure maximum local control and adequate resources.

I have introduced H.R. 5527, the Missouri River Restoration Act of 2000. That bill has

served as a model for title IX of this bill and will continue to serve as a framework for future amendments to title IX if necessary.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman BOEHLERT for their support of my request on this issue and a number of other issues throughout my service in the House.

I look forward to WRDA 2000 being signed into law and for improvements to begin on the Missouri River in South Dakota, ensuring this great treasure is available for generations to come.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on Water Resources Development Act of 2000 has my full support. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their considerable efforts to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives for final consideration.

Section 338 of the conference agreement concerns a project at Sandbridge Beach in the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia. I am particularly grateful to Chairman SHUSTER for his personal commitment to favorably resolving this issue. The project was authorized for construction by Section 101(22) of WRDA 1992. Due to severe conditions at Sandbridge in 1998, the City of Virginia Beach entered into a Project Cooperation Agreement with the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the hurricane and storm protection project. The City expended \$7.8 million to complete construction that was executed by the Corps of Engineers. Section 338 will assist the City of Virginia Beach in maintaining this hurricane and storm protection project. Project maintenance is critical to the future protection of public and private property in the area. I thank the Chairman for the considerable time, patience and effort he expended on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in strong support of the S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) conference report. This Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SHUSTER), Chairman of the Transportation Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), Ranking Member on the Transportation Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), Chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee for all their hard work in bringing this important conference report to the Floor. This Member is especially appreciative that he has had the opportunity in the 106th Congress to serve on the Transportation Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. Clearly, it has been a highlight of the 106th Congress for this Member.

This important legislation presents a tremendous opportunity to improve flood control, navigation, shore protection and environmental protection. This Member is pleased that the conference report we are considering today includes contingent approval for the sand Creek watershed project in Saunders County, Nebraska. This proposed project, which is a result of the Lower Platte River and Tributaries Flood Control Study, is designed to meet Fed-

eral environmental restoration goals, help provide state recreation needs, solve local flooding problems and preserve water quality. It is sponsored jointly by the Lower Platte North NRD, the City of Wahoo and Saunders County.

The plans for the project include a nearly 640-acre reservoir, known as Lake Wanahoo, wetlands restoration and seven upstream sediment nutrient traps. The Sand Creek watershed project would result in important environmental and recreational benefits for the area and has attracted widespread support. It is especially crucial that the Sand Creek project is included in WRDA this year as the Nebraska Department of Roads is ready to begin design of an expressway in that area that will be routed across the top of a dam if the project is approved. If the Sand Creek project is not included in WRDA, a new bridge will have to be planned and built, which probably would make the project not economically feasible.

This Member is also very pleased that contingent authorization of the Antelope Creek flood control project is included in WRDA 2000. Antelope Creek runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city of Lincoln. The purpose of the project is to solve multi-faceted problems involving the flood control and drainage problems in Antelope Creek as well as existing transportation and safety problems all within the context of broad land use issues. This Member continues to have a strong interest in this project since he was responsible for stimulating the City of Lincoln, the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to work jointly and cooperatively with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify an effective flood control system for Antelope Creek in the downtown area of Lincoln.

Antelope Creek, which was originally a small meandering stream, became a straightened urban drainage channel as Lincoln grew and urbanized. Resulting erosion has deepened and widened the channel and created an unstable situation. A ten-foot by twenty-foot (height and width) closed underground conduit that was constructed between 1911 and 1916 now requires significant maintenance and major rehabilitation. A dangerous flood threat to adjacent public and private facilities exists.

The goals of the project are to construct a flood overflow conveyance channel which would narrow the flood plain from up to seven blocks wide to the 150-foot wide channel. The project will include trails and bridges and improve bikeway and pedestrian systems.

Another Nebraska project was included on the contingent authorization list for Western Sarpy and Clear Creek for flood damage reduction. Frankly, this Member must say he has reservations about the Clear Creek project in light of comments from his constituents in adjacent Saunders County.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support this important conference report. In the short time left in the 106th Congress, we must work to ensure WRDA becomes law this year.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when we considered this bill last month I had some serious reservations about it, especially those parts dealing with oceanfront development, dredging, and other projects to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

I thought the House should have had the chance to consider amendments that would have improved the bill and regretted that it was considered under procedures that did not permit that.

However, I voted for the bill because I strongly support authorizing the important program of environmental restoration for the Everglades.

The bill then went to conference with the Senate, and today we are considering a revised version that was produced in that conference.

Compared with the original bill, the conference report is much improved and deserves to be passed and sent to the President for signing into law.

As has been noted already, the conference report not only authorizes restoration work for the Everglades, it also includes important provisions to improve the way the Corps of Engineers carries out its work. I do not think they fully address all the changes that need to be made, but they are an improvement and deserve support.

So I will vote for the conference report, and urge its approval by the House.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the WRDA Conference Report. Let me begin by commending the Chairman of the full committee Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member OBERSTAR. Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and ranking member Mr. BORSKI also deserve special commendation. This important piece of legislation is necessary to improve our ports, waterways and environment. I am especially pleased that the restoration of the Everglades is included in this WRDA package. Though this precious natural resource is located in my home state of Florida, let there be no mistake this is America's Everglades and the bipartisan nature of the restoration effort reflects this.

In addition, it is widely known that I have serious concerns regarding the participation and inclusion of socially and economically disadvantaged businesses in the Everglades Restoration Plan, the largest environmental restoration project in the history of this nation. The Ranking Member, Mr. OBERSTAR and the administration has been extremely sensitive to this concern and I appreciate his efforts to address the issue. I have received numerous correspondences from residents of my district and across my state, urging that we pass this measure before we adjourn. I urge strong support for this Conference Report and again thank the Chairman and Ranking member for their usual fine work.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on S. 2790, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, the biennial authorization bill for programs and projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Since the landmark water resources legislation of 1986, the former Public Works and Transportation Committee, now renamed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has worked to maintain a consistent two-year authorization schedule for the Corps. It is critical to maintain this two-year cycle to provide continuity to the program and certainly to the non-federal, local sponsors who support Corps

projects. This biennial cycle also affords Congress the opportunity to monitor and, if necessary, amend the workings of the Corps program.

This Conference Report authorizes projects for the entirety of the Corps civil works program. It includes navigation, flood control, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration and protection.

This bill both builds and rebuilds the Nation's infrastructure. It will allow us to expand international trade through projects to improve our coastal ports and inland navigation system. Through flood control and hurricane and storm damage reduction measures, it will help to meet critical needs to protect lives and property.

It is no secret that one of the issues that delayed House consideration of this bill until last month was the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to non-federal contributions to federal projects of the Corps. I have always believed that Davis-Bacon applies to all aspects of a federal public works project, regardless of whether the Corps is performing the work, or a non-federal sponsor is contributing the work. The key element is that these have always been federal public works projects, and Davis-Bacon should apply.

I was surprised that the Corps was not consistently applying the Davis-Bacon wage protection provisions to the non-federal contribution for Corps projects. I was prepared to offer legislative language to the bill to rectify this situation—ensuring that the Corps would apply Davis-Bacon Act protections to all aspects of its program.

I am pleased to say that such legislative action is no longer necessary. Following numerous meetings with the Corps, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Labor, there is agreement within the Administration that my view of the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act is the correct one. The Davis-Bacon Act wage provisions apply to non-federal contributions to federal Corps of Engineers projects. It applies regardless of whether the non-federal contribution is in cash, or in-kind work for which credit or reimbursement is sought.

I appreciate the Administration working with me to make sure that the protections of the Davis-Bacon statute are provided to all workers on all federal public works.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains an important tribute to our late colleague, and my friend, Bruce Vento. This bill will rename a portion of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness in my district as the Bruce Vento Unit of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

Bruce served people of his district nobly, with dignity, with passion, and with purpose. He did the same for the Nation, particularly in preserving and enhancing its parks and wilderness areas. Bruce has been credited with championing hundreds of bills into law that protect and preserve our precious natural resources. I believe that it is most appropriate that one of those precious resources in our home state of Minnesota bears his name in perpetuity, and I am proud that this tribute will be in my Congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, local newspapers have devoted a lot of time and effort over the past nine months to criticizing the Corps. But, the

Corps is a proud institution with a long history. It deserves our praise and respect. Let me share some of its history with my colleagues.

First, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to the organization frequently mentioned in debate here but whose accomplishments are almost never discussed, the Corps of Engineers. The Corps celebrates its 225th birthday this year. During those years it has established itself as the Nation's oldest, largest, and most experienced government organization in the area of water and related land engineering matters. It has provided extraordinary, competent, lifesaving, economic development enhancing service to this country for two and a quarter centuries.

Few people today know that the Corps of Engineers, among its many responsibilities, once had jurisdiction over Yellowstone National Park. The Corps managed Yellowstone Park for 30 years. Lieutenant Dan Kingman of the Corps, who would later become the Chief Engineers, wrote:

"The plan of development which I have submitted is given upon the supposition and in the earnest hope that it will be preserved as nearly as may be as the hand of nature left it, a source of pleasure to all who visit and a source of wealth to no one."

A few years later, John Muir, founder of the Sierra Club, said:

"The best service in forest protection, almost the only efficient service, is that rendered by the military. For many years, they have guarded the great Yellowstone Park, and now they are guarding Yosemite. They found it a desert as far as underbrush, grass and flowers are concerned. But, in two years, the skin of the mountains is healthy again, blessings on Uncle Sam's soldiers, as they have done the job well, and every pine tree is waving its arms for joy."

Another great American said: "The military engineers are taking upon their shoulders the job of making the Mississippi River over again, a job transcended in size only by the original job of creating it." That was Mark Twain.

Those statements together pay tribute to what the Corps of Engineers has done so admirably, and the great legacy they have left for all Americans protected in floods, enhanced with river navigation programs, and, of immense importance to me, by protecting the great resource of the Great Lakes—one-fifth of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth.

The Corps of Engineers deserves recognition for all of these works and the great contribution it makes to the economic well-being, and to the environmental enhancement of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that even while some criticize the Corps, the central piece of this legislation is a project to invest nearly \$8 billion in federal, state, and local funds for the greatest environmental restoration project ever conceived. A project that has the support of the Administration, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, the environmental community, Florida, affected Indian Tribes, local governments, and the business community of South Florida. This critical project has not been entrusted to an agency incapable of carrying out its mission. No, the project has been entrusted to the only agency capable of carrying out the mission.

The Everglades are dying from years of population growth, and a Corps project that works all too well in draining them. While some criticize the existing Corps project for having harmed the Everglades, it should be recalled that the current system of canals, levees, and pumps that redirect water from the Everglades to the ocean was built with the support and encouragement of Florida and local residents.

The project has provided the desired flood and hurricane protection, as well as water supply for South Florida. Unfortunately, when the project was constructed, no one envisioned the dire consequences for the Everglades ecosystem.

The restoration project initiated in this bill will help restore the Everglades by changing the plumbing of South Florida to more closely resemble historical patterns and amounts. Today, the Everglades receive the wrong amount of water at the wrong times of the year. The Everglades restoration project, when fully implemented, will provide a more natural flow through the Everglades, and the Everglades National Park. It will do so without diminishing flood and hurricane protection for South Florida.

Mr. Speaker, scores of individuals worked for many years to develop the comprehensive plan to restore the Everglades. For many, their efforts have been acknowledged here and in the Senate. However, I will compliment one individual who has worked tirelessly toward the Everglades restoration project, and whose name has not been mentioned on this Floor.

Mr. Gary Hardesty of the Corps of Engineers headquarters office has given of himself above and beyond the call of duty to make the Everglades restoration happen. He coordinated the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, was responsible for drafting the Report of the Chief of Engineers, wrote Congressional testimony for numerous hearings, and provided detailed and accurate information to the House and Senate in the drafting of the bill. As Members of Congress know well, there are less visible individuals who make the work we do possible. For the Everglades, Mr. Hardesty is one of the individuals that made the Everglades restoration possible. He deserves the Nation's recognition and gratitude.

The Conference Report is not just the Everglades and other projects. It also includes a number of provisions to improve the operation of the Corps program. But, I am disappointed that more of the program improvements contained in the House amendment were not acceptable to the Senate. In particular, it is unfortunate that the Conference Report does not include House language to ensure that Corps' projects will successfully mitigate any adverse environmental impacts associated with its projects. I intend to revisit this issue next Congress.

The Conference Report expands the ability of non-governmental entities to participate as non-federal sponsors of projects. This is particularly important for environmental restoration and improvement projects where local organizations are anxious to work with the Corps to improve the environment.

Mr. Speaker, this water resources bill is worthy of strong bipartisan support. It is consistent with other Water Resources Acts that

Congress has approved overwhelmingly over the past 15 years. We should give this Conference Report that same overwhelming support today.

I urge all Members to support the Conference Report on S. 2796, the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and my Subcommittee Chairman Mr. BOEHLERT, and Ranking member Mr. BORSKI for their support and dedication in moving this important legislation forward. Additionally, I would like to express my gratitude for their tireless efforts to move my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 828. While it is not part of this package, I am pleased that an agreement was reached that will result in the eventual passage of this important legislation.

I would also like to express appreciation to all those Members who played a key role including Congressman LATOURETTE who is a leader on this issue as well.

I am pleased that we will pass WRDA today, legislation that will have a positive impact on communities across the country and I look forward to continuing our work to provide clean water for the citizens of this great nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 2, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

YEAS—312

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	DeMint
Aderholt	Bryant	Deutsch
Andrews	Burr	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Burton	Dixon
Baca	Buyer	Doggett
Bachus	Callahan	Doolittle
Baker	Camp	Doyle
Baldacci	Canady	Dreier
Baldwin	Cannon	Duncan
Barcia	Capuano	Edwards
Barr	Cardin	Ehrlich
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Engel
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	English
Bartlett	Coble	Eshoo
Barton	Coburn	Etheridge
Bass	Combest	Evans
Bereuter	Condit	Everett
Berkley	Cook	Fletcher
Berry	Cooksey	Foley
Biggert	Costello	Ford
Bilirakis	Cox	Fossella
Blagojevich	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Bliley	Cramer	Frost
Blunt	Crane	Galleghy
Boehlert	Crowley	Gekas
Boehner	Cubin	Gibbons
Bonilla	Cummings	Gilchrest
Bonior	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bono	Davis (FL)	Gilman
Borski	Davis (VA)	Gonzalez
Boyd	Deal	Goode
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Goodling
Brown (FL)	DeLay	Gordon

Goss	Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
Graham	Markey	Sabo	Kasich	Morella	Smith (WA)
Green (TX)	Martinez	Sanders	Kennedy	Neal	Spratt
Green (WI)	Mascara	Sandlin	Kilpatrick	Nethercutt	Stark
Gutknecht	Matsui	Sawyer	King (NY)	Oberstar	Stupak
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton	Klink	Ose	Talent
Hastert	McCrery	Scarborough	Lantos	Owens	Tancredo
Hastings (WA)	McDermott	Schakowsky	Lazio	Paul	Taylor (NC)
Hayes	McGovern	Scott	Lee	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Hayworth	McHugh	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Pickett	Tierney
Herger	McInnis	Sessions	Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Towns
Hill (IN)	McIntyre	Shadegg	McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Turner
Hilleary	McKeon	Shaw	McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
Hilliard	McNulty	Sherman	McIntosh	Riley	Waters
Hinchey	Meeks (NY)	Sherwood	McKinney	Rodriguez	Watts (OK)
Hinojosa	Menendez	Shimkus	Meehan	Rush	Waxman
Hobson	Metcalfe	Shows	Meek (FL)	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Hoefel	Mica	Shuster	Miller, Gary	Sanchez	Wexler
Hoekstra	Millender-	Simpson	Miller, George	Schaffer	Weygand
Holden	McDonald	Sisisky	Mink	Serrano	Whitfield
Holt	Miller (FL)	Skeen	Mollohan	Sha's	Wise
Hooley	Minge	Skelton			
Horn	Moakley	Smith (MI)			
Hostettler	Moore	Smith (NJ)			
Houghton	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)			
Hoyer	Murtha	Snyder			
Hulshof	Myrick	Souder			
Hunter	Nadler	Spence			
Hyde	Napolitano	Stabenow			
Inslee	Ney	Stearns			
Isakson	Northup	Stenholm			
Istook	Norwood	Strickland			
Jackson (IL)	Nussle	Stump			
Jefferson	Obey	Sununu			
Jenkins	Olver	Sweeney			
John	Ortiz	Tanner			
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Tauscher			
Johnson, E.B.	Packard	Tauzin			
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Taylor (MS)			
Jones (NC)	Pascarella	Terry			
Kanjorski	Pastor	Thomas			
Kaptur	Payne	Thompson (CA)			
Kelly	Pease	Thornberry			
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Thune			
Kind (WI)	Peterson (PA)	Petri			
Kingston	Petri	Thurman			
Kleczka	Phelps	Tiahrt			
Knollenberg	Pickering	Toomey			
Kolbe	Pitts	Traficant			
Kucinich	Pombo	Udall (CO)			
Kuykendall	Porter	Udall (NM)			
LaFalce	Portman	Upton			
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Velázquez			
Lampson	Quinn	Vitter			
Largent	Radanovich	Walden			
Larson	Rahall	Walsh			
Latham	Ramstad	Wamp			
LaTourette	Rangel	Watkins			
Leach	Regula	Watt (NC)			
Levin	Reynolds	Weiner			
Lewis (CA)	Rivers	Weldon (PA)			
Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Weller			
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Wicker			
Linder	Rogers	Wilson			
Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Wolf			
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey			
Lowe	Rothman	Wu			
Lucas (KY)	Roukema	Wynn			
Lucas (OK)	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)			
Luther	Royce	Young (FL)			
Maloney (CT)	Ryan (WI)				

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Sanford

NOT VOTING—119

Ackerman	Clayton	Filner
Allen	Clement	Forbes
Archer	Clyburn	Fowler
Baird	Collins	Frank (MA)
Ballenger	Conyers	Franks (NJ)
Becerra	Danner	Ganske
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Gejdenson
Berman	DeGette	Gephardt
Bilbray	Delahunt	Granger
Bishop	Dickey	Greenwood
Blumenauer	Dicks	Gutierrez
Boswell	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dooley	Hansen
Calvert	Dunn	Hastings (FL)
Campbell	Ehlers	Hefley
Capps	Emerson	Hill (MT)
Carson	Ewing	Hutchinson
Chambliss	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Clay	Fattah	(TX)

Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
Kasich	Morella	Smith (WA)
Kennedy	Neal	Spratt
Kilpatrick	Nethercutt	Stark
King (NY)	Oberstar	Stupak
Klink	Ose	Talent
Lantos	Owens	Tancredo
Lazio	Paul	Taylor (NC)
Lee	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Pickett	Tierney
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Towns
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Turner
McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
McIntosh	Riley	Waters
McKinney	Rodriguez	Watts (OK)
Meehan	Rush	Waxman
Meek (FL)	Salmon	Weldon (FL)
Miller, Gary	Sanchez	Wexler
Miller, George	Schaffer	Weygand
Mink	Serrano	Whitfield
Mollohan	Sha's	Wise

□ 1127

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DUNCAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 594, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 594 on November 3, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both rollcall votes Nos. 593 and 594.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD how I would have voted if I had been present today. Rollcall 593, Approving the Journal, "aye." Rollcall 594, Conference Report on WRDA, "aye."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 2796.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001, CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE, AND AUTHORIZING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CAUCUSES

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of, and hereby pass, House Joint Resolution 124; take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 84, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in each of the Senate amendments; take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 160 and agree to the same; and hereby adopt a resolution providing that any organizational caucus or conference in the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress may begin on or after November 13, 2000; that the texts of each measure be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that motions to reconsider each of these actions be laid on the table.

The Clerk read the titles of the resolutions.

The text of H.J. Res 124 is as follows:  
H.J. RES. 124

*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 "November 4, 2000".*

The text of the Senate amendments to H.J. Res. 84 is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: *That Public Law 106-275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting "November 14, 2000".*

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes."

The text of S. Con. Res. 160 is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 160

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, November 2, 2000, or on Monday, November 6, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 14, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, November 2, 2000, Friday, November 3, 2000, Saturday, November 4, 2000, Sunday, November 5, 2000, Monday, November 6, 2000, Tuesday, November 7, 2000, Wednesday, November 8, 2000, or Thursday, November 9, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, November 13, 2000, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant*

to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The text of H. Res. 666 is as follows:  
H. RES. 666

*Resolved, That any organizational caucus or conference in the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Seventh Congress may begin on or after November 13, 2000.*

SEC. 2. As used in this resolution, the term "organizational caucus or conference" means a party caucus or conference authorized to be called under section 202(a) of House Resolution 988, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to on October 8, 1974, and enacted into permanent law by chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (2 U.S.C. 29a(a)).

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

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. on Saturday, November 4, 2000, unless it sooner has been informed by the President of the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 84, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to Senate concurrent resolution 160 until 2 p.m. Monday, November 13, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

CROMWELLIAN ADJOURNMENT

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to take about 15 minutes to recite my objections to our leaving with all of the unfinished business, but I have been persuaded by those with greater wisdom to simply remind the House of something the gentleman from Massachusetts said yesterday. He showed us the statement of Oliver Cromwell upon dismissing Parliament in 1653, which reads as follows: "Ye who are grown intolerably odious to the whole Nation; you who are deputed here by the people to get grievances redress'd, are yourselves become the greatest grievance. Your country, therefore, calls upon me to cleanse this Augean stable, by putting a final period to your iniquitous proceedings in this House; and which, by God's help and the strength he has

given me, I am now come to do; I command ye therefore, upon the peril of your lives, to depart immediately out of this place; go, get out! Make haste! Ye venal slaves be gone! So! Take away that shining bauble there, and lock the doors. In the name of God, go!"

□ 1130

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is a student of Oliver Cromwell, and I enjoy reading Cromwell's very famous statements as well.

I would like to respond to the gentleman's Cromwell quote by reading another one. These were Oliver's dying words.

He said, "It is not my design to drink or to sleep, but my design is to make what haste I can to be gone." So goodbye, God bless you, see you in two weeks.

APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 3, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through November 13, 2000.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: On Wednesday, September 27, 2000, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §606, approved twenty-two resolutions concerning GSA's FY 2001 Capital Investment Program.

Please find enclosed copies of these resolutions.

With warm regards, I remain.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,  
*Chairman.*

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, November 15, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday November 13, 2000, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

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.

AN APT DESCRIPTION OF THE END OF THIS SESSION OF THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, T.S. Eliot said: That is the way the world goes, not with a bang but a whimper. It seems like an apt description of the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from Slate, which is a magazine, an online magazine, entitled "Ralph the Leninist."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Slate magazine, Oct. 31, 2000]

RALPH THE LENINIST

(By Jacob Weisberg)

Over the past 10 days, liberals have been voicing shock and dismay at the imminent prospect of their old hero, Ralph Nader, intentionally throwing the election to George W. Bush. A first, eloquent protest came 10 days ago from a group of a dozen former "Nader's Raiders," who asserted that their former mentor had broken a promise not to campaign in states where he could hurt Gore

and begged him to reconsider doing so. Others, including Newsweek columnist Jonathan Alter, have expressed a similar sense of disappointment and betrayal.

Nader's response to all this heartfelt hand-wringing has been to scoff and sneer. On Good Morning America, he referred contemptuously to his old disciples as "frightened liberals." The Green Party nominee is spending the final week of the campaign stumping in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Washington—the very states where a strong showing stands to hurt Gore the most. Nader has said he wants to maximize his vote in every state in hopes of attaining the 5 percent of the vote that will qualify the Green Party for \$12 million in federal matching funds in 2004. Speaking to foreign journalists in Washington yesterday, he explicitly rejected Internet vote-swapping schemes that could help him reach this qualifying threshold without the side effect of electing Bush president. In various other TV appearances, Nader has stated bluntly that he couldn't care less who wins.

This depraved indifference to Republican rule has made Nader's old liberal friends even more furious. A bunch of intellectuals organized by Sean Wilentz and Todd Gitlin are circulating a much nastier open letter, denouncing Nader's "wrecking-ball campaign—one that betrays the very liberal and progressive values it claims to uphold." But really, the question shouldn't be the one liberals seem to be asking about why Nader is doing what he's doing. The question should be why anyone is surprised. For some time now, Nader has made it perfectly clear that his campaign isn't about trying to pull the Democrats back to the left. Rather, his strategy is the Leninist one of "heightening the contradictions." It's not just that Nader is willing to take a chance of being personally responsible for electing Bush. It's that he's actively trying to elect Bush because he thinks that social conditions in America need to get worse before they can get better.

Nader often makes this "the worse, the better" point on the stump in relation to Republicans and the environment. He says that Reagan-era Interior Secretary James Watt was useful because he was a "provocateur" for change, noting that Watt spurred a massive boost in the Sierra Club's membership. More recently, Nader applied the same logic to Bush himself. Here's the Los Angeles Times' account of a speech Nader gave at Chapman University in Orange, Calif., last week: "After lambasting Gore as part of a do-nothing Clinton administration, Nader said, 'If it were a choice between a provocateur and an anesthetizer, I'd rather have a provocateur. It would mobilize us.'"

Lest this remark be considered an aberration, Nader has said similar things before. "When [the Democrats] lose, they say it's because they are not appealing to the Republican voters," Nader told an audience in Madison, Wis., a few months ago, according to a story in The Nation. "We want them to say they lost because a progressive movement took away votes." That might make it sound like Nader's goal is to defeat Gore in order to shift the Democratic Party to the left. But in a more recent interview with David Moberg in the socialist paper In These Times, Nader made it clear that his real mission is to destroy and then replace the Democratic Party altogether. According to Moberg, Nader talked "about leading the Greens into a 'death struggle' with the Democratic Party to determine which will be the majority party." Nader further and shockingly explained that he hopes in the fu-

ture to run Green Party candidates around the country, including against such progressive Democrats as Sen. Paul Wellstone of Minnesota, Sen. Russell Feingold of Wisconsin, and Rep. Henry Waxman of California. "I hate to use military analogies," Nader said, "but this is war on the two parties."

Hitler analogies always lead to trouble, but the one here is irresistible since Nader is actually making the argument of the German Communist Party circa 1932, which helped bring the Nazis to power. I'm not comparing the Republicans to fascists or the Greens to Stalinists for that matter. But Nader and his supporters are emulating a disturbing, familiar pattern of sectarian idiocy. You hear these echoes whenever Nader criticizes Bush halfheartedly, then becomes enthusiastic and animated blasting the Green version of the "social fascists"—Bill Clinton, Gore, and moderate environmentalists. It's clear that the people he really despises are those who half agree with him. To Nader, it is liberal meliorists, not right-wing conservatives, who are the true enemies of his effort to build a "genuine" progressive movement. He does have a preference between Republicans and Democrats, and it's for the party that he thinks will inflict maximum damage on the environment, civil rights, labor rights, and so on. By assisting his class enemy, Nader thinks he can pull the wool from the eyes of a sheeplike public.

If Nader's goal were actually progressive reform—a ban on soft money, a higher minimum wage, health-care coverage for some of the uninsured, a global warming treaty—it would be possible to say that his strategy was breathtakingly stupid. But Nader's goal is not progressive reform; it's a transformation in human consciousness. His Green Party will not flourish under Democratic presidents who lull the country into a sense of complacency by making things moderately better. If it is to thrive, it needs villainous, right-wing Republicans who will make things worse. Like Pat Buchanan, Nader understands that his movement thrives on misery. But the comparison is actually unfair to Buchanan (words I never thought I'd write) because Buchanan doesn't work to create more misery for the sake of making his movement grow the way Nader does. From a strictly self-interested point of view, Nader's stance is the more rational one.

So Gore supporters might as well quit warning the Green candidate that he's going to put George W. Bush in the White House. Ralph Nader is a very intelligent man who knows exactly what he's doing. And they only seem to be encouraging him.

Mr. Speaker, this article lays out, I think, the basic premise by which this Congress failed to deal with the Patients' Bill of Rights, education, prescription medicines for senior citizens.

In talking about the Ralph Nader campaign, it said that Mr. Nader has made it perfectly clear what his strategy was. It is the strategy of Lenin; that is, to "heighten the contradictions." That is in quotes.

Now, the whole idea of bringing down the political process to make things better out of the ashes is one that has been very actively pushed by Mr. Nader in his campaign. He said it very directly in many places. He said, "We are

hoping that we will destroy the Democratic Party, and that from that will rise a new party on the left."

This House and its failure to deal with these major issues today and in this session are a direct result of a strategy very similar announced by Speaker Gingrich. His idea, when he was in the minority, was to destroy the House; to do everything possible to discredit the government, to discredit the House of Representatives, to bring it into ill repute with everybody in the public.

Now we come to this session. He started it 6 years ago. He tried it for 2 years. He lost seats in the next election. He tried it again. He lost seats in the next election. And the third time they tried it, they lost seats in the next election.

Now, what we have got here is a situation where the Congress simply did not function. All that lovey-dovey kissy-face that was going on a few minutes ago is basically to obscure the fact that, although the Republican leadership said, "We will pass the budget and all its parts by a timely date the first of October," but in fact, we stand here today, 1 month after the new fiscal year is in, and we have not passed three major bills. The Senate and House Republicans could not get their act together and get it down to the President.

They say, well, the President was not going to sign it. They never could get an agreement among themselves to send the bill down to the President and veto it if he chose. They sent some down, which he vetoed. But if they cannot decide among themselves, maybe they should go down and sit down with the President and negotiate and get the people's business done.

They could not do it. They could not bring themselves to. Having created these contradictions and all the fighting in here, they could not then sit down with the President and negotiate how to deal with tax relief for the middle class, how to deal with educational financing for schools. They could not deal with the Patients' Bill of Rights. They could not deal with prescription drugs for senior citizens.

I do not know how any State is going to plan their budget when they have no budget from the United States government. They are just sort of sitting out there waiting.

There are hospitals. The BBA give-backs, that is, the restoration of the unfortunate cuts that were made in Medicare, which have put hospitals all over this country in serious problems, have not been done.

We are going into an election with a hospital in every one of the 435 districts represented in this House where they do not know how much money they are going to have, or if they are going to have any money to make up for the deficits they are running now.

This comes from this idea that somehow they can radically rip this government up and start over new. It is a fallacious idea that Mr. Nader is using, and it was a fallacious idea that Mr. Gingrich used in this House.

We must come back here and work together in the future, or this country will suffer immensely.

—————

TRIBUTE TO JIM AND BETTY MCCANN ON THEIR RETIREMENTS FROM THE NEW BRUNSWICK DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE HONORABLE FRANK J. PALLONE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to two of my longest serving and most loyal staffers, Jim and Betty McCann, who retired this year from my New Brunswick district office.

Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual to have an outstanding individual on your staff for a long time, but to have two outstanding individuals who also happen to be married to each other is most unusual and most fortunate for me.

Jim and Betty McCann worked for my predecessor, the late Congressman James Howard, in the 1980s. Jim Howard recognized early on that Jim and Betty had the talent and the personalities to handle the varied and difficult job of running a congressional district office.

Just as we know that not everyone has the special skills needed to be a successful politician, so, too, not everyone has the versatility and interpersonal and organizational skills to survive and excel on a congressional staff.

After Jim Howard passed away and I was elected in 1988, I urged Betty and Jim to stay on and work for me. When redistricting reshaped the districts in New Jersey and I ran and won in the Sixth Congressional District, I set up a new office in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in the Middlesex County portion of my district.

Jim and Betty's experience on congressional and case work matters were very important to the success of my new office, which handled a tremendous amount of constituent casework and important projects in the most populous and ethnically diverse area of my district.

In all those years, I did not think I ever heard a word of complaint about the operation of the New Brunswick District Office. I knew it was being well administered, so I could divert my attention to other important issues in Middlesex County, secure in the knowledge that the equally important constituent matters were being carefully attended to.

I was often complimented in person and in letters about Jim and Betty's service to the Sixth District, and I would like to quote from some of the hundreds of letters that I have received thanking me, or thanking me for their efforts, over the years.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is from a physician in my district. He writes:

"Dear Congressman Pallone:

I am writing this letter to thank you and your outstanding office staff for the great effort in dealing with my difficult case. Mrs. McCann has been very helpful, sincere, and had the leading role in solving my complicated case.

Over the past few months, I have been dealing with Mrs. McCann, and she has always been very cooperative and always walks the extra mile to get things done properly. I was very impressed by her knowledge of the immigration laws and rules and her superior ability to approach a difficult case like mine. . . . She is a superb case-worker."

I have another letter from a retired lieutenant colonel regarding Jim McCann. It says, "Dear Congressman Pallone, I am writing to thank you and a member of your staff, Jim McCann, for responding so quickly and effectively to my family in time of need.

My wife's brother recently died after a long illness. He was a retired Navy Chief Petty Officer and wished to be buried at sea. Because of Jim McCann, who made the arrangements with the Coast Guard in New Jersey and who personally appeared at dockside on the day of the burial, the occasion proceeded smoothly.

I was struck by how quietly and efficiently Mr. McCann coordinated the details without intruding on the grief of the immediate family. He is a very considerate individual who gave up a good portion of his Saturday to represent your office. I am personally very grateful."

Mr. Speaker, Jim and Betty epitomize the best in congressional service. Working long and hard and not seeking the limelight, they loyally served the residents of the Sixth Congressional District by walking that extra mile to get things done properly.

I want to thank them deeply, and wish them a happy and productive retirement.

—————

WHICH CANDIDATE WOULD ENSURE THE CONTINUED SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was just on an interview with the Wall Street Journal asking me what I thought would happen after the election of the President, and which person might move ahead to make sure that we save social security.

Working on this problem of keeping social security solvent, and having introduced four bills on social security, I made my comment that the greatest risk is doing nothing at all and simply saying, look, we are going to keep your benefits coming. Do not worry about it. Because the greatest problem is that if we keep putting off a solution, then what we are doing is ensuring that our kids and our grandkids are going to have an enormous tax burden to keep social security solvent.

Social security has a total unfunded liability, according to Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve, of \$9 trillion. That means we have to put \$9 trillion in right now and have that start drawing a real return of at least 6.7 percent interest to keep social security solvent over the next 5 years. The social security trust fund contains nothing but IOUs on a ledger down in Maryland where every time the government borrows that money, either to pay back debt or expand social programs, just another figure is written on that ledger.

The challenge is coming up with the money to keep paying the benefits for social security that we have promised the American people.

□ 1145

To keep paying promised Social Security benefits, if we do nothing, the payroll tax is going to have to be increased by nearly 50 percent or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent.

This is the problem. We have surpluses coming in after the big tax increase in 1983. Those surpluses are going to run out. We are going to have to start coming up with additional funds from someplace starting in 2015. That red portion on the bottom left of that chart is the taxes that our kids are going to have to pay in addition to current taxes, \$9 trillion today in tomorrow's dollars, it is \$120 trillion over the next 75 years.

This is what we have done on tax increases so far. That is why the evidence is there that probably if we keep putting it off, we are simply going to increase taxes on our kids and American workers even again.

In 1940, it was 1 percent for the employee and the employer for a maximum of \$60 a year; 1960, 3 percent on employee/employer total of 6, on the first \$4,800 to be \$288. Today, in the year 2000, since the 1983 tax increases, it is 12.4 percent on the first \$76,200 for a total of \$9,440 a year for each worker. And that is part of the problem. We have gone from 38 workers for each 1 retiree in 1940; today we have three workers paying in their Social Security tax immediately sent out in benefits. And the estimate is that in 25 years, it is just going to be two workers working.

Mr. Speaker, it has to be changed. I think that Governor Bush has been

willing to step up to the plate saying look, we cannot just talk about it. We have to do something about it. He has been criticized by Vice President Gore. And Vice President Gore's plan is to take the interest savings on the debt held by the public, the interest savings on the debt held by the public, the debt held by the public right now is \$3.4 trillion. The interest savings are \$260 billion a year.

It is not going to accommodate the \$46 trillion that we are going to need between now and 2054. It is just another way of examining the Vice President's suggestion that we use the blue part, or \$260 billion a year, to accommodate the \$46 trillion that is going to be needed in addition to Social Security taxes.

It still leaves a \$35 trillion deficit. I just urge everyone, as they size up their candidates, try to pick the candidate that is willing to step forward on this issue. Next year is our best chance to solve Social Security. Let us do it.

#### REMEMBER ELECTIONS ARE IMPORTANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing shocked me more, left me less prepared than the sudden burst of sanity that swept this hall just an hour ago when we decided to finally leave town.

Mr. Speaker, I am hardly prepared to deliver these remarks, but seeing as no one else wishes to address the House at this time, I have put together a few notes of a speech I thought I would be delivering 3 hours or 4 hours from now. What is apparent, as we leave town, is that elections are important, that whether we get a patients' bill of rights, whether we get Medicare to provide coverage for pharmaceuticals, whether we get Federal aid for education and for school construction, and I will be talking about that a little later, whether we protect our environment and protect the women's right to choose, increase the minimum wage, protect Social Security, all of these things are on the line next Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, until we left town, there was the illusion that the country could get these democratic proposals adopted in what I call "Democrat-lite" form, that we would pass some bill that seemed to address the issues that we Democrats have put on the agenda, like the issues I just mentioned, education, health care, that we have put these issues on the agenda, but that the majority would pass some sort of "lite" version of these bills, and at least make the country think that these issues had been dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, now as we adjourn, the words "do nothing Congress" rings in

our ears, for we have accomplished not even the minimum required of this Congress. In fact, a Senate and a House both controlled by the majority party have not even sent to the President for his analysis all of the 13 appropriations bills that should have reached there in September.

So we have a do-nothing Congress, a Congress that has not addressed the issues that we Democrats have put on the agenda. It has not addressed them, even in some sort of mild or illusory form. We have an election coming up that will help us address those issues.

Before I move off of this topic, I do think that it was wrong to criticize our colleagues who were not here yesterday, participating with us in this charade where this House pretended that we were going to reach a compromise on all of the issues, even though the Senate, including the Republican Senate leadership, had already left town. Those in the majority who would criticize, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), our colleague, for not being here yesterday should not have issued that criticism to a Member of this House.

I know that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) had campaigning to do in New York and chose not to join us yesterday, but we were hardly doing important work.

But at this point, I want to focus on the school construction issue. The tax bill that we just passed out of this House dealt in a poor way with the crisis that is facing this country; and that crisis is the need to build new schools, to refurbish older schools, to renovate schools, to wire schools for the Internet, to do the things that are normally done by school districts by issuing school bonds.

The tradition in this country has been for this Congress to help school districts issue school bonds and to do so by using the Tax Code for us to provide a subsidy to those who hold school bonds, so that investors will buy school bonds, even though they yield a rather low rate of interest.

We have done this in the past by providing an exemption from taxation for all of the interest paid on school bonds and other municipal bonds. We need to do more, because even when we exempt the interest, the school bonds end up having to yield 5 percent or 6 percent and many school districts cannot afford to pay 5 percent or 6 percent. So we on the Democratic side said we need to provide for the issuance of \$25 billion worth of a new kind of school bond with even greater benefits under the Federal Tax Code and even lower costs to the school district.

We did not design to bond where the interest was not merely tax exempt, but instead the school district did not have to pay interest at all, but the bond holder, instead of getting even a reduced interest payment from the

school district, received a tax credit for holding the bond. An outstanding way to use our Tax Code to turn to school districts that would otherwise have to pay \$100,000 a year to service a particular bond, tell them they can raise that same amount of money, build that same size of a school and only make annual payments of \$66,000 a year, a greater Federal subsidy for those school districts that issue school bonds to renovate and build new schools.

We thought that it was necessary to provide this \$25 billion of special aid to our local schools over a 2-year period, roughly \$12½ billion a year. The Republicans decided instead to provide per year less than half of what was necessary, but rather to provide \$5 billion a year over 3 years on a per-year basis less than half.

They also, and this troubled me, weaseled the Davis-Bacon provisions so that these school bonds could be used to build substandard schools at substandard wages for those building them. We do not need slipshod workmanship. We do not need substandard schools. We do not need to weasel around the Davis-Bacon action that has assured that our public buildings built with Federal dollars are built well.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very watered-down version of the Democratic proposal, which is clearly insufficient, but what is worse is that the same tax bill which came before this House, and which most of us on this side voted against, also provided for another method of helping school districts, a method that costs the Federal Government well over \$2 billion, but was actually worse than nothing.

What was this? How do we figure out a way to pretend to help school districts and actually hurt them? We changed the arbitrage rules, or at least the majority would have us change the arbitrage rules in the Tax Code. What are those rules? The rules say this: If a public entity, a school, a city, is going to issue tax exempt bonds for a public purpose, they need to use the money for that public purpose. This avoids the possibility that some school district would issue a lot of bonds at a real low interest rate, so they borrow money cheap. Instead of using the money for a public purpose, they would just use the money to invest on Wall Street.

We have arbitrage rules for a reason. That is if the Federal Government is going to subsidize borrowing, the borrowing should be for something like building a school, not building a portfolio.

But what the Republican bill would do is change those rules and identify that change as our way of helping school districts, a special encouragement from the Federal Government. Here, school districts, is how we are going to help you. How? Issue the

bonds, issue tax exempt bonds. We are not going to let you issue those credit bonds because those would help you too much. The Democrats wanted to give you that much help, but the Republicans want to provide that only in very small quantity, issue regular tax exempt bonds, pay 5 percent or 6 percent interest and then take the money to Wall Street. We are sure you will earn 8 percent or 9 percent or 20 percent or 80 percent or 2000 percent on your money, and you will be allowed to keep the profit.

This is the Republican way of building schools, by building portfolios. This is how Orange County, California went bankrupt a few years ago. We should be trying to build a school on Elm Street, not a skyscraper on Wall Street.

We should not be turning to schools and saying we will not provide you with adequate help to issue bonds and use the money to build schools, but we will instead encourage you to issue bonds and use the money to play the market.

I know that our friends on Wall Street would prefer that, a whole new customer, but I was surprised to find the real impetus for this proposal. It comes from people I used to work with, the tax lawyers who are subspecialists in tax exempt municipal bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I am sympathetic with them. You see, I was a tax nerd for a lot of years. For over a dozen years, I practiced tax law, and after a day of reading the most complex regulations printed in the finest print, I had but one solace, one joy, one redemption, and that was that my job was not quite as boring as those of my colleagues who subspecialized in the tax law of municipal bonds, even among tax nerds that is regarded as a boring job.

□ 1200

So this tax provision that is stated to try to help our schools was in essence designed to provide excitement to tax bond counsel, to say they are not just going to issue bonds and build schools and deal with, frankly, excessively complex provisions in doing it; but instead they are going to issue bonds and then, with the members of the school board, go play the market with the money.

Mr. Speaker, we need schools. We need to see them built soon. We need the school districts to handle their fiscal affairs safely. That is the chief problem. The way to deal with it is to provide Federal subsidies to school districts who are issuing these school bonds by making those bonds tax credit bonds.

There may, in fact, be another problem, and that is that my former colleagues, the tax bond counsel, lead excessively boring lives. But it would be cheaper to buy a Ferrari for every bond counsel than it would be to urge school districts across this country to play

the market and keep the supposed profits as the federally encouraged way for the Federal Government to help them finance school construction.

So when we return for our lame-duck session, if someone is concerned with the lack of excitement of tax lawyer subspecialists, let them put forward a bill to provide a free Ferrari to every bond counsel. But if we are concerned with building schools, let us not change those arbitrage provisions. Let us not pretend that we are helping schools by urging them to gamble school bond proceeds.

Instead, let us instead adopt the plan that is bipartisan, that has been in this House for over a year that was put forward by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). To put forward that bill and pass a full \$25 billion of tax credit bonds to provide the maximum possible assistance to local schools.

Let me now launch into a second topic, a topic about which I have addressed this House in the past; and that is the mischaracterizations of statements made by the Governor of Texas. I refer not to his comments about events long ago in Kennebunkport, but rather his own description of his tax plan.

I do not know whether it is because the Governor has not read and fully understood his tax plan or whether the Governor just cannot get away from constantly mischaracterizing it to the American people. But there are several myths that are repeated, frankly, almost every day on the campaign stump. I would like to set them straight.

The first is that the Bush plan would provide a tax relief to every taxpayer. This is simply false. See, Mr. Speaker, there are 30 million Americans who pay FICA tax, have it pulled out of their wages by the Federal Government every year, but who do not pay income tax. These 30 million Federal taxpayers receive not one penny of tax relief from a candidate who has promised tax relief to everyone.

Now, I should caution that, of these 30 million taxpayers, a little fewer than half receive the earned income tax credit which we on this side of the aisle have fought for so hard and so long. So ultimately, one could say their total combined Federal tax liability was at zero. That may be the case. It may be that the Governor's proposal simply shortchanges 15 million Americans.

But to repeat on the stump every year, every day, again and again, that one has a proposal which will provide tax relief to all American taxpayers while leaving out 15 million Americans who pay money to the Federal Government in excess of any credits they receive who are Federal taxpayers, no matter how one counts it, these 15 million should not be left out.

But if the Governor wants to leave them out of his plan, he ought to have the integrity to say so and tell us that, yes, he wants to provide almost half of his tax relief package to the best-off 1 percent of Americans, but that he wants to give not one penny to those who clean up in nursing homes and in buildings, those who wash cars and those who clean up at restaurants. He wants to provide not one penny to 15 million of the most struggling, hard-working families in America who pay taxes. He ought to have the courage of his conviction. He ought to be forthright.

There is a related aspect of the Governor's proposal, and that is the brouhaha over whether he is, indeed, providing over or close to half his benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

This is clearly the case, but not something the Governor is willing to acknowledge. See, in the debates, he said that his plan provided only \$223 billion of tax relief over a 10-year period to the wealthiest 1 percent.

Now, \$223 billion even over 10 years sounds like a lot of tax relief, but it is a lot more than that. See, the Governor, in his fiscal statements in adding up his program, the Governor leaves out the repeal of the estate tax.

Now, in talking vaguely about his tax plan, in firing up the troops, he says he is going to eliminate the death tax. But in talking about the fiscal effect of his program, he forgets the fiscal effect of eliminating that tax.

Now that fiscal effect can be hidden by phasing in the elimination of the tax and using fuzzy phase-in figures. But the fact remains that, over a 10-year period, once it is fully effected, the repeal of the estate tax will cost \$50 billion a year. That is \$500 billion over 10 years. Virtually all of that saving goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. A little bit is shared by percentile number 2, the people who are in the second percent of the wealthiest Americans.

I mean, that is, I guess, what the Governor has to consider to be really sharing the wealth with everybody. He includes, not just the wealthiest 1 percent, but a small piece goes to that second 1 percent, leaving out only 98 percent of Americans.

So we are talking about a plan which not only provides \$223 billion of tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent on their income tax returns, but virtually another \$500 billion on the estate tax, well over \$700 billion of tax relief.

I wonder frankly why the Governor would state that he is only providing \$223 billion. Again, he ought to have the courage of his convictions. He ought to be forthright; and he ought to have integrity. Integrity requires that he admit that it is, indeed, true that, under his plan, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans receive more than he pro-

poses to spend on strengthening our military and education and health care and pharmaceuticals for our seniors combined.

The most important issues facing us receive less help than 1 percent of Americans and, frankly, 1 percent that perhaps need it least.

Now I want to emphasize I have sympathy for all taxpayers. I wish we could abolish all taxes. They are each painful. But when we start to provide tax relief, to the extent that we can afford to provide tax relief, should we not focus on Bill Gates' maid before we focus on the as-yet-unborn Bill Gates, Jr. and his eventual estate tax return? Should we not focus on people struggling to get by rather than people struggling to hold on to multibillion dollar empires?

I strongly support estate tax reform, which we can do at a rather modest cost. At a rather modest cost, we can make sure that every family in America will not pay a single penny of estate tax on its first \$2 million of assets.

We can provide that, when those assets are locked up in a farm or a family held business, that we can draw the line at \$3 million or \$4 million. That is the kind of estate tax reform that we can easily afford. But the absolute abolition of the estate tax is so expensive that, when the Governor adds up his own program, he leaves it out.

It is troubling to me that the press has not picked this up. But eyes begin to glaze over, I see a few eyes glazing over now, as figures are reviewed. But we are in a great debate about figures. This is not a popularity contest, but rather is a focus on who will be running the largest economy in the history of the world.

Which brings me to another issue, and that is, how has this economy run so well and who deserves the credit. I think we all agree that the lion's share of that credit goes to American working families, American scientists and executives and entrepreneurs whose hard work and ingenuity has built a new economy, the envy of the rest of the world.

But wait a minute. Our people were hard working and ingenious in the mid-1980s, the late 1980s, and the early 1990s. In fact, during that period, Alan Greenspan was running the Federal Reserve Board. But Alan Greenspan at the Federal Reserve Board, the ingenuity of American entrepreneurs, the hard work of American people all together gave us a terrible economy in 1991.

What was missing? A key ingredient was missing. That ingredient was fiscal responsibility here in Washington.

Now, I realize that it is in the Governor's political interest to ignore that key ingredient, to say that we can have prosperity as long as Americans work hard. Well, Americans have always worked hard, but we have not always been prosperous.

It is in his political interest to say that we can always have prosperity as long as Americans work hard because he does not want to admit that the Clinton-Gore administration provided that key element that had been previously missing in our economic life, and that was fiscal responsibility. That fiscal responsibility is the hardest thing to accomplish in Washington.

I think the public understands the pressures on us and how often we buckle to those pressures. Here in Congress one can be very popular, standing behind this podium or that podium, and calling for a reduction in taxes or calling for an increase in those items of expenditures which are popular. Many of us have done that.

But imagine how difficult it is for a President, for a political leader to stand before the country and suggest exactly the opposite on both fronts, how only incredible leadership fortitude can turn to a Congress and to a country and say, yes, we would be more popular if we cut taxes, but we are not going to, or at least we are not going to do so to an irresponsible degree.

Yes, there are pressing priorities and pork projects that would be popular either nationally or in a particular region, and we are going to resist so many of them.

Back in 1991, scholars wondered whether America was ready for self-government, because, after all, the incredible pressure to have lower taxes and higher expenditures seemed to be in control here in Washington.

The Clinton-Gore administration came here and with great pain and with the political loss of some people who lost their careers in this House for the benefit of the country, we passed some very difficult bills, and that was hard.

□ 1215

And then as the country got more prosperous and there were increased pressures from those who say, oh, the deficit is down, let us abolish the estate tax, as we had to stand up to those who would squander the surplus, the Clinton-Gore administration stood there again and again.

How easy it would have been for this Federal Government to have engaged in an orgy of profligate spending and irresponsible tax cuts. But the Clinton-Gore administration prevented that from happening. It is not easy. And that is why we enjoy the combination of hard work and ingenious effort from the American private sector and fiscal responsibility to levels that would absolutely have dumbfounded anyone who was looking at the situation just 8 or 9 years ago, a level of fiscal responsibility that almost matches the hard work and ingenuity of the American people.

What worries me most is that, for political reasons, the Governor has said

that what goes on in Washington does not matter. Yes, he is under tremendous political pressure to say that 8 years of Clinton-Gore did nothing for the country's economy. But when he does this, he must argue that fiscal responsibility had nothing to do with the country's economy. And if that is true, then what is to prevent us from engaging in a wild frenzy of spending and tax cuts and deficit spending at that?

When the Governor builds the rhetorical and philosophical foundation for the belief that what goes on in Washington has nothing to do with our prosperity, he grants a license to Washington to do whatever we want since it does not risk our prosperity.

The facts are clearly otherwise. In the absence of fiscal responsibility, this economy will not work. It will not work because, under George Herbert Walker Bush, we had deficits of over \$250 billion a year. What does that deficit mean? It means that those thinking of investing in bonds, those thinking of investing in stocks believe that we are going to have inflation in years to come, demand high interest rates, high rates of return and, as a result, a business cannot get the capital it needs to expand. It means that in a country that, frankly, does not save enough, the Federal Government is going into the private markets and scooping up almost a quarter, sometimes even a third, of the valuable capital not for investment, which is what capital is for, but, rather, scooping it up and using it just to deal with ongoing Federal operations.

When I say scooping it up, what I mean is that there is a certain amount of money to be invested by the private sector in stocks and bonds and bank accounts, and a Federal Government that runs a deficit issues more and more bonds, receives more and more of that investment capital, and leaves less and less capital available to build homes and to bill businesses.

So fiscal responsibility is important and whatever political advantages there may be for saying that what has gone on in Washington in the last 8 years has nothing to do with our prosperity over the last 8 years should be repudiated.

Now, I want to deal with the argument that is made usually by Republican Members of this House. They start with one chart, which I am going to show you, a Republican chart. I have had it redone. And then they reach a particular conclusion without showing you the second chart.

You will see the chart put forward by Republican speaker after Republican speaker showing that Federal receipts as a percentage of our GDP have grown.

Why is that? It is not because we have changed tax provisions. We have changed rather few. It is because the country is more prosperous. People

now find themselves in higher tax brackets even when those brackets are adjusted for inflation because they are doing well in the market, they are exercising stock options. This is not everybody, but it is enough to drive higher Federal receipts.

But this chart is often put forward by the Republican side to argue that there must be some huge explosion in liberal spending in this town that is responsible for these increases in Federal receipts as a percentage of GDP.

Let me go on to the second chart. This is the chart they will not show you, Federal Government expenditures as a percent of GDP dropping every year, every year. Well, expenditures are going down as a percent of GDP receipts are going up.

Is this some liberal conspiracy to spend more money? Obviously not. Expenditures are on their way down. What we are doing is paying off the huge multi-trillion-dollar national debt. And it is about time. We are building up a surplus in the Social Security fund which we have locked up there for Social Security beneficiaries. And it is about time. It is just in the nick of time.

The chart that shows that Federal receipts are up simply shows that a more prosperous Nation will pay higher capital gains taxation, higher estate taxes, simply because more prosperous people pay more taxes. The chart here shows that fiscal responsibility has reigned on the expenditure side in this Federal Government and that we have begun the long period of paying off our national debt, the vast majority of which was run up during the Reagan-Bush administrations.

So we on the Democratic side get criticized for paying the debt run up during their administrations. It just shows you how absurd some of the fiscal analysis has been.

Now, at this point let me address the most fiscally irresponsible proposal that has been put forward in this campaign, and that is the plan of Governor Bush to promise the same trillion dollars to two groups of people.

Now, when I first got to Congress, everybody said Social Security is in deep trouble, that Social Security may not be able to survive. And after a while, we improved the economy so that more workers are paying more money into Social Security, and we are now in a position with a few very minor additions to the Social Security trust fund that have been proposed to ensure that the Social Security system is solvent for 50 or even 75 years.

But no one thinks that there is just a huge pile of unneeded money in the Social Security trust fund except perhaps the Governor of Texas. He has promised to take a trillion dollars over the next decade and put it in special extra accounts for young workers. This is money that is needed to pay Social

Security benefits to older workers and our retirees. He makes this promise; and he promises whole new benefits, you will be able to play the market, you will get rich, you will have a lavish retirement and even more.

Social Security has always been there to provide security for those who live into their retirement years and who otherwise, without Social Security, would not have that as a source of income and might not have any other source of income.

But one thing with Social Security is, when you die, you are done. There is a small death benefit. But we cannot afford to turn to the sons and daughters of a man or woman who dies at age 66 and say, well, you know, your parents did not live as long as expected. Actuarially, they should have lived to age 80. We planned to pay them until age 80. Here is a big check. We cannot afford to do that.

The reason we cannot afford to do that is that next door there will be another senior who will not only live to age 80 but will live to age 1001, and if you are going to be able to afford to make Social Security benefit checks to those who live far longer than expected, you cannot write huge residual checks to the families of those who live shorter than expected.

But Bush has promised huge checks inheritable by the heirs of those who participate in this new Social Security system and extra retirement bordering on luxury combined with a whole new inheritable benefit.

How does he propose to provide this trillion dollars of extra benefits to buy the votes of younger Americans? At the same time, this trillion dollars is needed to pay retirement benefits to those who are presently retired.

Well, the story is not quite as simple as I make it out to be. The Governor is correct when he says that Social Security is scheduled to have a \$2.7 trillion surplus by the year 2010. So if you have a \$2 trillion-plus surplus, what is the matter with the Governor buying some votes by giving away a trillion dollars of it or not giving away but providing additional benefits not previously there?

The problem is that we need a \$2.7 trillion surplus in Social Security and more to prepare for the baby boomer retirement, that demographic bulge when you raid the surplus held in Social Security to the tune of a trillion dollars on the theory that there will still be plenty of money left there in 2010, you assure the bankruptcy of Social Security in a year, approximately 2020.

Because once the baby boomers retire and for as long as we are receiving Social Security benefits, there will be a need to pay out of Social Security more than it is taking in. And that is why you need a large surplus in Social

Security in the year 2015 or thereabouts when the baby boomers start to retire.

□ 1230

So we have a candidate for President who promises a trillion dollars to two different groups of people: those who are older and those who are young. He can do it by raiding the Social Security trust fund which he correctly points out has well over \$2 trillion in it and could be used to provide massive benefits and special accounts to the tune of well over \$2 trillion so long as we did not care what happened to the solvency of Social Security after 2010. I for one think that we should worry about the solvency of Social Security. It is not so dire that we should scare people into thinking Social Security will not be there for them when they retire. But there is not such a huge surplus that we can provide whole new benefits to new voter blocs unconceived of at the time Social Security was put together to be paid for out of supposedly huge surpluses in the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, that really concludes what I wanted to say about fiscal policy. I want to focus next on events in the Middle East.

We all pray for peace in the Middle East, but it is important that we focus on the reasons for the rioting, the reasons for the conflict breaking out recently. We are told that this conflict broke out because General Sharon, the leader of the minority side of Israeli politics, chose to visit the site where Solomon's Temple once stood, the site where Jesus confronted the money changers, that he chose to visit that site and that the Palestinian Authority found that visit, just the fact that he was visiting, so offensive that they have begun weeks of violent confrontations.

Let me put this into context. First, Mr. Sharon contacted the Palestinian Authority and indicated his desire to visit the site of Solomon's Temple, the site that is the holiest site in the Jewish religion, so holy that many Jews will not visit there because it is too holy to visit; but he chose to go there, and I respect that. And he was told, fine, visit that site. Simply do not go into the mosques that have been built there. He reached that agreement. It was choreographed that soon after this planned, expected, and scheduled visit by Mr. Sharon, the Palestinian Authority unleashed its malicious, disguised as disorganized, rioters in announced, planned days of rage for the purpose of causing as much violence and death as possible. But even if Mr. Sharon's visit had not been scheduled and approved, a statement by the Palestinian Authority that Mr. Sharon cannot visit the Temple Mount and to do so will cause violence, what does that mean?

I know that Israel, as to every holy site under its control, has an absolute

policy that everyone of every religion, and three great religions have holy sites in a relatively small area there, everyone is entitled to visit. Certainly that policy should apply to the Temple Mount in the center of Jerusalem, Israel's capital. But to say that a Jew cannot visit that site, does that mean a Christian cannot visit that site? I hope not. Because over the centuries, much blood has been spilled by the right to establish the right of pilgrims to visit the holy sites in the Holy Land.

And then we are told, well, it is not because Mr. Sharon is a Jew but because his politics are controversial, that it was somehow appropriate for the Palestinian Authority to react angrily to his visit. Wait a minute. What if Israel said that Reverend Sharpton could not visit Bethlehem, or Pat Buchanan could not visit Bethlehem because they have controversial positions, positions that many Israelis and many American Jews disagree with? If we are going to say that access to the holy sites is not available to those with controversial political positions, then we have ended the time when the holy sites are available to all pilgrims of all religions. It is the responsibility of the Palestinian Authority to make the holy sites available to everyone who wishes to visit. And if they are incapable of doing so, they should turn not only legal control but physical control of those sites over to Israeli security forces so that the Israelis are in a position to assure access, and we, all of us of all faiths, are free to visit.

I am troubled, also, but intrigued by the recent decision of the Palestinian Authority to send some of its wounded people to Baghdad for treatment. Now, our heart goes out to anyone injured in this conflict, whether that person be an innocent bystander or whether that person be someone engaged in physical violence. Once they are wounded, our heart goes out to them. But this does not mean we can ignore the implications of sending these people to Baghdad for treatment. What does it mean?

First, it means that all the discussion of the sanctions against Iraq being bad and being harmful to the people of Iraq are exploded. Iraq not only has the medical capacity to treat its own people, it is bringing in people from two countries away to provide medical treatment. This is proof that through the export of oil under the oil for food and medical supplies program, Iraq is able to generate as much in the way of food and medicine as it needs. In fact, Iraq has been exporting both food and medicine; and now by importing patients, they in effect are exporting medicine or medical care as well.

The fact is that the people of Iraq are being held hostage by Saddam Hussein. He would starve millions with full warehouses of food. He would starve millions if he thought that by their death they would create a picture on

CNN that would compel the United States to eliminate the controls on his economics and allow him to export all the oil he wants, keep all the money, spend none of it for food, probably, and spend it all building his military. He would kill millions of his own people if he thought that would give him the chance to build nuclear weapons. And it does not matter what sanctions we impose, he will starve people to create the pictures he needs to pressure the United Nations to let him spend all his money, or all that he would choose to, on nuclear weapons.

The second thing that is interesting about the sending of these individuals for treatment to Baghdad is that it shows the close alliance between Arafat and some of those around him on the one hand, or at least many of those around Arafat on the one hand, and the Butcher of Baghdad on the other. Those who are wounded in this Intifada have a certain celebrity status in the Arab world. The Egyptian Government, the Jordanian Government, many governments in the area with fine hospitals and a dedication to the peace process would have happily accepted for treatment all those injured as a result of these unfortunate occurrences. They would have received better treatment in Amman or Cairo than could be available in Baghdad, but they were sent to Baghdad as a sign of solidarity between the Palestinians and Saddam Hussein and an endorsement and a thank you to Saddam Hussein for resisting the peace process.

Even when it comes to the treatment of those injured, there seems to be less attention paid to the individual who is hurt and more attention to building a consensus for war.

I finally want to point out that the entire discussion in the Middle East is land for peace. But all too often the discussion is about land and not about peace. The discussion is about this acre or that acre and whether Israel will make this territorial concession or a further territorial concession or be driven from this or that parcel. Whether the Israelis will be driven from Joseph's Tomb which will then be destroyed in an act of religious savagery or antireligious savagery, all the discussion is about what land Israel will give up. We need to have a discussion in land for peace with the other side of that equation, peace; and peace is more than a day without a riot or a day without a bomb.

Peace is the universal recognition throughout the Middle East that Israel is a natural part of that region. If Israel is to make the territorial concessions which it has offered to make, it is entitled to the kind of peace the Netherlands enjoys. Does the Netherlands have the most powerful army in Europe? I do not think so. No huge air force. What the Netherlands has is universal acceptance throughout its region that there could not be a Europe

without a Holland. And that is why one could not even imagine that people would be demonstrating in Paris shouting for the eradication of the Netherlands. No one is marching through Madrid screaming death to the Dutch. But if you recast that to the Middle East, not a day goes by, certainly not a week goes by without a huge demonstration in one of Israel's neighbors in which thousands of people call for the extermination of the Israeli state and the Israeli people. That is not peace. And the end of those actions is not even being discussed.

Peace is more than a day without a riot. Peace is every textbook published by every government from Tehran to Tunis to Rabat acknowledging that Israel is an inherent part of the Middle East with a right to live. And if instead what is being offered to Israel is this shallow, temporary cease-fire, then one need not wonder why Israelis are reluctant to make territorial concessions. Land for peace is not land for a temporary lull. Because once territorial concessions are made, those concessions are permanent, measurable, and irreversible. We need an establishment of peace which is permanent and irreversible. That begins by a dedication to the Palestinian Authority to insist that every governmentally paid textbook everywhere in the Middle East shows Israel as an organic part of the Middle East with every right to be there. It does not mean huge territorial concessions by the Israelis in return for a handshake that can later be reversed.

Now, I recognize that even the description of peace I have provided is ephemeral and that the hope that Israel would be accepted someday in the Middle East the same way that

says the Netherlands is accepted in Europe may go beyond any reasonable expectation. But clearly an Israel that is willing to give up 90, 95 percent of the territory in question is entitled to every possible effort that might lead in 50 years to the kind of peace that Israel deserves.

□ 1245

I believe that that concludes my remarks, except to say that when this Congress returns, we may have to deal with the possibility of a unilateral declaration of statehood by the Palestinian Authority. Such a declaration would be a renunciation of the peace process, a renunciation not only of Camp David but also of Oslo, and such a renunciation must be met by the United States with complete repudiation. It should include all of the steps outlined in a bill passed this House just a few weeks ago, which should also include the immediate movement of the American Embassy to Jerusalem, where it should have been all along.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the previous order of the House of November 3, 2000, the House stands adjourned until 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, November 4, 2000, unless it has sooner been informed by the President of the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 84, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 160 until 2 p.m. Monday, November 13, 2000.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 160, 106th Congress, and its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 13, 2000, at 2 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the third quarter of 2000, by Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the third quarter of 2000 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Jay Jakub, Staff	7/16	7/22	Europe		1,500.00						1,500.00
Commercial airfare							5,655.79				5,655.79
Pat Murray, Staff	7/17	7/22	Europe		1,300.00						1,300.00
Commercial airfare							5,647.24				5,647.24
Merrell Moorhead, Staff	7/17	7/22	Europe		1,300.00						1,300.00
Commercial airfare							5,647.24				5,647.24
John Stopher, Staff	8/7	8/12	Europe/Asia		1,482.00						1,482.00
Commercial airfare							5,890.87				5,890.87
Beth Larson, Staff	8/16	8/27	Asia		3,882.50						3,882.50
Commercial airfare							5,337.00				5,337.00
Wyndee Parker, Staff	8/16	8/27	Asia		3,882.50						3,882.50
Commercial airfare							5,337.00				5,337.00
Diane Roark, Staff	8/16	8/26	Asia		3,516.50						3,516.50
Commercial airfare							4,300.93				4,300.93
Committee total					16,863.50		37,816.07				54,679.57

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Richard Burr	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
Alison Taylor	8/16	8/18	Jordan		464.00						464.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
	8/23	8/25	Canada		385.00		640.04				1,025.04
	8/23	8/25	Canada		385.00		584.50				969.50
Joseph Stanko	9/7	9/8	Beijing		552.00						552.00
Christopher Knauer	9/9	9/11	Lianyungang		558.00						558.00
	9/12	9/12	Shanghai		303.00						303.00
	9/13	9/15	Hong Kong		690.00						690.00
	9/16	9/18	India		669.00		7,744.13				8,413.13
	9/7	9/8	Beijing		552.00						552.00
	9/9	9/11	Lianyungang		558.00						558.00
	9/12	9/12	Shanghai		303.00						303.00
Alan Slobodin	9/13	9/15	Hong Kong		690.00						690.00
	9/16	9/18	India		669.00		7,744.13				8,413.13
	Committee total				9,552.00		16,712.80				26,264.80

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel Bryant	8/28	8/30	The Netherlands		818.49						818.49
	8/30	9/1	Germany		595.00						595.00
Commercial airfare							2,050.22				2,050.22
Carl Thorsen	8/28	8/30	The Netherlands		818.49						818.49
	8/30	9/1	Germany		595.00						595.00
Commercial airfare							2,050.22				2,050.22
Committee total					2,826.98		4,100.44				6,927.42

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY HYDE, Chairman, Oct. 30, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Erika Schlager		7/14	United States				5,578.00				5,578.00
		7/15	Bulgaria		1,201.00						1,201.00
Orest Deychakivsky		7/14	United States				5,578.00				5,578.00
		7/15	Bulgaria		975.00						975.00
Janice Helwig		7/1	Austria				1,453.00				1,453.00
		8/4	United States				5,224.00				5,224.00
		8/19	Austria		12,895.00						12,895.00
Maureen Walsh		8/20	United States				1,149.00				1,149.00
		8/21	England		676.00						676.00
		8/23	Ireland		581.00						581.00
Committee total				16,328.00		18,982.00				35,310.00	

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS SMITH, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

10884. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Conforming Amendments to the Regulations Governing Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Disability, Sex, and Age Under the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (RIN: 1870-AA10) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10885. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's consolidated report for the year ending September 30, 2000, on the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the results of internal audit and investigative activities, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10886. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Habitual Residence in the Territories and Possessions of the United

States (RIN: 1115-AB61) received September 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10887. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 560XL Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-255-AD; Amendment 39-11850; AD 2000-15-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10888. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher GmbH & Co. Model ASW-27 Sailplanes

[Docket No. 99-CE-70-AD; Amendment 39-11609; AD 2000-04-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10889. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; REVO, Incorporated Models Lake LA-4, Lake LA-4A, Lake LA-4P, Lake LA-4-200, and Lake Model 250 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-27-AD; Amendment 39-11746; AD 2000-10-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10890. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 757, 767, and 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-355-AD; Amendment 39-11848; AD 2000-15-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10891. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Model S-61 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-18-AD; Amendment 39-11805; AD 2000-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10892. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-51-AD; Amendment 39-11559; AD 2000-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10893. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-49-AD; Amendment 39-11560; AD 2000-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10894. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-260-AD; Amendment 39-11828; AD 2000-14-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10895. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-316-AD; Amendment 39-11754; AD 2000-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10896. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-11845; AD 2000-15-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10897. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-11846; AD 2000-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10898. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), and DC-9-87 (MD-87); Model MD-88 Airplanes; and Model MD-90-30 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-227-AD; Amendment 39-11849; AD 2000-15-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10899. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100 and -200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-320-AD; Amendment 39-11851; AD 2000-15-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10900. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. PA-42 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-20-AD; Amendment 39-11817; AD 2000-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10901. A letter from the Co-Chairmen, National Commission For The Review Of The National Reconnaissance Office, transmitting a report titled "The National Reconnaissance Office at the Crossroads"; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

#### 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 November 4, 2000.

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 2580. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 4144. Referral to the Committee on the Budget extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 4548. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 4585. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 4725. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 4857. Referral to the Committees on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Serv-

ices, and Commerce for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 5130. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

H.R. 5291. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 4, 2000.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COX (for himself and Mr. Wu):  
H.R. 5625. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a pilot program under which an alien may be provided H-1B nonimmigrant status without regard to the numerical limitation applicable to that nonimmigrant category if the United States employer seeking the alien's entry makes a qualifying scholarship contribution to an institution of higher education in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:  
H.R. 5626. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide additional authority to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to order refunds of unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential rates and charges for electricity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:  
H.R. 5627. A bill to designate the national aviation center located at 5020 South Meridian Avenue in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the "Glenn English Customs National Aviation Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 5628. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a patients' bill of rights, patient access to information, and accountability of health plans, and to expand access to health care coverage through tax incentives; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:  
H. Res. 666. A resolution relating to early organization of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Seventh Congress; considered and agreed to.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SHAW introduced a bill (H.R. 5629) to permit the Asphalt Commander to be placed under a foreign registry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1592: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2774: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4416: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4941: Mr. FILNER and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 5091: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 5572: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5612: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

117. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 555 of 2000 petitioning the United States Congress to enact the Younger Americans Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

118. Also, a petition of the Saipan and the Northern Islands Municipal Council, The Mariana Islands, relative to Resolution No. 6SMC-3RS-25 petitioning the Northern Mariana Islands Commonwealth Legislature to enact legislation to hold a referendum on the Federal Take Over in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Resources.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE J. CLAYTON  
WARNOCK

### HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Judge J. Clayton Warnock who has admirably served his community in Treutlen County, GA, for more than half a century.

Judge Warnock was named Treutlen County attorney in 1947 and has also served as Solicitor of City Court and Judge of City Court of Soperton, which became the State Court of Treutlen County in 1968. During his years on the bench, Warnock reviewed over 40,000 cases, only two of which were appealed and those decisions were upheld by the Appellate Court. Judge Warnock resigned in 1991 for health reasons but continued to play an active role in the community of Treutlen County Hospital Authority and the Treutlen County Development Authority.

Judge Warnock played an instrumental role in founding the county development authority and creating economic opportunities in Treutlen County, which have helped create and sustain jobs that are critical to livelihoods of many men and women in middle and south Georgia.

His perseverance in following the law, his dedication to justice, his earnest work for the people of Georgia, and his commitment to improving the lives of the families of Treutlen County have characterized his service as a community leader. His life has been one of great public service, dedication, and commitment. It is my great honor to represent Judge Warnock and the people of Treutlen County for whom he has done so much. I applaud Judge Warnock for his leadership and distinguished service, congratulate him on a job well done, and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
ARAM SEVERIAN

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud American and distinguished Californian, the Honorable Aram Severian, on the occasion of his retirement from the Superior Court of San Mateo County, CA.

Aram Severian began his career in private practice, but soon moved to public judicial work. He became deputy district attorney of San Mateo County in 1971 and commissioner of the San Mateo County Superior Court in

1976. In December 1986, Governor George Deukmejian appointed Aram Severian to the San Mateo County Municipal Court. In 1989, he became the presiding judge and in December of that year, Governor Deukmejian again recognized Judge Aram Severian and appointed him to the Superior Court in San Mateo County. He has served with distinction as the presiding judge of the Superior Court since 1994.

Judge Aram Severian has generously donated his personal time and energy to community service throughout his life. He served as director of the United Cerebral Palsy Foundation of San Mateo, coached Little League baseball in Foster City and he has been the chairman of the Parish Council at his Armenian Apostolic Church. Time and again Judge Aram Severian has given of himself and his talents for the betterment of our community.

Aram Severian has an exceptional partner in life in Hasma Severian, who in her own right is a highly regarded member of our community, and is respected for her years of important advocacy and volunteerism and who today, remains devoted to the Redwood City Library. They are the proud parents of three grown children, Michael, Linda and Lisa.

Judge Aram Severian's life of community leadership and public service is instructive to us all. His dedication to the ideals of democracy and his record of wise and fair adjudication stands tall, and it is therefore fitting that he is being honored on the occasion of his retirement from the Superior Court of San Mateo County.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, to join me in honoring this great and good man whom I'm proud to call my friend for over 30 years. We are indeed a better country and a better people because of him.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOCK  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Block Communications, Inc. The Block family and its extended mass communications family celebrates this significant milestone on November 2, 2000.

Born in Lithuania, moving to Germany for a time until his family immigrated to the United States, Paul Bloch began working in the newspaper business at age eleven when the Elmira Telegram in Elmira, New York hired him. Through age twenty, Paul Bloch—who by now had Americanized the family name to Block—worked in every department of the Elmira Telegram learning the trade and becoming especially adept at sales. Then, in 1895 and with

the encouragement of his employer, Paul Block made the move to New York City where he found employment selling advertising for newspapers across the country as a national representative for the A. Frank Richardson Company.

In 1900, Paul Block decided to venture out on his own, and by 1910 Paul Block and Associates was among the major national newspaper advertising representative firms. Further branching out, Paul Block organized a group of investors in order to purchase the Newark Star Eagle in 1916. Purchases of several other newspapers soon followed, and in ten years Paul Block owned the Detroit Journal, The Toledo Blade, and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. Paul Block struggled to keep his business alive through the decade of the Depression, and the company was again thriving upon his death in 1941.

The company continued in the Block family and eventually became known as Blade Communications Inc. Through the latter half of the century the company diversified to include cable and broadcast television, telecommunications, and Internet opportunities. Blade Communications Inc. holds fourteen communication companies today. To mark the company's centennial, the company's name was changed once more to Block Communications Inc.

The Block family remains a strong fixture in Toledo, Ohio and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where it still owns The Blade and the Post-Gazette. The Block imprimatur is evident in many of these cities' major projects and institutions, and the family remains an integral component of both communities. I join with many others as we salute one hundred years of Block family tradition in communications and community, and look forward to the next one hundred years.

HONORING THE SANDY SPRING  
MUSEUM IN ROCKVILLE, MARY-  
LAND

### HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I speak of the success of the Sandy Spring Museum in Rockville, Maryland, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary celebration. Twenty years ago the museum started with a few dozen people in the basement of a Sandy Spring Bank branch office. Today it has more than 1,000 members, a nine acre campus, and a million dollar building.

The Sandy Spring Museum is a valuable asset to our community in that it provides educational and informational services to its citizens, especially students. The Museum provides such worthwhile services as a yearly

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

musical concert series, an art gallery, and a large public research library. In addition, it houses thousands of artifacts related to the Sandy Spring community, which is over 250 years old.

Most of the success of the Museum is due to the dedication and support of the officers, staff, and members, and I commend them for their service. Through their hard work, the Museum has been successful in contributing to the preservation of the heritage of our community. It is with great pride that I congratulate the staff and members of the Sandy Spring Museum as well as the entire community as they celebrate their achievements and the heritage of their community.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following recorded votes due to funeral services for my father. I wish the RECORD to reflect how I would have voted on the following had I been present:

No. 587, H.J. Res. 122: Passage of Continuing Appropriations for FY2000, "aye"; No. 588, Motion regarding House Meeting Hour for November 2, 2000, "aye"; No. 589, H. Con. Res. 397: Passage of resolution voicing concern about serious human rights violations and fundamental freedoms in Central Asia, "aye"; No. 590, H.R. 4577: Passage of Holt motion to instruct conferees on Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, FY 2001, "no"; No. 591, H.R. 4577: Passage of Wu motion to instruct conferees on Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, FY2001, "no"; No. 592, H.J. Res. 123: Passage of Continuing Appropriations for FY 2000, "aye"; No. 594, S. 2796: Passage of Water Resources Development Act of 2000 Conference Report, "aye."

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, I was away from the House and missed one vote. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: Roll No. 592, Further Continuing Appropriations—"yea."

---

#### FINANCIAL TIMES

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to bring the following insightful opinion piece from the November 1, 2000, edition of the Financial Times to the attention of his colleagues. Written by Mr. Jagdish Bhagwati,

the Andre Meyer senior fellow in international economics at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, this commentary accurately describes the weak record of the current Administration over the past eight years in achieving needed comprehensive trade liberalization. It then forcefully identifies the disturbing consequences for further liberalization, which is beneficial to the United States and the international trading system, should Mr. GORE win the presidency. I submit the following article into the RECORD.

#### DISCRIMINATION DISGUISED AS FREE TRADE

Many card-carrying Democrats among America's trade experts are unable to make up their minds as the day approaches when they must cast their vote for George W. Bush or Al Gore.

When they think of social issues, the Supreme Court vacancies to be filled and spending on liberal programmes, they turn to Mr. Gore. But when they think of the Clinton-Gore administration's record on trade policy and of what Mr. Gore promises to do, they sit up and shudder.

The unpleasant reality is that the outcome of the election has huge implications—disturbing under Mr. Gore and comforting under Mr. Bush—for trade liberalisation and the trading system.

Start with the current administration's record. True, the White House saw through both the Uruguay round of trade talks and the North American Free Trade Agreement. But while the administration fought hard and well—as indeed a Republican administration would have done—both were Republican initiatives that the present administration inherited when they were already at an advanced stage. Furthermore, the real heroes who delivered the majority votes were Republicans.

The Democratic administration's only home-grown success has been with Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. But the deal was entirely one-sided, with China giving the U.S. everything on market access and the U.S. giving China nothing but entry into the World Trade Organization.

The Democratic team passed off these deals as a great victory for the US and for free trade. But no amount of spin can hide the ineptitude that led to the first ever failure in 1997 by a US administration to get fast-track authority renewed by Congress: Bill Clinton managed to bring only a fifth of House Democrats on board to vote for renewal.

Nor can one forget or forgive the debacle in Seattle last year when a deadly mix of mismanagement and calculated cynicism—pan-dering to the labour unions with an eye to the elections—dashed hopes of launching a new round of multilateral trade negotiations and brought the WTO into unmerited disrepute.

Underlying these failures, and prospective problems under a Gore presidency, are two legacies of this administration: surrender to the notion that free trade requires "fair trade"; and a capitulation to labour unions that fair trade requires market access to be conditional on a social clause at the WTO on fulfilment of labour standards, now tactically defined as "workers' rights".

The rise of fair trade owes much to the first Clinton-Gore administration's fixation with Japan. Bent on branding Japan as an "unfair trader" and going for high-profile but fruitless confrontations such as the car dispute, the administration made "unfair trade" a favoured tactic in the political domain.

The labour lobbies have been smart enough to adapt their demands accordingly. For decades they have worried about foreign competition and outflow of investment, especially in labour-intensive goods such as apparel and shoes. Now, they have a great new argument: unless labour standards elsewhere are similar to those in the US, trade is unfair and must be stopped. This way, you get on to higher moral ground. You also do so in the battle over markets. If poor countries accept the demands, their costs should rise and the competition will be reduced. By contrast, if they do not their exports will be cut off. This is a cynical game where governments that badly need support from the labour unions even as they turn to the "third way" see domestic political gain in caving in to these demands. The Clinton-Gore team—unlikely Tony Blair's British government—is no stranger to this tactic. Last week's announcement of a free trade agreement with Jordan—with labour and environmental standards stipulated in the text—left John Sweeney of the AFL-CIO trade union jubilant and fired up for the election. Charlene Barshefsky, the US trade representative, has called it a "template" for all trade treaties by the US.

Only a significant power would have the hubris or the chutzpah to present a trade agreement with a monarchy essentially dependent on the US, with a minuscule trade volume, as a model for the rest of the world to emulate.

But that Al Gore thinks so is certain. Indeed, his policy statements and the Democratic platform are unambiguous: no trade liberalisation without such preconditions. If so, we can forget the WTO where nothing but a big north-south divide will follow, as it did in Seattle largely as a result of this issue.

And so, under Mr. Gore, Washington will contemplate more templates with inconsequential performers, multilateral trade liberalisation will languish, and the WTO will atrophy as the world is plagued by yet more inherently preferential free trade agreements masquerading as genuine non-discriminatory free trade. Is this what we deserve?

---

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

### HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 31, 2000*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the respected representative of Nebraska's Third Congressional District, the Honorable BILL BARRETT, is retiring from this House at the end of the 106th Congress. BILL has served five productive and distinguished terms in this House. I know that BILL's presence here in Congress will be sorely missed. I wish BILL the best of luck in the coming years. The gain of Lexington, Nebraska is a loss for this body and the American people.

BILL BARRETT was elected in 1990 and his constituents have sent him back every election since, and by resounding margins I might add. BILL has served not only the needs of his mainly rural Nebraska constituents, but the needs of farmers across the nation. In 1996 BILL was instrumental in passing the Federal

Agriculture Improvement Reform Act or FAIR Act—legislation authorizing the majority of U.S. agricultural programs until 2002. And BILL has been a leader in his efforts to improve education in rural communities across the United States, particularly as a respected Member of the Education and the Workforce Committee. BILL's hard work and dedication on Agricultural matters will be missed, he leaves some very large shoes to fill come January.

Then there is the matter of our resemblance. Some have claimed that BILL and I are similar in appearance. To compound matters even further, there is a third Member, TOM EWING of Illinois—and TOM is also retiring this year—who is said to share our resemblance. Well, I can't say for certain which of the three of us gets the better end of that comparison, but I do know that I wouldn't mind being confused for BILL BARRETT when it comes to this enthusiasm for smaller, more efficient government. Since helping to bring a Republican majority to Congress in 1994, BILL BARRETT has been a steadfast voice in bringing fiscal responsibility back to the federal budget process. His efforts to ensure a balanced budget and to restrain federal spending over the past ten years have been instrumental in bringing about the budget surplus that we enjoy today. That is something that BILL can be very proud of during this retirement years.

I've known BILL and Elsie since I was first elected to this House in 1992. BILL quickly became a trusted friend, one who could always be counted on to provide clear and useful information, wise insight, and good, solid counsel. To a freshman Member of Congress in 1992, BILL's friendship and wisdom meant a great deal to me. It still does. I place the highest value on that friendship.

I wish BILL and his family heartfelt congratulations on his retirement and I thank him for his many years of public service to America.

---

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
SIDNEY R. YATES

**HON. OWEN B. PICKETT**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and a sense of loss that we ponder the passing of a truly great public servant, Sidney Yates. I had the pleasure of working with Sid during my entire career in the U.S. House of Representatives. During that time, I came to know him as a tireless servant to the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois and the nation as a whole.

Sid served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 24 terms. During his tenure, he was a constant champion of the arts and, as Chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, an unswerving advocate for the conservation of our public lands. To many of his colleagues, however, Sid was an inspiring example of dedication, character and integrity. He has been and will continue to be missed in the halls he walked in for so many years.

TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN S. TAMRAZ

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished American who has been honored with the AMVETS Silver Helmet Americanism Award, Lincoln S. Tamraz.

Lincoln S. Tamraz has been an active member of AMVETS for over 50 years. He has held numerous leadership positions, including being elected national commander of AMVETS. He worked successfully to establish the Assyrian American AMVETS Post No. 5. Mr. Tamraz is serving his second term as national president of the Past Association of National Commanders.

In addition to his extraordinary leadership of AMVETS, Mr. Tamraz has also dedicated himself to spreading the ideals of the American flag. He has been an active member of the AMVETS Flag Day committee where he has assisted with the establishment of the Avenue of Flags, which places flags on the graves of veterans in Illinois cemeteries. He has also tirelessly worked to ensure that Chicago public schools receive an American flag each year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Lincoln S. Tamraz and his superb leadership and patriotism of over half a century. I am exceedingly proud to know him and honor him for making our country a better place for all.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BOB ETHERIDGE**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 592, H.J. Res. 123, the 13th Continuing Appropriations Resolution, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

---

MINORITY HEALTH AND HEALTH  
DISPARITIES RESEARCH AND  
EDUCATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 1, 2000*

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my House colleagues JOHN LEWIS, BENNIE THOMPSON, CHARLIE NORWOOD, and JESSE JACKSON, Jr. who are champions in this important effort to address the issue of minority health disparities. This is a matter of deep concern to not only African-Americans, but also to Hispanic-Americans, Native-Americans, and other minorities who are clearly underserved by the American health care system.

Despite continuing advances in research and medicine, disparities in American health care are a growing problem. This is evidenced

by the fact that minority Americans lag behind in nearly every single measure of health quality. Those measures include life expectancy, health care coverage, access to care, and disease rates. Ethnic minorities and individuals in medically underserved rural communities continue to suffer disproportionately from many diseases such as cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases. There have been numerous studies in scientific journals showing the severity of racial and ethnic health disparities and the need for action in order to remedy this grave problem.

For these and countless other reasons, it is time for the Nation to focus on this problem and to work to bring fairness to our minority citizens in the Nation's public and private health care systems. There is no better place to start this effort than the focal point for Federal health research, the renowned and highly respected National Institutes of Health.

Since 1996, Congress has increased funding for basic medical research at NIH from \$12 billion to over \$18 billion—over a 50 percent increase. These funds support 50,000 scientists working at 2,000 institutions across the United States. I have been proud to support these increases, but I think it is now time that we target some portion of those funds on the Nation's most acute health problems among our minority citizens—and I might add, minority taxpayers.

Let me say that I am delighted to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3250. Among other provisions, this legislation will elevate the existing office of Research on Minority Health at NIH to a National Center for Research on Minority Health. This upgrade to the level of National Center would in itself underscore the importance of this work, and along with expanded research and education, improved data systems and strengthened public awareness, we will be taking a great leap forward in addressing this critical national problem.

The Minority Health and Health Disparities Research and Education Act will increase our knowledge of the nature and causes of health disparities, improve the quality and outcomes of health care services for minority populations, and aid in bringing us closer to our mutual goal of closing the long-standing gap in health care.

I am deeply committed to this legislation, and I urge you to support my colleagues and me in our effort to rectify this inequality in health care.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, I missed several votes. Had I been here I would have voted as follows: Roll No. 588, that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. on Thursday, November 2—"no"; Roll No. 589 to agree to H. Con. Res. 397, Violation of Human Rights in Central Asia—"yea"; Roll No. 590, Holt Motion to Instruct—"yea"; Roll No. 591, Wu Motion to Instruct—"yea."

THE WESTFIELD SHOPPINGTOWNS  
IN MARYLAND

**HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, for the third year in a row, the Westfield Shoppingtowns in Maryland have been fulfilling dreams in their local communities.

Westfield Works Wonders is a fundraising event that has helped over 125 Maryland non-profits raise funds for their organizations. Traditionally held on the Sunday before Thanksgiving, tickets to the event are sold by local charities for an exclusive evening of shopping and festivities. One hundred percent of the ticket proceeds benefit the participating charities.

This year Westfield Works Wonders will be held on Sunday, November 19th from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m. at Westfield Shoppingtowns Montgomery Mall, Wheaton, and Annapolis. Last year over \$160,000 was raised for the participating organizations.

I applaud the Westfield Shoppingtowns for their committed spirit of volunteerism and extend best wishes for a "wonderful" evening.

A TRIBUTE TO SIDNEY YATES

**HON. MARCY KAPTUR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to be able to enter these precious remembrances of our dear friend and able attorney, Congressman Sidney Yates, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His illustrious career spanned half a century, 24 terms as a Member of the people's House. And what a stellar human being, citizen, and Member he was! I had the distinct pleasure of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee and in that capacity deepened my respect for him each passing year.

When I think of this true gentleman from Illinois, I remember his engaging smile, his brilliant intellect, his love of the arts and of the environment, his puckish humor, and his devotion to human and civil rights. His knowledge of the Rules of the House knew no equal. And he applied his legislative skills with a mastery that elevated us all. Yes, Sid Yates, Master of the House.

How many times I recall Sid standing up for recognition in the Committee to carry his arguments. Eloquent. I admired his ability highly. So erudite was he, holding the attention of all listeners. Were it not for the fact that he left the House briefly to run for the U.S. Senate, I have no doubt he would have attained the Chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee. He certainly possessed all the ability and respect required of it.

Just before Sid left Congress, I asked him what he considered his major accomplishments as a tenured Member of this body. I thought he would answer that his legacy included major expansion of our national park

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

system, or our institutions of art and culture, or improvements to his home district on Chicago's northwest side. Or, I imagined he would mention the major donations of art he had given to museums across our nation. For indeed his accomplishments included all of these. Yet he mentioned none of this. First, he said he considered his efforts to achieve the integration of the Capitol Police Force in the late 1940's to be a stellar achievement. Then, he said helping establish the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum would remain in his memory always.

One cold winter evening, when the National Gallery of Art had a modernist exhibition, I was strolling through the galleries and came upon Sid with his beloved wife, Addie. As always, he greeted me warmly and called me "dearie", too, as I imagine he did with all the women Members. He was always encouraging, cajoling, lifting us all. I think he took special satisfaction in helping the minority of women in this institution rise to full acceptance.

My heartfelt sympathies go out to the family of this magnificent man who loved his nation and dedicated his entire life to the business of democratic governance. What a joy to have known him and learned from him! What a legacy he has left for America.

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE  
ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, the Congress was set to vote on a historic resolution recognizing the Armenian Genocide but it was pulled because the lobbying power of the Turkish Government has once again stifled it. Opponents have argued that passage of this resolution would severely jeopardize United States-Turkey relations. This resolution is not an indictment of the current Turkish Government nor is it a condemnation of any current leader of Turkey. It is an acknowledgment of genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire almost a century ago.

In 1915, 1.5 million women, children, and men were killed and the Ottoman Empire forcibly deported 500,000 Armenians during an 8-year reign of brutal repression. Armenians were deprived of their homes, their dignity, and ultimately their lives. Yet America, the greatest democracy and land of freedom, has not made an official statement regarding the Armenian Genocide. I am dismayed and angered by this hypocrisy and I will not rest until this resolution passes the Congress.

The Armenian Genocide has been acknowledged by countries and international bodies such as Argentina, Belgium, Canada, the Council of Europe, Cyprus, the European Parliament, France, Great Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Russia, the United Nations and Uruguay. All of these countries and organizations believed that recognizing this resolution outweighed any potential repercussion from Turkey. We should be part of this honor roll of nations and organizations.

*November 3, 2000*

Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress of Armenian and Assyrian descent, I am very proud of my heritage. I sat at the knees of my grandparents and elders as they told their stories of hardship and suffering endured by so many at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. That is how I came to this understanding and this knowledge and why I bring this story to the House of Representatives.

It is important to appreciate fully that the Armenian people have made great contributions to our nation. They have distinguished themselves in the arts, in law, in academics, in every walk of life and they continue to make significant contributions in communities across our country today.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that Congress begin to heal the wounds of the past. It's critically important for our nation to acknowledge what happened, but also as a nation it is important to understand that we are teaching present and future generations of the Armenian Genocide.

In closing, I want to express my gratitude to the Armenian community for their hard work on this resolution. This work is not in vain because we've brought the genocide into our nation's consciousness against great odds. In another Congress, in another time, we shall complete this effort and I shall do everything I can to see that this resolution and all it represents will be the official expression of our nation.

HONORING JENNIFER AND MARK  
EDWARDS, JR.

**HON. BOB ETHERIDGE**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate Jennifer and Mark Edwards, Jr. of Raleigh, North Carolina. On October 31, 2000, they welcomed into the world a seven-pound, four ounce baby girl, Avery Sutton Edwards. As the father of three wonderful children myself, I know that there is nothing more wonderful and joyous than the experience of watching a child grow. I know that they will treasure every new day with their new daughter. Faye joins me in wishing the Edwards family great happiness during this very special time of their lives.

TENNESSEE DIVISION I  
GOVERNORS CUP RECIPIENTS

**HON. ED BRYANT**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate the Adamsville, Tennessee Junior/Senior High School Band for winning the governors cup in the Tennessee Division I State Championship.

In addition to winning this distinguished award, the band also did well in several areas. The band received first place in the percussion division and third place overall in the

guard division. The field commander was fourth overall and the band received an award for High Music. The band percussion color guard and the field commander received superior ratings from the judges.

I would like to further recognize Ms. Lyndi Henline, the first chair trumpet, who was recognized as being the best soloist in the competition. Band director Frankie Congiordo, assistant band director Scott King and color guard coordinator Kelly Wilder should be commended for their tremendous coaching job. But these accomplishments required a fine group of young adults and I would like to recognize the whole band and color guard for their accomplishments.

The members of the band and color guard are: Felicia Jenan Acker; Jonathon Garrett Alexander; Catherine Elizabeth Bart; Jennifer Lynne Boyd; April Lynn Britt; David Seth Brooks; Jessie Lauren Bryant; Jessica Brooke Carr; Brandon James Choate; Alex Sagan Eubank; Lauren Elaine Finley; Jessica Ashley Bearden; Kevin Wesley Blythe; Christy Lynn Brewer; Allyson Paige Browning; Matthew Rogers Browning; Adam Neal Carothers; Stephanie Anne Casey; Trina Corine Doyle; Adam Ryan Eubank; Matthew David Ferguson; Lydia Ruth Gillis; Lyndi Nicole Henline; Sean Michael Humphries; Matthew Ryan Lott; Sara Elizabeth Norris; Alison Marie Oldaker; Lakesha Laquia Patterson; Jennifer Dawn Pickens; Justin Randall Qualls; Christopher Lyn Ritter; Carrie Beth Roach; Tabatha Ann Robertson; Felicia Lynn Frazier; Kellan Ann Hanson; Justin Lynn Jones; Lindsay Carol Rose; April Chalice Pickens; Britney Nicole Rose; Adam Dwayne Shambeau; Christopher John Stricklin; Mallory Brooke Tucker; Miranda Lee Weeks; Allison Renee White; Natalie Brooke White; Zachary Michael Yarbrough; Ann Hark; Robbin Leora Acker; Magan Devena Alexander; Brandon Ray Brown; Glynnis Michelle Gerstenkof; Nathan Allen Haynes; Brenda Nicole Spence; Holly Renee Spencer; Ashley Brooke Terry; Mary Elizabeth Wiley; Jana Michelle Henry; Jennifer Crystal Merryman; Kimberly Denise Moore; Mary Beth Pickens; Christina Jewel Rootes; Amber Lynn Starnes; Whitney Michelle Tennyson; Maria Danielle Wiley; Megann Jean Wright; Matthew Raymond Robinson; James Justin Roy; Daniel Ray Russell; David Lawrence Russell; Stefanie Annette Spence; Cory Alan Tucker; Elizabeth Arianne Turner; Mitzi Lynn Williams; Rhianna C. Axley; Jessica Renne Curtis and Rebecca Adeline Davis.

Adamsville High School Principal Brian Jackson and Assistant Principals Mike Kimmon and Greta Bachuss should be proud of the accomplishments of their students and directors. I know that many parents are involved in the band boosters association and I am very appreciative for their hard work as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Adamsville Junior/High School band represented the town of Adamsville to the best of their ability and was rewarded with so many honors. I wish this team the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

U.S. EDUCATION EXPENDITURES

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, this election year, time and time again, on the campaign trail, in the halls of Congress, and out in neighborhood communities, the subject of education spending is high on the minds of many. While many individuals and groups call out for more and more federal spending, they perhaps do not realize that government spending on education (at all levels) has increased more than six-fold in the past 25 years. The United States spent twice as much on education as it did on national defense in 1998. Those who clamor for better education through increased spending should look at the vast expenditure increases we've made in the last quarter century and consider whether the improvements made have lived up to the dollars spent.

In July 1974, I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks concerning my extensive study of U.S. education expenditure at the time. Now a quarter of a century later, I am including some updated facts on U.S. education spending.

EXPENDITURES ON U.S. EDUCATION

Education is still the largest occupational group in America. In 1998 there were nearly 6 million Americans employed as teachers in levels K through college. Nearly 1 in 5 of the world's teachers is an American teacher.

Education expenditures per student in public elementary and secondary schools have increased by leaps and bounds since the end of World War II. The following figures show expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools on a per student basis based on fall enrollment (all figures in constant 1998-99 dollars).

1947-48 .....	\$1,119
1957-58 .....	1,793
1967-68 .....	2,963
1977-78 .....	4,404
1987-88 .....	5,577
1997-98 .....	<sup>1</sup> 6,275

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

Likewise, per student expenditures of all institutions of higher education and degree-granting institutions have gone up dramatically since the end of World War II. The following figures show educational and general expenditures per student in fall enrollment (all figures in constant 1995-96 dollars).

1947-48 .....	\$3,946
1957-58 .....	6,078
1967-68 .....	8,444
1977-78 .....	7,925
1985-96 .....	<sup>1</sup> 10,583

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

1. Total U.S. expenditure on education (federal, state, local, and private) in 1998, at all levels, was \$618.6 billion. This is twice as much as the amount spent for national defense, \$310.3 billion in 1998. This is compared to \$98 billion spent in 1974 on all levels of education.

2. Total public expenditure (federal, state, and local) in 1998 was \$429.2 billion. Total private spending was \$189.4 billion, or about

30.6% of the total education expenditure. Total public expenditure in 1974 amounted to \$79 billion.

3. In 1998, \$371.9 billion was spent on elementary and secondary schools. Of that, private expenditures amounted to \$36.4 billion, or 9.8%. Back in 1974, \$61.6 billion was spent on elementary and secondary schools, both at the public and private level.

4. In 1998, \$246.7 billion was spent on higher education. Of that, private expenditures amounted to 62%. In 1974, I found that \$34.7 billion was spent on higher education and of this amount \$23 billion was public and \$11.7 billion was private.

5. Of the total public funds spent on education in 1998, \$52.3 billion were appropriated at the federal level, \$222.6 billion at the state level, and \$154.3 billion at the local level. \$189.4 billion was spent at the private level in 1998.

6. The U.S. has spent 7.3% of its GDP on education since 1991.

7. In 1998, the U.S. spent a total of \$2,287 per capita on all levels of education. By comparison, in 1970, the U.S. spent an average of \$308 per capita on total U.S. education expenditures.

8. According to 1994 UNESCO figures, European nations averaged \$982 per capita in education outlays. The U.S. spent twice that per capita in 1994 at \$2,286.

9. Also according to 1994 UNESCO figures, the United States budget for education in 1994 was \$481.7 billion. This is nearly equal to the total budget for education in all of Europe, \$492.6 billion. Additionally, the U.S. is host country to 30% of the foreign students seeking an education outside of their home country.

10. Although education spending represents a small part of the federal budget, education is still the single largest item in state and local budgets. Education accounts for 12.4% of state expenditures and 36.8% of local expenditures.

Looking back historically over the past few decades:

In 1978, federal education spending was \$14.6 billion, state education spending was \$51.1 billion, and local education spending was \$39.1 billion. Private educational expenditures were \$35.6 billion. The total U.S. education spending at all levels was \$140.4 billion.

In 1988, federal education spending was \$26.7 billion, state education spending was \$121.3, and local education spending was \$79.3 billion. Private educational expenditures were \$86.1 billion. The total U.S. education spending at all levels was \$313.4 billion.

In 1998, federal education spending was \$52.3 billion, state education spending was \$222.6 billion, and local education spending was \$154.3 billion. Private educational expenditures were \$189.4 billion. The total U.S. education spending at all levels was \$618.6 billion.

It is important to ask ourselves then, while education expenditures have been steadily increasing, has the quality of education also been rising in tandem? Are students and parents getting more for their money, as they should be? Our children deserve the best possible education that we can give them, either public or private. Before we dedicate even

more resources to federal education spending, we should investigate whether throwing more money into a deep well is the best path to follow for our nation's school children.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
CHARLES CANADY

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, CHARLES CANADY of Florida. I have had the good fortune to serve with CHARLES CANADY on the Committee on the Judiciary. In his capacity as Chairman of the Constitution subcommittee, as in all his professional roles, he had served with honesty, dedication, and integrity. Therefore, I know I echo the sentiments of our colleagues, both on the Judiciary Committee and throughout the House, when I say that we will miss our friend, CHARLES CANADY.

CHARLES CANADY has served as a tireless advocate for the people of Florida's 12th Congressional District. At the same time, he has fought on behalf of all Americans to bring morality and common-sense to the laws governing our great nation. Even when issues as controversial as partial birth abortion came up, he stuck by his principles. When the country was divided during the impeachment nearly two years ago, he stood firmly behind the rule of law.

One of CHARLES CANADY's guiding principles is that government should not divide its citizens, but unite them. It should not place Americans into separate racial, gender, or ethnic groups. Rather government should strengthen those bonds that make us all Americans. Throughout his tenure in the House, CHARLES CANADY has remained committed to working toward realizing this goal.

For these and many other reasons, both CHARLES CANADY's constituents and his colleagues will miss him. Back in 1992, CHARLES CANADY pledged to serve no more than four consecutive terms in this body. While I admire his commitment to keeping his word, I know I speak for many of our colleagues when I say the House is losing one of its most effective Members. I wish CHARLES CANADY the best in whatever the future holds.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CHRIS CANNON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege. I was unavoidably detained during a vote on the motion by the gentleman from Oregon to instruct conferees on the Fiscal Year 2001 Labor-HHS Appropriations Bill, rollcall vote No. 591.

Had I been present I would have voted "no."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWO CENTRAL NEW YORK HIGH  
SCHOOLS WIN NEW YORK STATE  
MARCHING BAND COMPETITION

**HON. JAMES T. WALSH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 29, 2000, two Central New York high schools won their respective divisions at the 2000 New York Field Band Conference Championship in Syracuse, New York. West Genesee High School located in Camillus, New York won their 12th straight title in the National Division of the competition. C.W. Baker High School in Baldwinsville, New York placed first in the Division III large-school competition.

Today, I would like to recognize the hard work, dedication and support of the band members, leaders and parents. Excellence has been achieved only through the dedication of so many, and I congratulate all of them on their success.

Forty bands competed in the championship competition held at the Carrier Dome on the Syracuse University Campus. West Genesee competed against six other teams in the National Division. Since 1974, West Genesee has won 23 of the past 27 New York State Field Band Conference Championships. The 2000 "Wildcat" Band has 170 members in grades 9-12. The end of the 2000 season marks the bands seventh consecutive undefeated year in New York State competition.

C.W. Baker High School competed against nine schools in the Large School, Division III component of the competition. The win marked "the Bee's" third New York State Championship victory. The 2000 Baker High Band has 70 members in grades 8-12.

I am pleased to congratulate all of the participants, supporters and leaders of West Genesee High School and Baldwinsville C.W. Baker High School Marching Bands.

MISSED OPPORTUNITY

**HON. LOIS CAPPS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I stayed in Washington until the last possible moment, hoping that Congress could finish the business of the people of the Central Coast and all Americans. There are critical unresolved issues still on the table—including school modernization, common-sense tax relief, and adequate funding for Medicare.

I am deeply dismayed that the congressional leadership has decided to push these issues off to a lame duck session. The American people deserve better. I support the Water Resources Development Act for a number of reasons. The bill authorizes a historic environmental restoration of our national treasure, the Everglades. Here on the Central Coast, I was pleased to help include \$9.2 million in federally authorized funding for the Lower Mission Creek Area flood control project.

*November 3, 2000*

I am, however, very disappointed that two additional provisions that I secured in the House bill were stripped out by the Senate Leadership. I fought for authorization to fund the Los Osos sewage treatment. I also secured a \$10.3 million authorization for a desalination project in Cambria. Both of these projects are important to the quality of life for thousands of San Luis Obispo county residents.

At this time, I am pleased to note that the leadership of both the House and Senate have pledged to include these projects in the final appropriations legislation that will pass when Congress reconvenes after the election. My constituents can rest assured that I will work very hard to see that these critical programs are enacted.

HONORING CITIZENSHIP AND  
SERVICE

**HON. STEVE BUYER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the final days of the 106th Congress, I would like to address what it means to be a citizen of these United States. America's national character has always been defined by hard work, discipline and commitment to a higher goal. These ideals have convinced patriots throughout our history to serve their nation and defend freedom and the rule of law in every corner of the globe. They have also inspired ordinary citizens to dedicate themselves to improving the lives of their neighbors through service to their communities.

With Veterans' Day now a week away, it is appropriate to pause and reflect on the service and sacrifice that so many of our citizens have made in defense of freedom. Tragically, this service has often exacted a terrible price. On October 12, 2000, seventeen American sailors gave their lives when a terrorist bomb exploded near the U.S.S. *Cole*, a Navy destroyer moored in Aden, Yemen. I extend my condolences to the families of those who died and my heart felt appreciation to all those who wear the uniform of America's armed forces. Your dedicated service ensures our nation's continued prosperity and well-being.

The obligation to serve one's nation is an important component of citizenship but it is not the sole domain of those who wear the uniform of the United States' armed forces. On the contrary, service comes in many forms. Participation in one's local government, church or charity is an important aspect of service to the nation. Active involvement in the lives of our families is an often overlooked and neglected aspect of service. Whatever the calling, selfless service to a higher goal satisfies an important obligation that we all have as citizens of our great nation.

As we approach Election Day 2000, it is important to recognize another equally important component of citizenship: Our right and duty to vote. Plato said, "The price of apathy towards public affairs is to be ruled by evil men." In our form of democracy, liberty cannot be preserved without the participation of the

electorate. Yet, sadly, many of our citizens fail to exercise their right and responsibility to cast their vote for those who would govern them. This ambivalence erodes the rigor of our democracy and can lead to disastrous results for our nation. On Tuesday, November 7, 2000, honor your fathers and their fathers before them by exercising your civic responsibility at the voting booth.

The most visible and enduring symbol of a strong, active American citizenry is our flag, the Stars and Stripes. Two hundred and twenty-three years after Congress first authorized the flag, it stands as a powerful symbol of our Republic, the courage of those who have defended it, and the resolve of Americans to protect their freedom. It is a mighty symbol, not only to the citizens of this great nation, but also to those abroad who see it flying at our embassies or on the ships of our naval fleet.

The Continental Congress resolved that, "The flag of the United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." This blueprint is representative of the unity that we have been able to forge in this melting pot of cultures, ethnic groups, and races. Regardless of where our families originated from, the rich heritage that they brought with them and the uniquely American culture that they have forged, represents one of our greatest strengths.

America is still recognized as the land of opportunity and some of our proudest citizens are the newest Americans. Dr. Lorne A. Schnell, the father of a member of my Congressional staff, was one of these proud new Americans. Originally from Saskatchewan, Canada, Dr. Schnell and his wife, Joanne, have lived in Bourbonnais, Illinois since 1984. Steadfastly proud of his Canadian heritage, he made the decision to become an American citizen last year. Dr. Schnell flew his American flag with unabashed pride and he was eagerly looking forward to voting in this first election next week. Sadly, this proud new American passed away suddenly on October 12, 2000, in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Dr. Schnell's life embodied the tenets of citizenship that I have discussed above. After a thirty-six year career in the pharmaceutical industry, he chose to dedicate his retirement years to serving his community. A gifted musician, avid golfer and talented woodworker, Dr. Schnell nonetheless committed countless hours to improving the lives of the people in his community. He worked hard to establish the Kankakee Valley Youth Orchestra and his vision was finally realized this summer. He also served on his church board of trustees and taught English as a second language to new immigrants.

President Richard Nixon said, "We must always remember that America is a great nation today not because of what government did for people but because of what people did for themselves and for one another." President Nixon's words embody the spirit of individual service and honor the extraordinary contributions of ordinary citizens like Dr. Lorne A. Schnell.

Liberty, justice, freedom and opportunity. These are not just idle words, they are the fundamental principles that make our Republic

unique. Embrace these ideals and honor our forefathers by participating in the governance of your town, county, state and country. Volunteer your time and serve your community. Stand and proudly salute as your nation's flag passes by and instill in your children what it means to be an American citizen.

Citizenship is one of our nation's greatest strengths; it gives our nation's democracy vitality and longevity. As we face the uncertainties and challenges of the third millennium, the strength and character of the American citizenry provides us with the foundation to move forward as a nation. President Abraham Lincoln once said, "Whatever you are, be a good one." Heed President Lincoln's words by committing yourself to being an active participant in the well-being of your family and your community. Your dedicated service will help ensure the continuing prosperity of our great nation.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO  
CONGRESSMAN CHARLES CANADY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixture of sadness and enthusiasm that I bid farewell to a friend and colleague, CHARLES CANADY as he prepares to voluntarily end his service in the United States Congress.

I am sad because I have known CHARLES since our days in the Florida state legislature but am excited for him as he embarks on a new journey.

I have had the distinct pleasure of not only serving with Congressman CANADY here in the House, but also in the Florida legislature where during his first term he was honored as the Most Effective First Term Legislator.

I believe that designation has stayed with him throughout his tenure in the House where he has served his district, the state of Florida, and indeed the nation by working hard on behalf of Florida's agricultural industry, on legislation for lobbying disclosure reform and strengthening our criminal justice system.

The 1998 Almanac of American Politics summed it up when they said that "CANADY is hard-working and . . . strong in his convictions . . ."

I am certain his leadership will be missed by the constituents of Florida's 12th Congressional district. For myself, I can certainly say that his friendship and accomplishments in the House will be sorely missed and I know that he will continue to succeed in his role as Florida Governor Jeb Bush's General Counsel.

I am proud to have known and worked with Representative CANADY and I ask my Congressional colleagues to join me in paying tribute and saying good-bye to this dear friend.

IN HONOR OF THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE RESEARCH OF MIDDLE EASTERN CULTURES AND THE MOROCCAN 45TH INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the Association for the Research of Middle Eastern Cultures, A.R.M.E.C., on its fifth anniversary, and to recognize the 45th Moroccan Independence Day. A.R.M.E.C promotes cultural, social, educational, and religious activities in order to facilitate the participation of the Middle Eastern community in American life.

A.R.M.E.C strives to promote interaction between individuals of various cultural and religious backgrounds in order to create an environment of mutual respect and understanding. For the past three years, they have honored and commended various Artists of the Year in order to further appreciate and bring recognition to the rich cultural heritage of the Middle East.

A.R.M.E.C.'s mission is to help facilitate a harmonious multicultural society. They sponsor various cultural and sporting events including conferences, musical performances, and traditional celebrations. In 1996, A.R.M.E.C. co-sponsored a family conference in Washington, D.C. with the theme: True Family Values for American Moslem Families. One hundred and fifty participants attended this conference to discuss how to improve the quality of families throughout the world.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, A.R.M.E.C. is involved in many humanitarian and social activities. After the death of King Hassan II of Morocco, A.R.M.E.C. made available for signing a condolence book addressed to his son and successor, King Mohammed VI. Following this year's devastating earthquake in Turkey, A.R.M.E.C. sent an appeal to its members to express their solidarity and generosity toward the people of Turkey.

The Association for the Research of Middle Eastern Cultures hopes to continue its efforts in familiarizing members with United States history, religious traditions, culture and laws, in order to facilitate integration into American society. Future projects include new immigrants support and assistance services, English and Arabic language classes, Middle East music and dance classes, and marriage and family counseling.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the Association for the Research of Middle Eastern Cultures and ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in recognizing the great contributions of A.R.M.E.C. and the Moroccan 45th Independence Day.

URGING THE SENATE TO CONTINUE TO BLOCK THE APPOINTMENT OF U.S. AMBASSADOR TO LAOS

### HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2000

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by the fact that the State Department has made almost no progress with regard to the disappearance of two Hmong Americans who went missing in Laos more than a year ago. Mr. Michael Vang, a constituent of mine from Fresno, CA, and Mr. Houa Ly, a constituent of Representative MARK GREEN from Appleton, WI, are believed to have been seized by the Pathet Lao along the border of Thailand and Laos. Our constituents have not been seen or heard from since.

I believe the U.S. Congress needs to get tougher with the military dictatorship in Laos and the bureaucrats at the State Department who are content to work gently and cooperatively with the same Lao officials who are likely responsible for the abduction of our constituents. The regime in Laos continues to brutalize and murder its own people, particularly the Lao and Hmong people—many of which have relatives in my Congressional district.

Congressmen Vento, GREEN and I helped to send a strong message to the State Department and to the Laos government last year with the passage of H. Res. 169, which was the first legislation to pass the House of Representatives specific to Laos—and it passed 412 to 20. Among other things it urged the Lao Government to return Mr. Ly and Mr. Vang, or their remains, to United States authorities and their families in America at once; it warned the Lao Government of the serious consequences, including sanctions, of acts of aggression against United States citizens; and finally it urged the Department of State and other appropriate United States agencies to share the maximum amount of information regarding the disappearance of Messrs. Ly and Vang. None of these things have come to pass.

So today I want to thank my colleague, Senator BOB SMITH from New Hampshire, for his efforts to place an ongoing hold on the appointment of a U.S. Ambassador to Laos until a fundamental overhaul of U.S. policy is made toward Laos, and until changes are made with regard to the way the State Department is handling the case of Mr. Michael Vang and Houa Ly.

There are others I would like to thank for their efforts to help us resolve this case. Ms. Susie Vang, the wife of Michael Vang, has repeatedly traveled from Fresno, California to provide crucial testimony at several important events highlighting this case in the 106th Congress. Chairman BEN GILMAN, Congressman MARK GREEN, Congressman Bruce Vento, Congressman RON KIND, Congressman WALLY HERGER and Congressman RICHARD POMBO were also among those who participated. Finally, I am grateful to the Lao Veterans of America, the largest group of Hmong and Lao veterans in the United States based in my district, for their active participation in facilitating

Congress' efforts to bring these Hmong Americans home.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter into the RECORD that Congressman MARK GREEN and I recently sent to Senator BOB SMITH regarding the need to keep a hold on the appointment of a U.S. Ambassador to Laos until fundamental changes are made in the way the U.S. State Department handles the Government of Laos and our case.

OCTOBER 6, 2000.

Hon. BOB SMITH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: We would like to thank you for your recent efforts in the Senate to delay the appointment of Douglas Hartwick as Ambassador to Laos. We agree with those efforts and encourage you to remain steadfast in your position.

For years we believe this Administration's policies toward Laos have been fundamentally flawed. Your placing a hold on Mr. Hartwick's Senate approval sends a powerful message that we in Congress reject this Administration's policies toward Laos, and are fully willing to support dramatic steps to force a change in those policies.

We support your efforts for a number of reasons. First and foremost is the State Department's handling over the past 17 months of the case of two Americans—our constituents—missing in Laos since April of last year.

As background, we offer the following brief review of the circumstances surrounding the disappearance of Messrs. Houa Ly of Appleton, Wisconsin, and Michael Vang of Fresno, California. According to America eyewitnesses who were traveling with Messrs. Ly and Vang, Lao government authorities are responsible for this disappearance—a belief we share. Given the Lao government's dismal record on human rights and other matters, we feel this allegation is entirely plausible.

These eyewitnesses have offered the following account of the incident:

“On April 19, 1999, a party of four Hmong-American men—Mr. Houa Ly, Mr. Michael Vang, Mr. Neng Lee and Mr. Hue Vang—were traveling in Thailand near the city of Chiang Khong. The group, having been advised that the nearby Thai-Lao border was open to tourists and the public, crossed the Mekong River into Laos.

“Once across the border, the party split into two groups. Mr. Ly and Mr. M. Vang began speaking to several men, some of whom identified themselves as authorities in the Lao government. Mr. Lee and Mr. H. Vang briefly left the area. When they returned, Mr. Ly and Mr. M. Vang were missing.

“After a brief search, Mr. Lee and Mr. H. Vang witnessed Mr. Ly and Mr. M. Vang being forced onto a boat by Lao men. The boat, with Mr. Ly and Mr. M. Vang aboard, sped away on the Mekong River. Mr. Ly and Mr. M. Vang have not been heard from since.

“On May 4, 1999, upon their return to Chiang Mai, Thailand, Mr. Lee and Mr. H. Vang reported this incident to the American Consulate. Two days later, according to Mr. Lee and Mr. H. Vang, an American official from the consulate informed them he had received reports that both men had been imprisoned and that Mr. Ly may have been killed.

“Subsequent independent reports have suggested that the two men are currently imprisoned by Lao government authorities.”

This case was initially brought to our attention in May of last year. Since then, we

have been working together with the families of Messrs. Ly and Vang and attempting to work with the State Department to get to the bottom of the matter.

We have repeatedly stressed the importance of this case to the State Department. Since our initial letter on the matter to Secretary Albright on May 19, 1999, we have worked to emphasize the urgent need to have this case resolved quickly for the sake of all involved. We have written letters, made repeated phone calls, sponsored meetings, organized briefings, held hearings and even passed House legislation dealing specifically with the disappearances.

By the State Department's own admission, the communist government of Laos has been largely uncooperative in the “joint investigation” of the matter undertaken by our two governments. The State Department has nevertheless continued to work directly with the Lao government in their investigation, despite evidence indicating Lao government involvement in the disappearance itself. The investigation, not surprisingly, has produced virtually no results.

Adding insult to injury, the treatment of the families of these two men at the hands of the State Department has been deplorable. Despite repeated State Department promises to keep family members regularly informed of progress and developments in the case, the families have reported that their contact with the State Department has been sporadic and inadequate. The families feel, and we agree, that the State Department has handled the Lao government with kid gloves while treating the families with skepticism and suspicion.

Also, in the course of pursuing answers in this case, Rep. Green and the Ly family were forced to file a formal Freedom of Information Act request with the State Department. An unforgivable seven months passed before the U.S. government documents on the disappearance were finally released to the family.

This pace of “progress” cannot be permitted to continue. We are resolute in our commitment to see this case resolved, and to provide the families of Mr. Houa Ly and Michael Vang the answers they deserve. We believe that is unlikely to occur unless there is a sweeping change in policy toward Laos within the State Department.

The case of these two men is but another result of the deferential, appeasement-oriented Laos policy the State Department has consciously decided to pursue. It is but one of number of damning examples that clearly demonstrate the flaws in that policy.

Consider the following as well:

1. Laos continues to exist as an old-style one-party communist state which maintains a monopoly on power and close relations with the world's remaining communist nations.

2. Human rights abuses by the Lao government continue to be appalling and widespread. The government deploys its security forces against many of its own citizens, including incidents last year in which pro-democracy student demonstrators were arrested and imprisoned. In addition, the Lao government denies its citizens' basic human liberties and rights, including freedom of speech, assembly and religion. These abuses have all been repeatedly documented by Amnesty International and other international organizations. Perhaps most alarming of all, at time when human rights in many areas of the world are improving, the human rights situation in Laos appears to be getting worse.

3. With the help of Vietnamese military forces, the Lao government has waged a systematic military campaign against the Hmong ethnic minority in the Laotian highlands. This campaign has caused inestimable civilian casualties and demonstrates that the regime in Vientiane is willing to wage outright war against its own people to maintain its increasingly unsteady grip on power.

As these distressing events have taken place, the State Department and the U.S. Embassy in Vientiane have utterly failed to recognize, document and address them. These actions by the Lao government continue to take place for the same reason: actions by any dictatorship continue occurring; because no one in power has the courage and determination to stop them.

It is our hope that your brave action in the Senate will force a change in U.S. policy toward Laos, will help advance the case of our two missing constituents, and will assist in moving the people of Laos closer to a day when they will live without fear in a free and open society.

Sincerely,

MARK GREEN,  
GEORGE RADANOVICH,  
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF  
NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 31, 2000*

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my colleague from Nebraska, Congressman BILL BARRETT. BILL and I had the distinction of coming to Congress in the same year, and I have always appreciated his enthusiasm toward issues we have worked on together.

BILL is a fellow Member of Congress who knows the value of visiting constituents at home and where they work. Like me, he spends almost every weekend traveling in his home State so he can spend time with his constituents in their hometowns.

In his first term, BILL was tapped by leadership for two key committees—the Agriculture Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee. He has worked hard at these assignments and his increasing seniority has allowed him to take a leadership role on a host of pivotal issues including: small business, child care, senior citizens, education, health care, rural development, agriculture, and other important issues.

As chairman of the General Farm Commodities Subcommittee, which he has chaired for three terms, and his assignment as vice-chairman of the Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops Subcommittee, BILL BARRETT has been on the forefront of agriculture policy. Through the subcommittees and as vice-chairman of the full House Agriculture Committee, he played a vital role in overseeing the 1996 Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act, which unleashed U.S. agriculture from antiquated programs and overbearing Federal intrusion.

BILL has been a leader in balancing the Federal budget and reducing taxes. In the

106th Congress, he has worked to maintain fiscal discipline while paying down the national debt and ensuring the long-term viability of Social Security. His priorities for agriculture have included export market development, further regulatory relief, and improved risk management options.

In another parallel to my own experiences, BILL BARRETT's public service didn't begin in the Nation's capital. He started at the grassroots level and has been active in local, State, and national politics for many years. He was a member of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature from 1979–90 and served as Speaker the last four of those years.

As Ohio's Seventh District Representative to the Congress of the United States, I take this opportunity to join with members of the Nebraska Congressional delegation and the rest of his colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to honor the efforts and the many outstanding achievements of Representative BILL BARRETT. His many contributions as a Member of the House of Representatives will be long remembered in Congress and by the people of Nebraska.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN  
TILLIE FOWLER

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to congratulate my colleague and good friend Congresswoman TILLIE FOWLER on her exemplary service to her district and the nation as she retires from the U.S. Congress.

Congresswoman FOWLER is well known as a determined advocate for a strong national defense and has worked with great success on behalf of the military personnel and facilities in her district and around the country. Congresswoman FOWLER supported me immensely as I secured \$5 million in the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill for the Women in Military Service for America Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery. These funds were used for much needed maintenance to the memorial. Over the past 3 years Congresswoman FOWLER has joined me in organizing a wreath laying ceremony at the Women's Memorial to pay homage to the thousands of women who have served in our armed services. Congresswoman FOWLER has served graciously and energetically as co-host of this very touching ceremony. The Women's Memorial was dedicated on October 18, 1997 and stands as the nation's only major national memorial honoring women who have served in our Nation's Armed Forces during all eras and in all services.

I have been fortunate to serve with Congresswoman FOWLER on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Together, we have worked for needed improvements to road, mass transit, water, and public works infrastructure. She is one of the hardest working Members I have had the pleasure of working with on this committee. I applaud Congresswoman FOWLER for her dedication to serving

the interests of her constituents and the nation. She has been an outstanding colleague and a good friend. I feel privileged to have worked with the Congresswoman and wish her God speed as she embarks upon another endeavor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 592. I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 3, 2000*

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House when the following votes were taken. Had I been present on the following items my vote would have been the same as indicated following the resolution.

Oct. 30, 583, H. Res. 663, on agreeing to the Resolution Providing for consideration of S. 2485; and Corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2614, "yes"; Oct. 30, 582, H. Res. 663, on ordering the Previous Question Providing for consideration of S. 2485; and Corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2614, "yes"; Oct. 30, 581, H. Res. 662, on agreeing to the Resolution Providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for 2001, "yes"; Oct. 30, 580, H. Res. 662, on Ordering the Previous Question Providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for FY 2001, "yes"; Oct. 30, 579, motion, on hour of meeting, "yes"; Oct. 30, 578 H.J. Res. 120, on Passage Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 2001, "yes"; Oct. 30, 577, Journal, on Approving the Journal, "yes"; Oct. 29, 576, H.R. 4577, on Motion to Instruct Conferees Making Appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services for Fiscal Year 2001, "yes"; Oct. 29, 575, H.J. Res. 119, on Passage Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 2001, "yes"; Oct. 29, 574, Journal, on Approving the Journal, "yes"; Oct. 28, 573, H.R. 4577, on Motion to Instruct Conferees Making Appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services for Fiscal Year 2001, "yes"; Oct. 28, 572, H.R. 4577, on Motion to Instruct Conferees Making Appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services for Fiscal Year 2001, "yes"; Oct. 28, 571, H.J. Res. 118, on Passage Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 2001, "yes"; Oct. 28, 570, Journal, on Approving the Journal, "yes"; Oct. 19, H.R. 4541, to Authorize and Amend the Commodity Exchange Act to Promote Legal Certainty, Enhance Competition, and reduce Systematic Risk in Markets for Futures and Over the Counter Derivatives, and for other Purposes, "yes."

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

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 31, 2000*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House of Representatives passed legislation giving billions of dollars to Medicare providers, the bulk of which went to Medicare HMOs. This legislation did virtually nothing for providers under Medicaid. Yet, in almost every State across the nation, Medicaid payment rates are a fraction of what Medicare pays.

The motion offered by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, insists that the conferees to the Labor HHS bill ensure provider payments in the Medicaid Program are adequate to ensure that the children, disabled, and working families covered by Medicaid have access to quality health care. I appreciate his commitment to readdress this in the next Congress.

Medicaid covers 38 percent of all births in this country. It pays for 30 percent of all visits to pediatricians. The Medicaid Program insures more than 21 million children in this country. It also pays for a significant portion of nursing home care for the elderly. Medicaid is an insurance program that provides care for the most vulnerable in our society. By failing to ensure that Medicaid provider payments are adequate, access is jeopardized and we are failing our children, our elderly parents, and the disabled who depend on this program for their health care.

In my home State of Michigan, I have worked to ensure providers get adequate reimbursement so that they will continue to participate in the Medicaid Program and provide quality care. But, the situation remains dismal. Medicaid payments for obstetric care in Michigan are less than half of the Medicare rate. Payment for primary care services is also barely half of what Medicare pays. This, at a time when the state has more than a billion dollars in budget surplus and will receive more than 300 million dollars this fiscal year in tobacco settlement money.

In Michigan, what is becoming increasingly troubling is that the state is attempting, by expanding the use of HMOs in Medicaid, to wash its hands completely of any responsibility to ensure providers are paid adequately. The state is shifting beneficiaries wholesale into managed care, yet the state is failing to monitor aggressively the adequacy of HMOs' payments to doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes that provide care for beneficiaries. In Michigan, inadequate provider payments by

managed care plans under contract with the state have resulted in disruption in care and difficulty for many in obtaining care. Particularly acute problems have surfaced for individuals with HIV and children with special needs. We have a responsibility to ensure provider payments are adequate for beneficiaries whether they are in fee-for-service or managed care.

Nursing homes too, receive woefully low reimbursement to care for Medicaid beneficiaries. In 2000, it is projected that more than half of all nursing home care will be paid for by Medicaid. Yet, we know from research, much of which has been conducted by my colleague HENRY WAXMAN and the Government Reform Committee Democratic staff, that conditions in many nursing homes do not meet even the most basic standards.

Given that my colleague from Texas offered this motion, I would like to also mention a few facts about this problem in the state of Texas. A recent Government Reform Committee investigation in Texas examined the 1,230 nursing homes in that state which serve more than 86,000 Texans. Their investigation found that there are serious deficiencies in many of these homes. More than 80 percent of the homes violated federal health and safety standards during recent state inspections. More than half of the homes had violations that caused actual harm to residents or placed them at risk of serious injury.

The State of Texas ranks 45th out of 50 states in terms of nursing home payments for Medicaid beneficiaries. In 1999, the average Texas per diem rate was a little over \$80 per person. The majority of nursing home beneficiaries are the frailest and most vulnerable of all. We have a responsibility to ensure that the payments for the care of our parents are adequate; that the payments do not encourage facilities to skimp on care; and that there is ample staffing to ensure the health and safety of nursing home residents. Unfortunately, many states have not been meeting these responsibilities.

Low provider payments also thwart efforts to promote dental health. A recent Center for Health Care Strategies report on increasing access to dental services in Medicaid noted: "In many states, dentists are not participating in Medicaid programs, mainly due to the low Medicaid reimbursement rates. Dentists have little financial incentive to see Medicaid patients, and often have a disincentive—they lose money on each patient, as reimbursement rates in many states do not cover costs." If states are not even paying dentists enough to cover costs, how can we expect them to participate?

A September 2000 study by the General Accounting Office confirms this problem: "While several factors contribute to the low use of dental services among low-income persons who have coverage for dental services, the major one is finding dentists to treat them.

Some low-income people live in areas where dental providers are in short supply, but many others live in areas where dental care for the rest of the population is readily available."

In Texas in 1998, there were 8,656 active dentists in the state—only 1,923 of them—or 22 percent—treated Medicaid patients. This number is clearly not adequate to treat the 2,680,583 Medicaid patients enrolled in the state in that year. These low

Letters from the National Governors' Association and the National Council of State Legislatures threatened cuts in state Medicaid programs and reductions in coverage if the motion were adopted. I am appalled by their callous statements. It is miserly and uncompassionate to say that, in this time of record prosperity, states cannot afford to pay providers so that the most vulnerable, sickest, and frailest members of society can be assured decent care. Especially when on average nearly 60% of every dollar of Medicaid spending is contributed by the Federal Government.

Perhaps what the Republican governors who support the NGA threat mean is that they would choose to allocate their money differently. My home state of Michigan has managed to provide tax cuts for the rich in three of the past four years. Last year they enacted a \$300 million tax cut, yet they have done little to address the inadequacy of provider payments in Medicaid. Many Republican governors, it appears, would rather help their wealthy friends, than spare a dime to help children, elderly, and pregnant women who depend on Medicaid for their health insurance coverage.

Some members that oppose ensuring adequacy of Medicaid payments argue that we voted for the repeal of the so-called "Boren Amendment" in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) and now we're reversing our position. I would just remind my colleagues that we voted for a lot of provisions in the BBA. Many of us also voted for Medicaid provider cuts. Now, however, we recognize the deep impact on these cuts on providers and beneficiaries—both in Medicare and Medicaid.

We recently passed a bill that added billions to Medicare provider payments, but the Republican Leadership stripped out many of the provisions helping Medicaid providers. Medicaid providers must be paid adequately. How can we expect providers to remain committed to providing quality care and continue treating patients in Medicaid if their reimbursement does not even cover their overhead costs? About 20 percent of children in this country are covered by Medicaid, as are about four million seniors. They don't have legions of well-paid lobbyists roaming the halls of Congress, and they don't contribute large sums of money to political campaigns. But they need and deserve our help.