

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 12, 2000

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 12, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution congratulating Representative Stephen S.F. Chen on the occasion of his retirement from the diplomatic service of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord, You alone can take the rock rejected or the stone overlooked and make it Your cornerstone. Upon Your chosen cornerstone, precious in Your sight and sacred by Your handling, You create something new.

You are the master builder. It is You, Lord God, who have redeemed Your people. You are the one who has given us this land of freedom and opportunity. You continue to fashion us into Your people and make of us a powerful nation.

By Your spirit, awaken in us Your desires. Help us to seize the present moment to bring forth Your set purpose in this world.

May the edifice You make of us be a city of virtue built on a mountain top; a beacon of justice, a household of integrity, and a harbor of peace.

In You, O God, Your people of promise find fulfillment now, in the future, and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMPSON 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.

TRIBUTE TO BOB JOHNS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude to a member of our Nevada staff, Dr. Robert Johns, for his dedication, hard work and commitment to this Nation. Dr. Johns has not only worked diligently serving the people of Nevada in our northern Nevada district office but has also served as the vice chairman of the President's council on historic preservation for two terms during the Reagan administration. As a retired

World War II naval officer, Dr. Bob Johns has dedicated most of his life to public service. He is a real American hero, Mr. Speaker. We both grew up in the same small town, Sparks, Nevada, just a few blocks apart. I have been honored to have Bob Johns as a true friend and a member of my staff since my time in the Nevada State legislature.

On May 30, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johns celebrated his 80th birthday. He continues to work every day serving as an active and vital public servant in his home State of Nevada.

Thank you, Dr. Johns, for your friendship, your hard work and your commitment to the people of Nevada and to this Nation.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of Audrey Lynn Leinoff. Audrey was abducted from New York when she was 4 years old by her noncustodial mother, Marcia Leinoff, on May 25, 1988. The international criminal police organization also known as Interpol confirmed that both Audrey and Ms. Leinoff entered Israel on June 19, 1988. Although there has been no confirmation of their ever departing Israel, their actual presence currently and location in Israel are unknown. Audrey's maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Sylvia Bloom, are also believed to be involved with the abduction.

In addition to custody from the United States, Audrey's father was given sole custody in January 1991 by the Jerusalem district court. Mr. Leinoff, despite having custody, has not had any contact with his daughter since her abduction.

Mr. Speaker, children like Audrey deserve to have a relationship with both their parents, and parents deserve a relationship with their children. This House should make sure that the most sacred of bonds, that between a parent and a child, is preserved. We must bring our children home.

GAS PRICES ON THE RISE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, gasoline is \$2.20 a gallon. That is right,

□ 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.

\$2.20. Now, if that is not enough to bust your bunions, Congress gives billions of dollars to OPEC countries, and they rip us off. To boot, the domestic oil companies are gouging us so bad, we are all passing gas.

Beam me up. I think it is time to tell the OPEC countries, "The next time you are attacked, call BP and Rotary. Don't call us." I also think it is time to pass H.R. 3902, which imposes a \$100 million fine for any American oil company that unreasonably gouges us and raises prices. Enough is enough.

I yield back the fact that while Uncle Sam is killing Microsoft, we are getting our oil changed big time.

SIERRA LEONE

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the situation in Sierra Leone, a marvelous country, a country with great promise, a country that provided freedom for slaves many years ago. Today it is in utter chaos. Revolution is taking place. But what is unique about this is that it is not a political revolution, even though it pretends to be that, but it is basically a band of bandits trying to take over the country so that they can have access to the diamonds and the diamond mines. They already have access to many of them and they are using those diamonds to finance the revolution.

The rebels are incredibly inhumane. Most of their captives have been released but only after a hand, a leg, a foot, or an arm have been chopped off and amputated.

The inhumanity is such that last week, an 8-month-old baby had his arm amputated when his mother was captured as part of the revolution. Imagine the rebels amputated the arm of an 8-month-old baby!

We must work with the British and the U.N. to stop this. We must act in a meaningful, humane way, and not back down from this as we have been backing down for a decade. It is time for our State Department and our President to act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6 p.m. today.

REQUIRING FRAUD AUDIT OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4079) to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department of Education, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4079

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

SECTION 1. COMPREHENSIVE FRAUD AUDIT OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

(a) AUDIT.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct and complete a fraud audit of selected accounts at the Department of Education that the Comptroller General determines to be particularly susceptible to waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(2) submit a report setting forth the results of the audit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4079.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4079 is a bill that in many ways we would probably rather not be dealing with today. We are dealing with this issue because of the Department of Education's inability to receive a clean audit. Each year, the Department of Education, like other Federal agencies, is required to undergo an audit. For fiscal years 1998 and 1999, the Department of Education could not receive a clean audit opinion. In plain English what that means is that the financial analysts who have gone in and taken a look at the books as prepared by the Department of Education do not have a high degree of confidence that the figures and the numbers that are reported in their financial statements are an accurate reflection of the actual conditions at the Department of Education.

Now, there are a number of reasons why this has occurred. There are also a number of instances where this lack of financial control has exhibited itself. One of the reasons why the Department is unable to get a clean audit is that it

lacks an accounting system that meets generally accepted standards or complies with Federal financial management standards. That is why it could not get a clean set of books for the last 2 years.

The disappointing thing here, and I think this is why we need to take this step today, is that the Department also does not expect to have an effective account system in place until at least October 2001, more than a year out. Thus, the fiscal year 2000 and 2001 audits will most likely result in the same results as 1998 and 1999, an inability to get a clean audit.

Now, it would be one thing just to say they cannot get a clean set of books. It is another when the General Accounting Office and other groups have identified that because of the weaknesses within the financial control system, this Department has experienced a number of cases of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me just highlight a couple of these. The Inspector General and the General Accounting Office have identified a number of examples. One is that the Department over the last 2 years has issued about \$175 million in duplicate payments to grantees. These payments continue to occur despite the Department's avowed attempts to crack down on them.

What is a duplicate payment? Well, we have here a list of duplicate payments that occurred in October of 1999. What a duplicate payment is, is that it means the Department recognizes that it has a liability, that it owes a State, it owes a contractor, or a supplier a certain amount of money, it cuts a check and it pays them. A duplicate payment means that it cuts a check and pays them again.

This is to the tune of over \$175 million of duplicate payments, one as large as \$71,425,000 that occurred on 10/20/1999. As I said, these payments have continued through 2000. So that is one area that the Inspector General and the GAO have said this is perhaps an area that we need to take an additional look at. Why? We need to identify whether, number one, we have captured all of the duplicate payments and we have identified all the contractors or suppliers who have received a duplicate payment. If not, let us find them.

The second thing we need to do is we need to identify whether for all of the duplicate payments that have been made, whether the American taxpayer and the Federal Government have been reimbursed for this duplicate payment. And then, thirdly, we need the General Accounting Office to go in and identify the problems that the Department of Education has in their system that allows this problem to continue on for 2 years.

So this is not a single occurrence. This is a series of occurrences over a period of 2 years that have resulted in

over \$175 million in duplicate payments.

□ 1415

Last month, a contract employee at the Department became the second person to plead guilty in participating in a theft ring. This is, again, disturbing because this builds off of recommendations that were not followed in previous audits. Previous audits, previous work by the Inspector General and by the General Accounting Office had indicated that the Department of Education did not have an effective way of managing its inventory, meaning that it would go out and buy capital assets, but had no way of tracking what assets were purchased and the location of each of those assets.

The result is, that with a lack of a good system in place, we created an environment where employees understood that there was a lack of these controls in place and, actually, created an environment that became inviting for waste, fraud and, in this case, abuse and fraud. Because what happened is that this Department of Education employee, along with outside contractors, and there are still additional people that are being investigated in this process, they put in place, we will use the word that is kind of in vogue today, they used a scheme to defraud the Department of close to a million dollars.

The scheme worked like this: someone within the purchasing department at the Department of Education would issue requisitions for certain kinds of equipment, and, in this case, it included computers. It included telephone equipment. It included a 61-inch TV, that is one big TV, and a whole series of other electronic equipment.

They would issue the requisition, the equipment would be purchased, and it would be delivered somewhere other than the Department of Education, perhaps to the employee's home or other locations ensuring that the equipment never came to the Department of Education. Roughly \$330,000 worth of equipment was defrauded from the Department through this mechanism.

Now, these purchase orders were supplied to an outside contractor. What was then in it for the outside contractor? The benefit to the outside contractor was that this outside contractor would be allowed and the purchasing agent would approve for the billing of hourly work and overtime by this outside contractor.

It is estimated that in this case close to \$600,000 in phony overtime was paid to this and other outside contractors. When we combine the fraud of purchasing this equipment and the overtime, we have close to a million dollars in fraud from the Department of Education.

These are just two examples of why I think on a bipartisan basis we have

recognized that when we are talking about some of the most important dollars that we spend in Washington today, those dollars that we invest in our young people, that we invest in our educational system, that when those are going into a Department we need to ensure that we have got the highest standards of integrity and accountability to make sure that those dollars are being spent where they will make a difference and that they are not being siphoned off through either waste and, in these cases, fraud and abuse.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I, too, support this bill before us today that was voice voted with unanimous support out of the whole Committee on Education and the Workforce just recently, at the end of May.

Just so our colleagues are clear, yes, there are problems at the Department of Education that we need to oversee, and I think this bill will address many of those issues. But the Department of Education is not the only agency that is having problems with audits and getting certified unqualified audits reported. In fact, at last count, we have 10 agencies and probably 11 for fiscal year 1999 alone that have not been able to produce unqualified audit reports.

We are not talking about an anomaly here in the Department of Education; but what I think is a whole scale problem that is affecting many, many different agencies within the Federal Government; and, hopefully, through the leadership of our committee and the oversight work that we have done here, it will encourage even greater oversight with many of these additional agencies, so we can get a clean, healthy book of record for all of the agencies that were responsible to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the Department of Education, there has been proof that the Department has been defrauded by some employees or contractors as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has indicated. While indictments and a conviction has been secured, in regards to the investigation at the Department, it is important that we, as the oversight body for the Department and its programs, ensure the security and safety of the Department's finances.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has held several hearings regarding the state of the Department's financial management systems, and we are very aware that the Department has had significant shortcomings in its audits over the last 5 or 6 years.

While the Department of Education is just one of several Federal agencies that have been unable to obtain unqualified audit reports in recent years,

we, as policymakers and the overseers, cannot take a relativistic attitude toward's Department audit shortcomings. We must set high standards for ourselves and the Department just as we do for the educators we are trying to assist through the Department programs.

With that being said, I have been very encouraged by the Department of Education's response to its audit weaknesses in the last year or so especially. New staff at the Inspector General's office and the chief financial officer's office had helped motivate change and a greater degree of responsibility in regards to the books in the Department. The last audit was completed on time and with corrections to previous weaknesses.

We on the subcommittee have been assured by the Department's new IG that the financial records will be produced in a timely and adequate manner for future audits. The electronic nightmare, which the Department has been living through with failing and faulty computer and accounting systems, should finally be corrected in the next 2 years, building more security and reliability in the overall financial system at the Department regarding outright fraud.

At our last subcommittee hearing on the subject, I was told by both the Inspector General and the outside auditor after a specific question to them on this issue that there is no systematic fraud or abuse that they have been able to detect at the Department of Education.

Obviously, again, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has pointed out, instances of fraud have, nevertheless, occurred at the time of the hearing. We are aware of pending investigations, and it is very distressing that multiple cases of fraud have, in fact, taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to just take a moment and commend the subcommittee Chair in his realization in order to save taxpayer dollars that we are taking a more targeted fraud investigation approach to the audit requests contained in this bill today. I think it is a very reasonable and responsible approach to this.

Accordingly, it is appropriate for us to demand a more probing audit specifically geared towards fraud detection and vulnerability at the Department. Ultimately, it is this committee's jurisdiction to authorize funding for the education programming that we expect will hopefully benefit the neediest of America's schools and children.

We decide programs structure. We set relative priorities, and we are the first to berate the appropriators for underfunding our education authorization levels. Accordingly, we must also be the first to raise the alarm when management issues move from the realm of accounting weaknesses to direct fraud and abuse.

I agree that a narrow, selective fraud investigation is warranted and should allow the Department to proceed with its financial management upgrades and security enhancements. Hopefully with this audit and the regular audits our subcommittee has been reviewing, we soon will see the promises of the Department and the Inspector General come to fruition. Hopefully, we will soon be able to focus on education policy with confidence and undivided attention, be able to move beyond just oversight and get to the bottom of some of the problems that exist at the Department of Education and pass important and meaningful education legislation that many of us were hoping to achieve this year.

We still have yet to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a vitally important program in order to improve the quality of education, especially for the most vulnerable and needy school children throughout our country. We have an Even Start Family Literacy bill that has passed the committee back in February, I believe, with wide bipartisan support under the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and that has yet to see the light of day on the House floor.

We are hoping to be able to move to that work as soon as possible, as well as some of the other unfinished education issues that are still pending before this Congress.

Let's do a responsible job of providing appropriate oversight with the Department of Education but let's not also lose sight on the unfinished job of passing meaningful education legislation that is going to improve the quality of education that our Nation's children deserve.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for his words and also his highlighting that hopefully some of the work that we have done on the subcommittee can perhaps be a stimulus for the House as a whole. We are currently in the process of drafting a piece of legislation where we apply the same standard to other Federal agencies that we have applied here to the Department of Education that says if, for 2 consecutive years, a Department or an agency cannot get a clean audit that it should be a fundamental requirement that a more in-depth analysis or a quote, unquote, a fraud audit or a targeted fraud audit should take place within these agencies because what we do know is that when an agency cannot deliver a clean audit, the auditors have some concern about their internal controls as to how they are measuring and recording the various expenditures. So the same standard

that we apply to the Department of Education should apply to all of the other agencies that we have, whether it is the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor or whatever we are working on, and propose this one because of the work that the subcommittee has done in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), because I agree with him the more time that we can spend on exploring educational policy and what is going on at the State and local level as to what works and what does not, the more effective we can be in spending the billions of dollars that we are allocating here at a Federal level so that we can move away from purely the measurement of where the dollars are going, but actually be taking a look at the effectiveness and are we getting the impact for the dollars that we would like to have.

I have to applaud my colleague. I think we have been in 21 different States and had 23 field hearings, and my colleague consistently is there with us. He has been in New Mexico with us. He has been in Colorado with us. Last week he was in Minnesota. He has been in my district in Michigan; and consistently when we are at a State in a local level having a field hearing, he has been there and participating in that process to make sure that we are getting the best bang for our buck.

The other thing that I would like to also say is that we have had a very good working relationship, developing a good working relationship with the new Inspector General and with the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office has completed an audit of the Department's grant back fund where there were some questions about how these dollars were being used and what was moving into the account and whether that was appropriate or not; and as a result of the work that they have done with us, I think, again, in a bipartisan way, the Department, I think, has returned over \$700 million back to the Treasury.

I think that is a very good, cooperative way of us moving through this process and dealing with this ugly side of the financial management part of the Department of Labor. I also think that as we move through this process in a more targeted approach, one of the ways that the Department or one of the areas that the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office have agreed with us that they will take a look at is the security of the computer data systems that the Department of Education maintains.

These systems contain student loan and grant records for tens of millions of students, and what we want to do is we want to make sure that the safeguards are in place to maintain the integrity of these systems to make sure that no one can get into these files and

either steal data or manipulate the data that are in these files.

It is a wide-ranging effort that we have undertaken, and I think we have had good cooperation from both sides of the aisle as well as with the Department, with the Inspector General and also with the General Accounting Office to get to the bottom of these issues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman of the subcommittee for his remarks and would be happy to be able to work with him and others who are drafting this legislation in order to form a stricter, higher standard of audit accountability in the rest of the agencies. I think that that is long overdue and the gentleman is heading in the right direction in drafting legislation for that very requirement.

Again, I do not want our colleagues who are listening to this discussion today to be under some false impression that everything is wrong and bad and the Department of Education is breaking down and they are not actually accomplishing some very worthwhile goals and objectives over there, because they are. As I indicated, during the previous hearings that we have had on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, as well as other Education hearings, there is a lot of hope and promise that we are finally starting to turn the corner, as far as the quality of programming, more direction with the resources, emphasizing quality and accountability, rather than just expansion of programs.

□ 1430

So I think there are a lot of things you can point to and show definite progress and improvement at the Department of Education.

I also feel that when the history books are written on this administration, we are going to be able to look back on the Department of Education and the leadership which has been provided to it by Secretary Riley and realize we have had one of the most effective, brightest, hard-working, and thought-provoking and innovative Secretaries that our Nation has ever seen in Secretary Riley. So I hope people do not view this as a reflection on the work that he has done at the Department of Education. Because under his leadership there have been significant improvements overall at the Department of Education. I just want to highlight a couple of those that we have seen in recent years.

The Education Department today has roughly two-thirds of the number of employees administering its programs since 1980, even though the budget has approximately doubled since then. The Education Department has trimmed its

regulations by a third and reduced grant application paperwork and aggressively implemented waiver authority to legal roadblocks to State reform.

The student loan default rate is now at a record low 8.8 percent after declining for 7 consecutive years. It was 22.4 percent when President Clinton took office, and, as a result, the taxpayers in this country have been saved billions of dollars.

Collections on defaulted loans have more than tripled, from \$1 billion in fiscal year 1993 to over \$3 billion in fiscal year 1999 alone.

The Direct Student Loan Program proposed by President Clinton in 1993 and enacted by Congress in 1994 has saved taxpayers over \$4 billion over the last 5 years.

The creation of the National Student Loan Data System has allowed education officials to identify prior defaulters and thereby prevent the disbursement of as much as \$1 billion in new grants and loans to ineligible students.

The customer saving rates for ED Pubs, the Education Department's documents and distribution center, exceed those of premier corporations like Federal Express and Nordstrom.

There are also signs that the quality of education is starting to turn the corner as well. We have higher academic standards and assessments being put in place throughout the 50 States, improvement in the Nation's reading scores in the three grades tested, and math scores are starting to show some improvement as well.

Yes, there are some management problems that we are hopefully going to be able to get to the bottom of, and, with this legislation, sooner rather than later, but there are a lot of achievements and progress being made with the Department of Education and the programs they are responsible for that we shouldn't lose sight of even with the need for this legislation today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for working together on this issue. We have outlined some of the problems within the Department of Education. Hopefully through this effort, by having the General Accounting Office go in and take a more in-depth analysis, hopefully they will go in and they will not find additional fraud or abuse and they will find that the Department is operating appropriately. At this point in time, we just do not know. We have enough cases that indicate on a bipartisan basis that we need to go in for a closer look.

This is a targeted approach. This is an approach that we can work with the General Accounting Office on and make sure that we are dealing with the

appropriate issues at the right time and that we then can move on to the other things that my colleague from Wisconsin was alluding to, as to the effectiveness of the spending participating here in Washington, are we getting the maximum effect for the dollars we are spending.

That will be a debate for another day, or hopefully that will be a debate or a process that we can build a bipartisan consensus as to the best way to move forward, empowering local officials and parents to make the decisions for the education of their children because that really is the leverage point, empowering parents and local officials to focus on basic academics, delivered in a safe and drug-free school, so that our children can get the best education of any kids in the world.

I think that is a vision that we share on a bipartisan basis, at least getting the best education for our kids. We may have some disagreements as to what the best process is, but we have the same long-term goals and objectives in mind.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4079, which requires the Comptroller General to conduct a fraud audit of selected accounts at the U.S. Department of Education. I want to thank Mr. HOEKSTRA for his work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I note at the outset that this bill received the support of minority members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce at our full committee mark-up held a couple of weeks ago. Both majority and minority members of the Committee are aware of the serious financial management problems at the Department of Education. This awareness is due to the considerable time and effort the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has spent assessing the agency's practices. Through its hearings, the Subcommittee found the department's operations and practices to be very susceptible to fraud and abuse.

By way of background, I would note that Congress has increased federal education funding in recent years. The Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001 provides \$37.2 billion in discretionary spending for the Department of Education. The agency also currently manages a \$100 billion direct student loan portfolio, a new banking function initiated by the Clinton Administration. I am concerned that the direct loan program is becoming a millstone around the neck of an agency struggling to handle its basic responsibilities.

Recent reports of independent auditors have informed us that the Department neither practices sound fiscal management nor possesses an appropriate accounting system. The agency has yet to get its first clean audit opinion and is consistently cited by auditors for failings. These include an inability to reconcile its accounts with Treasury; failure to properly inventory its computers and other equipment; and an inability to safeguard effectively its computer systems from access by unauthorized users.

Federal education dollars that should go to the classroom are instead going to buying tel-

evision sets, computers and palm pilots for friends and relatives of Department of Education employees. Two individuals recently pleaded guilty to participating in such a scheme, which remains under investigation by the Justice Department. And this is only one in a series of abuses recently examined by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation.

We have tried as a Congress to improve the fiscal stewardship of the Department. When the 105th Congress wrote the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, it turned the Education Department's Office of Student Financial Assistance into the federal government's first performance-based organization.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4079, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4504) to make technical amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4504

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE; EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000".

(b) REFERENCE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (Public Law 105-244).

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I.—

(1) Section 101(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", or students who meet the requirements of section 484(d)(3)".

(2) Section 102(a)(2)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of qualifying as an institution under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall establish criteria by regulation for the approval of institutions

outside the United States and for the determination that such institutions are comparable to an institution of higher education as defined in section 101 (except that a graduate medical school, or a veterinary school, located outside the United States shall not be required to meet the requirements of section 101(a)(4)). Such criteria shall include a requirement that a student attending such school outside the United States is ineligible for loans made, insured, or guaranteed under part B unless—

“(i) in the case of a graduate medical school located outside the United States—

“(I)(aa) at least 60 percent of those enrolled in, and at least 60 percent of the graduates of, the graduate medical school outside the United States were not persons described in section 484(a)(5) in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part B of title IV; and

“(bb) at least 60 percent of the individuals who were students or graduates of the graduate medical school outside the United States (both nationals of the United States and others) taking the examinations administered by the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates received a passing score in the year preceding the year for which a student is seeking a loan under part B of title IV; or

“(II) the institution has a clinical training program that was approved by a State as of January 1, 1992; or

“(ii) in the case of a veterinary school located outside the United States that does not meet the requirements of section 101(a)(4)—

“(I) the institution was certified by the Secretary as eligible to participate in the loan program under part B of title IV before October 1, 1999; and

“(II) the institution's students complete their clinical training at an approved veterinary school located in the United States.”

(3) Section 102(a)(3)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “section 521(4)(C) of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act” and inserting “section 3(3)(C) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998”.

(4) Section 103(7) (20 U.S.C. 1003(7)) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) NEW BORROWER.—The term ‘new borrower’ when used with respect to any date for any loan under any provision of—

“(A) part B or part D of title IV means an individual who on that date has no outstanding balance of principal or interest owing on any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under either such part; and

“(B) part E of title IV means an individual who on that date has no outstanding balance of principal or interest owing on any loan made under such part.”

(5) Section 131(a)(3)(A)(iii) (20 U.S.C. 1015(a)(3)(A)(iii)) is amended—

(A) by striking “an undergraduate” and inserting “a full-time undergraduate”; and

(B) in subclause (I), by striking “section 428(a)(2)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 428(a)(2)(C)(ii)”.

(6) Section 131(b) is amended by striking “the costs for typical” and inserting “the prices for, and financial aid provided to, typical”.

(7) Section 131(c)(2)(B) is amended by striking “costs” and inserting “prices”.

(8) Section 131(d)(1) is amended by striking “3 years” and inserting “4 years”.

(9) Section 141 (20 U.S.C. 1018) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting “total and unit” after “to reduce the”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “Each year” and inserting “Each fiscal year”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “guaranty agencies,” after “lenders,”; and

(iii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “expenditures” and inserting “administrative expenditures for the most recent fiscal year”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Chief Financial Officer Act of 1990 and” and inserting “Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990,” and by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and other relevant legislation”;

(C) in subsection (f)(3)(A), by striking “paragraph (1)(A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(D) in subsection (g)(3), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The names and compensation for those individuals shall be included in the annual report under subsection (c)(2).”

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III.—

(1) Subsection (g) of section 324 (20 U.S.C. 1063(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.—

“(1) HOWARD UNIVERSITY.—In any fiscal year that the Secretary determines that Howard University will receive an allotment under subsections (b) and (c) which is not in excess of amounts received for such fiscal year by Howard University under the Act of March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 438; 20 U.S.C. 123), relating to the annual appropriations for Howard University, then Howard University shall be ineligible to receive an allotment under this section.

“(2) UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—In any fiscal year, the University of the District of Columbia may receive financial assistance under this part, or under section 4(c) of the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-98), but not under both this part and such section.”

(2) Section 326(e)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting a colon after “the following”.

(3) Section 342(5)(C) (20 U.S.C. 1066a(5)(C)) is amended—

(A) by inserting a comma after “equipment” the first place it appears; and

(B) by striking “technology,” and inserting “technology.”.

(4) Section 343(e) (20 U.S.C. 1066b(e)) is amended by inserting after the subsection designation the following: “SALE OF QUALIFIED BONDS.—”.

(5) Section 1024 (20 U.S.C. 1135b-3), as transferred by section 301(a)(5) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (Public Law 105-244; 112 Stat. 636), is repealed.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 402D (20 U.S.C. 1070a-14) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(1) USE FOR STUDENT AID.—A recipient of a grant that undertakes any of the permissible services identified in subsection (b) may, in addition, use such funds to provide grant aid to students if the recipient demonstrates in its application, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the size of the grants the recipient will provide to students is appropriate and likely to have a significant impact on retention at that institution. In making grants to students under this sub-

section, an institution shall ensure that adequate consultation takes place between the student support service program office and the institution's financial aid office.

“(2) ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.—For purposes of receiving grant aid under this subsection, eligible students shall be current participants in the student support services program offered by the institution and be—

“(A) students who are in their first 2 years of postsecondary education and who are receiving Federal Pell Grants under subpart 1; or

“(B) students who have completed their first 2 years of postsecondary education and who are receiving Federal Pell Grants under subpart 1 if the institution demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

“(i) these students are at high risk of dropping out; and

“(ii) it will first meet the needs of all its eligible first- and second-year students for services under this paragraph.

“(3) DETERMINATION OF NEED.—A grant provided to a student under paragraph (1) shall not be considered in determining that student's need for grant or work assistance under this title, except that in no case shall the total amount of student financial assistance awarded to a student under this title exceed that student's cost of attendance, as defined in section 472.

“(4) MATCHING REQUIRED.—A recipient of a grant who uses such funds for the purpose described in paragraph (1) shall match the funds used for such purpose, in cash, from non-Federal funds, in an amount that is not less than 33 percent of the total amount of funds used for that purpose. This paragraph shall not apply to any grant recipient that is an institution of higher education eligible to receive funds under part A or B of title III or title V.

“(5) RESERVATION.—For any fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000, the Secretary may reserve not more than 20 percent of the funds available under this section for grant aid in accordance with this subsection.”

(2)(A) Section 404A(b) (20 U.S.C. 1070a-21(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(3) DURATION.—An award made by the Secretary under this chapter to an eligible entity described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) shall be for a period of 6 years.”

(B) The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall be effective for awards made for fiscal year 2000 and succeeding fiscal years, except that the Secretary shall permit recipients of 5-year grants made for fiscal year 1999 to amend their applications to include a 6-year project period.

(3) Section 415A(a)(2) (20 U.S.C. 1070c(a)(2)) is amended by striking “section 415F” and inserting “section 415E”.

(4) Section 415E(c) (20 U.S.C. 20 U.S.C. 1070c-3a(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Each State receiving a grant under this section may use the grant funds for—

“(1) making awards that—

“(A) supplement grants received under section 415C(b)(2) by eligible students who demonstrate financial need; or

“(B) provide grants under section 415C(b)(2) to additional eligible students who demonstrate financial need;

“(2) providing scholarships for eligible students—

“(A) who demonstrate financial need; and

“(B) who—

“(i) desire to enter a program of study leading to a career in—

“(I) information technology;

“(II) mathematics, computer science, or engineering; or

“(III) another field determined by the State to be critical to the State’s workforce needs; or

“(ii) demonstrate merit or academic achievement and desire; and

“(3) making awards that—

“(A) supplement community service work-study awards received under section 415C(b)(2) by eligible students who demonstrate financial need; or

“(B) provide community service work-study awards under section 415C(b)(2) to additional eligible students who demonstrate financial need.”

(5) Section 415E (20 U.S.C. 1070c-3a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding subsection (d), for purposes of determining a State’s share of the cost of the authorized activities described in subsection (c)—

“(1) in the case of a State that participates in the program authorized under this section in fiscal year 2000—

“(A) if such State participates in the program in fiscal year 2001, for that year the State shall consider only those expenditures from non-Federal sources that exceed its expenditures for activities authorized under this subpart for fiscal year 1999; or

“(B) if such State does not participate in the program in fiscal year 2001, but participates in the program in a succeeding fiscal year, for the first fiscal year after fiscal year 2001 in which the State participates in the program, the State shall consider only those expenditures from non-Federal sources that exceed its expenditures for activities authorized under this subpart for the preceding fiscal year, or fiscal year 1999, whichever is greater; and

“(2) in the case of a State that participates in the program authorized under this section for the first time after fiscal year 2000, for the first fiscal year in which the State participates in the program, the State shall consider only those expenditures from non-Federal sources that exceed its expenditures for activities authorized under this subpart for the preceding fiscal year.

“(g) USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PROHIBITED.—A State receiving a grant under this section shall not use any of the grant funds to pay administrative costs associated with any of the authorized activities described in subsection (c).”

(6) Section 419C(b)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1070d-33(b)(1)) is amended by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end thereof.

(7) Section 419D(d) (20 U.S.C. 1070d-34(d)) is amended by striking “Public Law 95-1134” and inserting “Public Law 95-134”.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO PART B OF TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 425(a)(1)(A)(i)(II) (20 U.S.C. 1075(a)(1)(A)(i)(II)) is amended to read as follows:

“(II) if such student is enrolled in a program of undergraduate education that is less than 1 academic year, the maximum annual loan amount that such student may receive may not exceed the lesser of—

“(aa) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subclause (I) as the length of such program measured in semester, trimester, quarter, or clock hours bears to 1 academic year; or

“(bb) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subclause (I) as the length of such program measured in

weeks of instruction bears to 1 academic year;”.

(2) Section 428(a)(2)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1078(a)(2)(A)(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (II) of clause (i); and

(B) by moving the margin of clause (iii) two ems to the left.

(3) Section 428(b)(1) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

“(II) if such student is enrolled in a program of undergraduate education that is less than 1 academic year, the maximum annual loan amount that such student may receive may not exceed the lesser of—

“(aa) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subclause (I) as the length of such program measured in semester, trimester, quarter, or clock hours bears to 1 academic year; or

“(bb) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subclause (I) as the length of such program measured in weeks of instruction bears to 1 academic year;” and

(B) in subparagraph (Y)(i), by striking “subparagraph (M)(i)” and inserting “subparagraph (M)(i)(I)”.

(4) Section 428(c)(3)(B) (20 U.S.C. 1078(c)(3)(B)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and recorded in the borrower’s file, except that such regulations shall not require such agreements to be in writing”.

(5) Section 428C(a)(3)(B) (20 U.S.C. 1078-3(a)(3)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) Loans made under this section shall, to the extent used to discharge loans made under this title, be counted against the applicable limitations on aggregate indebtedness contained in section 425(a)(2), 428(b)(1)(B), 428H(d), 455, and 464(a)(2)(B).”

(6) Section 428H(d)(2)(A)(ii) (20 U.S.C. 1078-8(d)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) if such student is enrolled in a program of undergraduate education that is less than 1 academic year, the maximum annual loan amount that such student may receive may not exceed the lesser of—

“(I) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in clause (i) as the length of such program measured in semester, trimester, quarter, or clock hours bears to 1 academic year; or

“(II) the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subclause (I) as the length of such program measured in weeks of instruction bears to 1 academic year;”.

(7) Section 428H(e) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(8) Section 432(m)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1082(m)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period;

(B) by striking clause (iv) of subparagraph (D); and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) PERFECTION OF SECURITY INTERESTS IN STUDENT LOANS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of any State law to the contrary, including the Uniform Commercial Code as in effect in any State, a security interest in loans made under this part, on behalf of any eligible lender (as defined in section 435(d))

shall attach, be perfected, and be assigned priority in the manner provided by the applicable State’s law for perfection of security interests in accounts, as such law may be amended from time to time (including applicable transition provisions). If any such State’s law provides for a statutory lien to be created in such loans, such statutory lien may be created by the entity or entities governed by such State law in accordance with the applicable statutory provisions that created such a statutory lien.

“(ii) COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION.—In addition to any other method for describing collateral in a legally sufficient manner permitted under the laws of the State, the description of collateral in any financing statement filed pursuant to this section shall be deemed legally sufficient if it lists such loans, or refers to records (identifying such loans) retained by the secured party or any designee of the secured party identified in such financing statement, including the debtor or any loan servicer.

“(iii) SALES.—Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii) and any provisions of any State law to the contrary, other than any such State’s law providing for creation of a statutory lien, an outright sale of loans made under this part shall be effective and perfected automatically upon attachment as defined in the Uniform Commercial Code of such State.”

(9) Section 435(a)(5) (20 U.S.C. 1085(a)(5)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “July 1, 2002,” and inserting “July 1, 2004;” and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1999, 2000, and 2001” and inserting “1999 through 2003”.

(10) Subparagraphs (A) and (F) of section 438(b)(2) (20 U.S.C. 1087-1(b)(2)) are each amended by striking the last sentence.

(11) Section 439(d) (20 U.S.C. 1087-2(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(e) AMENDMENT TO PART C OF TITLE IV.—Section 443(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 2753(b)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting “(including a reasonable amount of time spent in travel or training directly related to such community service)” after “community service”.

(f) AMENDMENT TO PART D OF TITLE IV.—Paragraph (6) of section 455(b) (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)), as redesignated by section 8301(c)(1) of the Transportation Equity for the 21st Century Act (112 Stat. 498) is redesignated as paragraph (8), and is moved to follow paragraph (7) as added by 452(b) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (112 Stat. 1716).

(g) AMENDMENTS TO PART E OF TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 462(g)(1)(E)(i)(I) (20 U.S.C. 1087bb(g)(1)(E)(i)(I)) is amended by inserting “monthly” after “consecutive”.

(2) Section 464(c)(1)(D) (20 U.S.C. 1087dd(c)(1)(D)) is amended by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(3) Section 464(c)(2)(A)(iv) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, except that interest shall continue to accrue on such loans and such interest shall be eligible for cancellation under section 465”.

(4) Section 464(h) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by inserting “, and the loan default has not been reduced to a judgment against the borrower,” after “defaulted on the loan”; and

(ii) by inserting after “held by the Secretary,” the following: “or if the borrower of a loan under this part who has defaulted on

the loan elects to make a single payment equal to the full amount of principal and interest and collection costs owed on the loan.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) SPECIAL RULE.—At the discretion of the institution or the Secretary, for the purpose of receiving the benefits of this subsection, a loan that is in default and reduced to judgment may be considered rehabilitated if—

“(A) the borrower makes 12 on-time, consecutive, monthly payments of amounts owed on the loan, as determined by the institution, or by the Secretary in the case of a loan held by the Secretary; or

“(B) the borrower makes a single payment equal to the full amount of principal and interest and collection costs owed on the loan.”.

(5)(A) Section 465(a)(2) (20 U.S.C. 1087ee(a)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 111(c)” and inserting “section 113(a)(5)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “With Disabilities” and inserting “with Disabilities”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (F), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, including full-time prosecutors and public defenders earning \$30,000 or less in adjusted gross income”.

(B) The amendment made by subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such amendment shall not prevent any borrower who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was receiving cancellation of indebtedness under section 465(a)(2)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 from continuing to receive such cancellation.

(6) Section 467(b) (20 U.S.C. 1087gg(b)) is amended by striking “(5)(A), (5)(B)(i), or (6)” and inserting “(4)(A), (4)(B), or (5)”.

(7) Section 469(c) (20 U.S.C. 1087ii(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “sections 602(a)(1) and 672(1)” and inserting “sections 602(3) and 632(5)”;

(B) by striking “qualified professional provider of early intervention services” and inserting “early intervention services”; and

(C) by striking “section 672(2)” and inserting “section 632(4)”.

(h) AMENDMENTS TO PART F OF TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 471 (20 U.S.C. 1087kk) is amended by striking “subparts 1 or 2” and inserting “subpart 1, 2, or 4”.

(2) Section 478(h) (20 U.S.C. 1087rr(h)) is amended—

(A) by striking “476(b)(4)(B).”; and

(B) by striking “meals away from home, apparel and upkeep, transportation, and housekeeping services” and inserting “food away from home, apparel, transportation, and household furnishings and operations”.

(3)(A) Section 479A(a) (20 U.S.C. 1087tt(a)) is amended by inserting “a student’s status as a ward of the court at any time prior to attaining 18 years of age,” after “487.”.

(B) The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall be effective for academic years beginning on or after July 1, 2001.

(i) AMENDMENTS TO PARTS G AND H OF TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 482(a) (20 U.S.C. 1089(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) The Secretary shall provide a period for public comment of not less than 45 days after publication of any notice of proposed rulemaking published after the date of the

enactment of the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000 affecting programs under this title.”.

(2) Section 483(d) (20 U.S.C. 1090(d)) is amended by striking “that is authorized under section 685(d)(2)(C)” and inserting “, or other appropriate provider of technical assistance and information on postsecondary educational services, that is supported under section 685”.

(3) Section 484 (20 U.S.C. 1091) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “certification,” and inserting “certification,”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 428A” and inserting “section 428H”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end thereof;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (C);

(C) in subsection (d)(3), by inserting “certifies that he or she” after “The student”; and

(D) in subsection (l)(1)(B)(i), by striking “section 521(4)(C) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act” and inserting “section 3(3)(C) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998”.

(4)(A) Section 484(r)(1) is amended by inserting after “controlled substance” the following: “during any period of enrollment for which the student was receiving assistance under this title”.

(B) Section 484(r) is further amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

“(3) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO ANSWER.—Any student who fails to answer a question of the common financial aid form developed under section 483 that relates to eligibility or ineligibility under this subsection shall be treated as ineligible until such question is answered.

“(4) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall require each institution of higher education that participates in any of the programs under this title to provide each student upon enrollment with a separate, clear, and conspicuous written notice that advises students of the penalties contained in this subsection.”.

(C) The amendments made by this paragraph shall be effective for academic years beginning on or after July 1, 2001.

(5)(A) Section 484B (20 U.S.C. 1091b) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting “subpart 4 of part A or” after “received under”;

(ii) in subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii) by inserting “(as determined in accordance with subsection (d))” after “student has completed”; and

(iii) in subsection (b)(2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “subject to—” through to the end of such subparagraph and inserting “subject to the procedures described in subparagraph (C)(ii).”; and

(II) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) GRANT OVERPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), but subject to clause (ii), a student shall not be required to return 50 percent of the total grant assistance received by a student under this title for a payment period or period of enrollment. A student shall not be required to return amounts of less than \$50.

“(ii) Subject to clause (iii), a student shall be permitted to repay any grant overpay-

ment determined under this section under terms that permit the student to maintain his or her eligibility for further assistance under this title, including a period during which no payment is due from the student—

“(I) for 6 months, beginning on the day the student withdrew; and

“(II) while the student is pursuing at least a half-time course of study, as determined by the institution.

“(iii) Clause (ii) shall not apply to a student who is in default on any repayment obligations under this title, or who has not made satisfactory repayment arrangements with respect to such obligations.”.

(B) The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall be effective for the academic year beginning July 1, 2001, except that, in the case of an institution of higher education that chooses to implement such amendments prior to that date, such amendments shall be effective on the date of such institution’s implementation.

(6) Section 485(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1092(a)(1)) is amended by striking “mailings, and” and inserting “mailings, or”.

(7)(A) Section 485(f)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(I) A statement of policy concerning the handling of reports on missing students, including—

“(i) the policy with respect to notification of parents, guardians, and local police agencies and timing of such notification; and

“(ii) the institution’s policy for investigating reports on missing students and for cooperating with local police agencies in the investigation of a report of a missing student.

“(J) A statement of policy regarding the availability of information, provided by the State to the institution pursuant to section 170101 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14071), regarding sexually violent predators required to register under such section. Such statement shall include, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) An assurance that the institution shall make available to the campus community, through its law enforcement unit or other office, all such information concerning any person enrolled or employed at the institution.

“(ii) The means by which students and employees obtain access to such information.

“(iii) The frequency at which such information is updated.

“(iv) The type of information to be made available.

“(K) A description of campus fire safety practices and standards, including—

“(i) information with respect to each campus residence hall and whether or not such hall is equipped with a fire sprinkler system or other fire safety system;

“(ii) statistics concerning the occurrence on campus of fires and false alarms in residence halls, including information on deaths, injuries, and structural damage caused by such occurrences, if any, during the 2 preceding calendar years for which such data are available; and

“(iii) information regarding fire alarms, smoke alarms, fire escape planning or protocols (as defined in local fire codes), rules on portable electrical appliances, smoking and open flames, regular mandatory supervised fire drills, and any planned improvements in fire safety.”.

(B) The amendment made by this paragraph shall be effective for academic years beginning on or after July 1, 2001.

(8) Section 485(f) is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting after the first sentence the following: "In addition, each such institution shall make periodic reports to the campus community regarding fires and false fire alarms that are reported to a local fire department.";

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "paragraph (1)(F)" and inserting "subparagraphs (F) and (J) of paragraph (1)";

(ii) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking "education, identify" and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: "education, identify—

"(i) exemplary campus security policies, procedures, and practices and disseminate information concerning those policies, procedures, and practices that have proven effective in the reduction of campus crime; and

"(ii) fire safety policies, procedures, and practices and disseminate information concerning those policies procedures and practices that have proven effective in the reduction of fires on campus; and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) not later than July 1, 2002, prepare and submit a report to Congress containing—

"(i) an analysis of the current status of fire safety systems in college and university facilities, including sprinkler systems;

"(ii) an analysis of the appropriate fire safety standards to apply to these facilities, which the Secretary shall prepare after consultation with such fire safety experts, representatives of institutions of higher education, and Federal agencies as the Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, considers appropriate;

"(iii) an estimate of the cost of bringing all nonconforming residence halls and other campus buildings into compliance with appropriate building codes; and

"(iv) recommendations concerning the best means of meeting fire safety standards in all college facilities, including recommendations for methods of funding such costs.";

(C) in paragraph (12)(A), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "other than in dormitories or other residential facilities reported under subparagraph (D)";

(9) Section 485 is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) NEW OR REVISED REQUIREMENTS.—For any new requirement for institutional disclosure or reporting under this Act enacted after April 1, 2000, the period for which data must be collected shall begin no sooner than 180 days after the publication of final regulations or guidance. The final regulations or guidance shall include any required data elements or method of collection (or both). The Secretary shall take reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that institutions have adequate time to collect and prepare the required data before public disclosure or submission to the Secretary."

(10) Section 485B(a) (20 U.S.C. 1092b(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the paragraphs following paragraph (5) (as added by section 2008 of Public Law 101-239) as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively; and

(B) in such paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "(22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.)," and inserting "(22 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.);"; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon.

(11) Section 487(a)(22) (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(22)) is amended by striking "refund policy" and inserting "refund of title IV funds policy".

(12) Section 491(c) (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The appointment of members under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication of the appointment in the Congressional Record."

(13) Section 498 (20 U.S.C. 1099c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(5), by striking "institution," and inserting "institution (but subject to the requirements of section 484(b));";

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking "for profit," and inserting "for-profit,"; and

(C) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by inserting "and" at the end thereof.

(j) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V.—

(1) Section 504(a) (20 U.S.C. 1101c(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(1) IN GENERAL.—"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(k) AMENDMENT TO TITLE VI.—Section 604(c) (20 U.S.C. 1124(c)) is amended by striking "this part" and inserting "this title".

(l) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VII.—

(1) Section 701(a) (20 U.S.C. 1134(a)) is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: "Funds appropriated for a fiscal year shall be obligated and expended for fellowships under this subpart for use in the academic year beginning after July 1 of such fiscal year."

(2) Section 714(c) (20 U.S.C. 1135c(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking "section 716(a)" and inserting "section 715(a)"; and

(B) by striking "section 714(b)(2)" and inserting "section 713(b)(2)".

(m) AMENDMENT TO TITLE VIII.—Section 857(a) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (112 Stat. 1824) is amended by striking "1999" and inserting "2001".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4504, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000. Most of you will recall that just over 2 years ago we met here on a bipartisan basis to consider the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. That legislation was subsequently enacted into law on October 7, 1998, and now greatly benefits students by providing the lowest student loan interest rates in almost 20 years, as well as by making needed improvement to important student aid programs like Work-Study, Pell grants and TRIO.

First, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania

(Chairman GOODLING) for his leadership on that bill and for the years of leadership he has shown on all education matters during his time here in the Congress.

I also want to thank the committee ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the former ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the current ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor and for the great work that they have done on the other bills that we have been working on.

These amendments which we crafted together have been a great success, and our continued efforts on this legislation will only improve on those results. The legislation we are considering today makes numerous technical corrections, but it also includes some significant policy changes that we believe are necessary to ensure that the Higher Education Act is implemented in the way we intended.

Although we could not include all the changes on everyone's wish list, we did try to include those improvements that will benefit students and families who are struggling to pay for a college education.

An important change included by the committee impacts the eligibility of historically black colleges and universities to participate in the Federal student aid programs. These institutions play a vital role in providing access to post-secondary education for students who might not otherwise enroll in higher education. In the 1998 amendments, we required some of these institutions to submit plans and implementation strategies that would result in default rate reductions at their institutions. However, we did not provide sufficient time for the affected institutions to take the actions outlined in the default management plans to reduce their cohort default rates. This bill is correcting that mistake.

H.R. 4504 also includes three new provisions all related to campus security. The first provision is based on H.R. 3619, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), that requires institutions of higher education to have a policy related to the handling of reports on missing students, including the notification of parents, guardians and local police.

The second provision is based on H.R. 4407, introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), which requires institutions to have a policy regarding the availability of information provided by the State under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act with respect to registered sexually violent predators.

The third provision was an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) that requires institutions to include in their

annual security report a description of campus fire safety practices and standards. All of these provisions will result in greater awareness of potential security risks on campus, and I, for one, believe that more information is better.

Additionally, this legislation will improve the regulatory process for institutions of higher education and other program participants. We continue to hear reports that the Department does not give the public enough time to comment on or to implement complex student aid regulations. For that reason, we have established minimum time periods for certain activities.

First, the bill requires the Department of Education to allow a minimum of 45 days for comment after the publication of a notice of proposed rule making. Second, it prevents disclosure or reporting requirements from becoming effective for at least 180 days after final regulations are published. Although some groups would have preferred a longer period of time, the committee believes that these time frames provide a reasonable period of time for action without causing disruptive delays in the regulatory or implementation process.

Most importantly, the bill clarifies and strengthens provisions in the Higher Education Act regarding the return of Federal funds when students withdraw from school. Specifically, it will correct the Department interpretation so that students will never be required to return more than 50 percent of the grant funds they receive. In addition, it will provide students with a limited grace period for repayment to help students who are unable to repay immediately upon their withdrawal and it will set a minimum threshold for grant repayment of \$50.

All of these steps will aid students who withdraw from college for emergency or financial reasons. It is our hope that these changes will allow a low-income student to make another attempt to obtain a post-secondary education in the future, which is, of course, what we are trying to do with this whole education process.

This legislation will improve the implementation of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 which we worked very hard to enact in the last Congress, and I urge every Member of this Congress to support it.

Finally, I would like to thank our Education staff members, Sally Stroup and George Conant on the majority side, and Maryellen Ardouny and Marshall Grigsby on the minority side, for all of the work they have done to make this bill possible at this time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, the Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2000. In October of

1998, as the chairman has already said, after 2 years of debate and compromise, the Congress passed and the President signed the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

Among other things, this bipartisan legislation reduced student loan interest rates to the lowest level in 17 years, established the performance-based organization to administer Federal student aid programs, and it authorized programs to help disadvantaged elementary and secondary students graduate from high school and enter college. It authorized new programs to strengthen the quality of the elementary and secondary teaching force, and expanded the loan cancellation for individuals teaching in low-income schools.

However, since its enactment, approximately a year and a half ago, as the chairman said, several technical errors, such as misnumbered paragraphs and incorrect punctuation, have been brought to the attention of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

In addition, it has become apparent as a result of the negotiated rule making process that, in few instances, clarifying language is necessary in order for the 1998 amendments to be implemented as Congress intended. Therefore, today we are considering H.R. 4504, the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000.

In addition to renumbering paragraphs and changing colons to semicolons, the bill does a number of things to improve the Higher Education Act and benefit students. For instance, it modifies the Student Support Service Program under TRIO to allow grantees to use funds for college completion grants and requires 33 percent matching funds used for this purpose. It extends the Gear Up grant award period to 6 years to allow grantees to serve a cohort of students beginning in the sixth grade. It allows work-study funds to be used for travel training, and it eliminates the 2-year waiting period Hispanic-serving institutions must observe before applying for another grant under title V, similar to the legislation recently passed by Congress and signed into law to eliminate the wait-out period for tribal colleges and Native Alaskan and Hawaiian institutions.

□ 1445

Most importantly, it adjusts the title IV refund policy to make it easier for low-income students who are forced to withdraw from school to reenter when their circumstances improve. I believe that the small number of changes in the bill and the very technical nature of most of them are testimony to the outstanding job that the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and members of the committee did in 1998. I urge my colleagues to support

the bill, which will improve the excellent piece of legislation we passed in 1998, and allow the Department and community to continue implementing the Higher Education Act as Congress intended.

In closing, I would like to say thank you to Sally Stroup, George Conant, Marshall Grigsby, and Mary Ellen Sprenkel of our staff for all their hard work on H.R. 4504 and the underlying bill.

I would also like to take a moment to express my deepest sympathy for John Oberg, special assistant of higher education at the Department of Education. John, who has done an outstanding job of representing the administration on issues concerning higher education for the past 6 years, lost his wife last week in a car accident.

John, our thoughts are with you during this very difficult time.

Once again, I urge Members to support this resolution.

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), a staunch member of the committee.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for allowing me the opportunity to speak in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000. As most will recall, about 2 years ago we enacted on a bipartisan basis the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. Millions of students have since benefited from our efforts, and the minimal number of technical amendments that we are considering today is testimony to the fact that the bill was well written.

The legislation we are considering today makes necessary technical changes, as well as a few policy changes, that the members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce believe are necessary to implement the act as intended. In writing this legislation, the members, with the guidance of our chairman, have worked to ensure that the bill is bipartisan; that it will benefit students; and that it will be signed into law.

One notable benefit to students is the way this bill improves the Perkins loan program. It modifies the loan rehabilitation programs to provide the benefits of loan rehabilitation to a borrower with a defaulted loan who pays his or her loan in full with a single payment if the defaulted loan has not been reduced to judgment.

It also clarifies that loans in deferment for a student who performs a service resulting in loan cancellation is reimbursed for interest and not just for principal. Additionally, this legislation improves the regulatory process for schools and other program participants. This is important because the

committee continues to hear reports that the Department does not give the public enough time to comment on or to implement complex student aid regulations.

To address this, the bill requires the Department of Education to allow a minimum of 45 days for comment after the publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking. It also prevents disclosure or reporting requirements from becoming effective for at least 180 days after final regulations are published.

Another significant element of this bill is the change to the return of Federal funds provision to help students who withdraw before the end of a term. It corrects the Department's interpretation and clarifies that students are never required to return more than 50 percent of the grant funds that they receive. However, considering that we in Congress have worked hard to help our Nation's students meet some of their needs in order to attend the college or university, I for one would hate to see us being taken advantage of, or the taxpayer being taken advantage of. It is theoretically possible for a person to get a Pell grant to enroll in a low-cost local program with the full intention of dropping out almost immediately and pocketing half of the grant money.

One thing I have learned in my years in Congress is that if there is a theoretical way for people to take advantage of the Federal Government, some people will find it and will do it. To address this concern, I intend to ask the General Accounting Office to conduct a study to determine whether or not this is a significant problem.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for allowing me to speak in support of the bill before us, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the legislation.

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a strong member of the committee.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for his excellent leadership in the higher Committee on Education and the Workforce and also our distinguished ranking member for his years of work in this committee as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two clarifications and one addition to the Higher Education Technical Amendments to the so-called Souder amendment to the Higher Education Act. This amendment probably has caused more controversy on our college campuses than all but few things in the Higher Education Act, and this is an attempt to clarify some things that I believe were misunderstood or had implementation problems at the Department of Education.

First, let me thank former Congressman Gerald Solomon. For years he led

this effort to hold students accountable for drug use if they were going to use taxpayer money to fund a student loan. What my amendment attempted to do was a very simple process and that said, if one abuses drugs, that is if they are convicted, not alleged but if they are convicted of using drugs or dealing drugs, they would lose their student loan for one year.

If they went through drug treatment and took a drug test and passed it twice, they could get back even within that year. Our goal was not to get kids tossed out of college. Our goal was to get kids off drugs. If it happened twice, they lost their subsidized student loan for two years. If it happened three times, they are out. For drug dealing it was one and two.

Now this caused a big rhubarb. The question was, is this punishing people who have already been punished once? As if our courts actually do more than slap on the wrist. But besides that, the question is not punishment; the question is treatment. How do we move to prevention, and how do we get those who are abusing drugs on to treatment and to help them with their problem?

There is also the question as taxpayers, is why should we be underwriting students who are abusing and convicted of drug use in college? In my five trips to Colombia, I have looked and listened to leaders in Colombia, leaders in Mexico. I have heard people back home and around the country say there is only so much we can do about interdiction. What is being done in America about the drug problem?

This is an effort to actually do prevention and to hold people accountable.

Now there were a couple of problems in implementation that occurred in the Higher Education Act. One, there was limited pre-testing of the question. Secondly, the poorly framed question caused tremendous confusion in incoming freshmen and others in 1999. Hundreds of thousands of students left the question blank, which would have stopped the system to enforce it and yet they cannot have questions left blank. There was also no auditing. There was no checking of those who said that they had not been convicted of a drug crime, or who left it blank, which is irresponsible enforcement. It is basically a toothless bill without that.

Now there was a misunderstanding as well. All the way through the whole debate, I never said anything differently than what I said today, which is that if one is going to take a student subsidized loan they should be held accountable. Yet for some unusual reason, and I am not faulting them for doing it because it was their decision to do so, the Clinton administration interpreted this to mean that anybody prior to going into college who had been convicted once, twice, or three

times of a drug crime was, therefore, either in violation of either clause one, clause two or clause three, which meant that many teenagers around the country who had been convicted of a drug crime all of a sudden were either being suspended for 1 year, 2 years or out on drug loans.

It meant people that were coming back in mid-life or adulthood all of a sudden were not eligible, theoretically, at least for student loans. There was nowhere in any record that suggested that any of us were advocating a reachback provision. The language was very explicit, I believed, which is if one takes taxpayer dollars, then they are expected to behave legally.

Now, what we need to do is to try to reach to those students who often are young people or middle-aged people who are coming back, who have had a tough time in life, who have been convicted of a drug crime, and now they want to go to college. The goal here is not to punish them.

I am a big supporter of GEAR UP, where we have technical amendments in this bill related to GEAR UP, and there is an unfortunate amendment later in the Labor HHS bill that would strike some of the clauses in GEAR UP which I oppose because I believe it is important to reach out to low-income students. We also need to have accountability.

What these amendments do are, one, first off one is only covered when they receive the loan and they are accepted into a university, or coming back after an absence. In other words, there is a short period of time while one is not in school, where they would be covered.

Also, if it is a continuous process, presumably one would be covered. In other words, if one took the January semester break off or a summer break; but they are in a continuous flow of college, they would be held accountable in that period. But the goal here is not if one drops out for 5 years to cover that period or to cover their whole years in high school.

The goal is while one is clearly going to college and has been approved for a student loan.

Secondly, we have made it clear now that we have had our trial run. If one leaves this blank, they will not get a loan until they fill out that question.

Now, a third part that the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER) added, which I think was a very wise additional amendment, was to make sure that all students understand that it is clear to the information to the Department of Education that if one is convicted of a drug crime, they cannot get a student loan, or they will be kicked off of a student loan.

Now lastly, we had some discussions with the Department of Education. I want to make it clear that we did not put some amendments in because I believe they are moving ahead on this.

One is to get the question better drafted. I am encouraged, but that question should be pre-tested better than they have pre-tested it in the past because as a parent whose kids have gone through college, the forms are very confusing; and it is very important if they are going to be held accountable to have that question clear.

Secondly, an auditing process, because without an auditing process this amendment is toothless. If we are going to attack the drug problem in this country and hold people accountable and help kids get into treatment and get their lives straightened around, there has to be an auditing and accountability process. We are either serious about the drug problem or we are not.

We need to make sure that we do not just focus on interdiction, which I believe is important, or border control, which I believe is important, or legal accountability, which I believe is important, but to have real prevention and treatment programs; and these amendments will help this become an even better process and hopefully help many students in this country understand that this problem is real.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a couple more comments. In addition to the committee staff that I thanked earlier, I would like to thank my legislative director, Karen Weiss, for all of the work that she has done on this bill. This may be the last time that we stand as a subcommittee on the floor with legislation during this Congress; and if so, I want to again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the ranking member of this committee. He has been a joy to work with. He really has the people of this country at heart. He has served a lot of time in this Congress and done an excellent job, and I just want to let him know that I appreciate greatly the ability that he has brought to this Congress and the opportunity that we have had to work together.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider the Higher Education Technical Amendments of 2000. Many of my colleagues will remember that in the last Congress we enacted the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 on a bipartisan basis. That bill was one of the most important pieces of legislation we considered for students and their parents. I want to thank Chairman MCKEON again for his leadership on that bill. Throughout that process he kept members focused on our goal of improving our student financial aid system. Millions of students have since benefited from our efforts, and the minimal number of technical amendments that we are considering today is testimony to the fact that the bill was well crafted.

The Department of Education has issued a majority of the final regulations implementing

the 1998 amendments. In most cases our intent was followed, but in a few important instances, it was not.

For example, I feel very strongly that the department is not following our intent with respect to direct loan origination fees. The 1998 amendments were designed to provide students with the best possible deal under very tight budget constraints, and I believe we succeeded in doing that. However, the law uses the word "shall" and it is very clear in directing the Secretary to collect a four percent origination fee on direct student loans. This is confirmed in legal opinions from the Congressional Research Service and the Comptroller General. It was not our intent to change that, and in my view the department's decision to arbitrarily interpret "shall" to mean "may" sets a very dangerous precedent. The fact that this legislation does not address this issue should not be taken as an endorsement of the department's actions.

The legislation before us today does make a needed change to the "return of federal funds" provisions in the Higher Education Act to help students who withdraw before the end of a term. By correcting the department's mistaken interpretation, we will ensure that no student is required to return more than 50 percent of the grant funds he or she received. I know there are those who would like us to go further. However, doing so would increase mandatory spending, and in many instances, would result in students leaving school with increased student loan debt, which I cannot support.

H.R. 4505 includes three new provisions all related to campus security. The first provision is based on H.R. 3619, introduced by Representative ANDREWS of New Jersey, and requires institutions of higher education to have a policy related to the handling of reports on missing students, including the notification of parents, guardians and local police.

The second provision is based on H.R. 4407 introduced by Representative SALMON of Arizona. It requires institutions to have a policy regarding the availability of information provided by the state under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act with respect to registered sexually violent predators.

The third provision was an amendment offered by Representative ROUKEMA of New Jersey that requires institutions to include in their annual security report a description of campus fire safety practices and standards.

All of these provisions will result in greater awareness of potential security risks on campus, and I, for one, believe that more information is better.

Finally, I want to thank Mr. CLAY and Mr. MARTINEZ for their efforts in crafting this bipartisan legislation. This bill will not satisfy everyone completely. But it does make necessary technical and policy changes that will improve the implementation of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, and it does so in a way that will benefit students.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLING and Chairman MCKEON and their staffs for all of their hard work on the Campus Protection Act, which will close a loophole in federal law that restricts the ability

of colleges and universities to notify students of the presence of convicted sex offenders on campus. I am thrilled that the campus security legislation has been incorporated into H.R. 4504, the Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2000.

What peaked my interest in this matter was a column Tamara Deitrich wrote for the East Valley Tribune on a sex offender roaming the campus of Arizona State University (ASU), which is located in my District. The sex offender secured a work furlough to study and do research at ASU, where about 23,000 young women attend classes. Campus law enforcement officials at ASU expressed concern that Federal law hampered their ability to adequately warn students about this threat. To me, it's unconscionable that women on campuses do not receive notification when a rapist or sex offender is enrolled.

S. Daniel Carter of Security on Campus, an expert in campus security matters, carefully evaluated the Campus Protection Act. The following is an excerpt from his letter:

For too long colleges and universities have used the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 USC Section 1232g) to withhold public safety information from their students and employees that any other citizen would be able to get freely. This is a situation that denies them equal protection under the law and unnecessarily puts their lives and safety at risk. The addition of a requirement to the campus security section of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that schools publicly disclose information about registered sex offenders who are either enrolled or employed by the institution should ensure that FERPA is not misinterpreted to preclude the release of this critically important information. The language included in H.R. 4504 is designed to clarify this point . . .

I thank S. Daniel Carter for his contribution to this effort and am delighted that the founders of his organization and the family most responsible for the original campus security law—the Cery's—endorse the Campus Protection Act.

The Campus Protection Act adds a new section to the Jeanne Cery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to clarify that sex offender information of all enrolled students and employees not only can be released, but when received, must be released. This will ensure that the same information about sex offenders available to other state citizens is available to college students. Additionally, the Act sensibly provides that universities develop a policy statement regarding the availability of this information as part of their annual crime statistics report.

Without a clear statement that schools are obligated to release this information, questions will remain about the legality of releasing sex offender information. Schools that withhold information because of this uncertainty unnecessarily put their students at risk.

Under the Campus Protection Act, colleges are only obligated to report information the state provides. This is not an undue burden or mandate, but authority that most campus security offices, such as the ASU unit, will welcome. The colleges maintain full discretion on how to disclose sex offender information.

The Campus Protection Act will aid campus law enforcement agencies and, more importantly, increase campus safety. In her letter

endorsing the bill, Detective Sally Miller of the Santa Rose Junior College District Police Department writes: "I wish to indicate my full support of [your bill] which provides direction and legal tools for college and university law enforcement agencies to educate and inform our communities about sexual predators currently hidden within our communities. These amendments . . . are vitally important to allow college and university police departments to adequately provide for the safety of our students and staff from sexual predators."

Passage of H.R. 4504 will close the sex offender campus loophole once and for all and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4504, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF STRONG MARRIAGES FOR A STRONG SOCIETY

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 280) recognizing the importance of strong marriages and the contributions that community marriage policies have made to the strength of marriages throughout the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 280

Whereas one of every two marriages ends in divorce;

Whereas children living with a single mother are six times more likely to live in poverty than are children whose parents are married;

Whereas married adults, on average, live longer, have fewer emotional problems, and are less likely to engage in alcohol or drug abuse;

Whereas visionary communities have adopted community marriage policies to empower couples for healthy, lifelong marriage and to foster an environment that has the greatest likelihood of ensuring the well-being of our citizens, especially our children;

Whereas a community marriage policy is a set of guidelines for premarital preparation and community support for marriage to which individuals, the community, clergy, and congregations voluntarily commit; and

Whereas a successful community marriage policy is one that urges clergy, congregations, and the broader community to—

(1) encourage premarital preparation education;

(2) train mature married couples to serve as mentors to the newly married;

(3) evaluate current practices that may unwittingly undermine marriage formation and stability;

(4) implement policies that promote marriage; and

(5) volunteer time, expertise, and resources to support initiatives that promote marriage and stable families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of strong marriages for a strong society;

(2) commends communities that have established community marriage policies for their efforts to support marriage and prevent the problems of divorce; and

(3) encourages other communities in the United States to develop voluntary community marriage policies to enable community members, such as clergy, business leaders, public officials, and health professionals, to work together to strengthen marriages and provide stable environments for children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 280.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of marriage and its benefits for individuals, for communities and for our Nation. There have been considerable discussion about the state of marriage in this Nation over the past half century because there has been such dramatic changes in our Nation and in the institution of marriage.

□ 1500

If we look at the details of what has happened to marriage in this half century and what has happened as a result, we find some very interesting things.

As an example, there has been a great deal of debate in America about the growing gap between rich and poor; and almost all of it focuses on the changing job force, the cost of living, and the tax and regulatory structure that hamstring businesses and employees.

But analysis of social science literature demonstrates that the root cause of poverty and income is definitely linked to the presence or absence of marriage. Among other problems, broken families earn less and experience lower levels of educational achievement.

Let's consider some of the statistics that have been offered: in 1950, 12 out of every 100 children, in other words, 12 percent, entered a broken family. By 1992, 58 percent, or 58 out of every 100 children born, entered a broken family. Children living with a single mother are six times more likely to live in poverty than are children whose parents are married.

Of families with children in the lowest quintile of earnings, 73 percent are headed by single parents. Ninety-five percent in the top quintile are headed by married couples.

In 1994, over 12.5 million children lived in single-parent families that earned less than \$15,000 per year. Only 3 million children lived in single-parent families with annual incomes greater than \$30,000.

Three-quarters of all women applying for welfare benefits do so because of a destructive marriage or live-in relationship. Those who leave the welfare system when they get married are the least likely to return to the welfare system.

Co-habitation doubles the rate of divorce. Co-habitation with someone other than one's future spouse quadruples the rate of divorce.

Divorce reduces the income of families with children by an average of 42 percent, and almost 50 percent of those families experience poverty. Married couples in their mid-50s amass four times the wealth of divorced individuals, \$132,000 versus \$33,600.

I think this illustrates some aspects of the current situation. But let us also consider, research that has been done on marriage and happiness and particularly marriage and health.

University of Chicago demographer Linda Waite found that life expectancy is more adversely affected by being unmarried than by being poor, overweight, or having heart disease.

Similarly, scholars at the National Institutes for Health Care Research recently compiled a lengthy report showing that divorced men are particularly likely to experience health problems. When compared to married men, divorced males are twice as likely to die prematurely from hypertension, four times as likely to die prematurely from throat cancer, twice as likely to die prematurely from cardiovascular disease, and seven times as likely to die prematurely from pneumonia. In other words, being married is healthy.

Why does marriage offer such extraordinary health benefits? The previously mentioned demographer, Linda Waite, states that marriage provides individuals a network of help and support which can be particularly beneficial in dealing with stress and in recovering from illness and accidents.

Of course the long-recognized linked between stable marriage and greater wealth is not simply due to the fact that married men have stronger incentives to work hard. It is also due to the fact that married-couple households benefit from role specialization and from pooling resources.

Another interesting aspect, Washington State University researcher Jan Stets reports that women in cohabiting unions are more than twice as likely to be the victims of domestic violence than married women.

Data from the National Institute of Mental Health shows that co-habiting women have rates of depression that are more than three times higher than married women and more than twice as high as other single women. On and on the statistics go.

I think a very important item to mention is that research reviews by UCLA Professor Robert Coombs and others find that the longer lives of married people cannot be explained by the fact that healthy people are more likely to get and stay married. The state of marriage itself is more important in fostering good health.

Now, that is very important to recognize because an immediate response of many people to all the statistics that I have given here is that we simply have not done a controlled experiment. The problem, they would say, is simply that the healthier people and the happier people are the ones more likely to get married and stay married.

But as I said here, the research by Robert Coombs of UCLA indicates that is simply not true. The state of marriage itself is more important in fostering good health.

The conclusion is that marriage is healthy. It is good for couples. It is good for children, good for communities, good for the Nation. It improves health, well-being, and makes children's lives, on average, more stable.

The question is what can we do to encourage marriage if marriage is so wonderful? Is there some magic wand we at the Federal level can wave and solve that particular problem? I think it is important to recognize that we cannot do a great deal at the Federal level. But we can certainly encourage community-level activity, particularly activity that is having a good effect.

I want to make it clear I am not up here to condemn divorce; I am simply pointing out that marriage can be a positive factor in many lives and that we should try to encourage those who are married to stay married and those who are not married to become married.

An example of a way to handle this appropriately is to mobilize religious and community support. Something that has emerged in this country, which is very good and has had a positive influence, is something called a community marriage policy.

Let me cite some material from a recent report, "Toward More Perfect Unions: Putting Marriage on the Public Agenda," a report from the Family Impact Seminar, reported by Theodora Ooms. She notes that perhaps the most promising and innovative marriage-strengthening strategy bubbling up from the community level is the community marriage policy. This is a strategy rooted in the religious sector and was originally conceived of and promoted by Michael McManus, a syndicated columnist and author of "Marriage Savers."

In the community marriage policy initiative, clergy and congregations in a community get together and agree upon a set of guidelines.

A particularly good example of such a community marriage policy is that of the Greater Grand Rapids, Michigan, area which I represent. I do not say that just because I represent it.

In the words of the report Family Impact Seminar report, the best community marriage policy is taking place in Greater Grand Rapids, Michigan, where, in 1996, the community launched an ambitious community-wide mobilization designed to support children-strengthening marriage.

The initiative has some core funding, an executive leader, Dr. Roger Sider, and institutional support from Pine Rest, a Christian Community Mental Health Center.

I should point out in an aside that Pine Rest is more than just a center; it is the second largest private community member health facility in the United States.

What distinguishes the Grand Rapids community marriage policy is that it involves a high caliber and breadth of community leadership, including many civic leaders and health professionals as well as the clergy. They have taken pains to be inclusive of many different views of marriage.

For example, they have been careful to listen to and accommodate the concerns of feminists working with battered women and minority leaders working with single-parent families.

Let me emphasize that this community marriage policy is voluntary; but the Grand Rapids one is unique in that it has involved the broader community, not just the religious community.

In Grand Rapids, pastors, rabbis, priests, judges, doctors, lawyers, counselors, elected officials, business leaders, educators and concerned citizens are being asked to find ways that they can strengthen and support marriages throughout their life cycle.

The chairman of the 50-person steering committee is Bill Hardiman, a good friend of mine, and the mayor of Kentwood, the second largest suburb of Grand Rapids. He has put many hours into this and has done exceptional work.

After more than a year of careful planning, in the spring of 1998 the initiative began implementation, starting by offering training to ministers and courses to others.

The Greater Grand Rapids Community Marriage Policy has set itself a goal of reducing the divorce rate by 25 percent by the year 2010, a very ambitious goal; and they are well on the way to achieving that. It will also establish some interim benchmarks of progress towards this goal.

So the purpose of this resolution is to commend community marriage policies throughout this land; and, in par-

ticular, although it is not specifically stated in the resolution, I want to commend the Greater Grand Rapids community in developing their community marriage policy. It has worked well. It holds great promise. We hope that it will achieve a great increase in the stability of marriages in our community and eventually throughout our Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 280, which recognizes the importance of strong marriages and community marriage policies. I think it is a wonderful thing if communities try to encourage strong marriages.

Our communities have changed so drastically over the past 3 years, today it is a fast-paced world and places constant stress on families and couples alike.

But today, most married couples, young married couples, one finds both of the couples working, dedicated to a career or a job, and that is a hectic life style. The hectic life style that many young couples are leading make it difficult for them to focus on family and each other, thereby putting a strain on their relationship and putting their marriage at risk.

This resolution, I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for bringing it forth, bringing attention to a need for strong healthy marriage and community support to make that a reality.

This support, in the form of community marriage policies and other efforts to ensure a network of help for couples, can greatly contribute toward more harmonious and happy marriages, especially churches and community-based organizations.

Those who are contributing that support are various members of our community, including those organizations, as I mentioned, religious and those people's community-based organizations that put forth counseling service.

In closing, I want to thank again the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for bringing this resolution to the House today and urge Members to support it.

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

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some of the reasons that our nation should consider as we try to strengthen marriages in our country. The benefits of health, the benefits of stability, the benefits for our Nation and particularly for our children and their education.

I have stated that the purpose of the resolution is simply to commend communities throughout the entire Nation that have established community marriage policies. But I would like to point

out that the Congress itself should focus on ways to undue the bias against marriage in certain Federal programs.

This House has already passed the elimination of the marriage penalty in our income tax, and we hope that that will soon pass the other body and be signed into law by the President. The earned income tax credit should also not have a marriage penalty, which it presently has.

There are other issues in poverty programs and many other programs in the Federal Government where one can detect some antimarriage bias. I think we as a Congress should address those issues.

In addition State governments, with their responsibility for the marriage laws, should do what they can to encourage proper premarital counseling and especially proper counseling of individuals considering divorce.

In the State of Michigan, we have done that through a State law which sets up a mechanism for counseling at the local level, using funds from marriage license fees. Churches and local communities, through initiatives such as community marriage policies, also should encourage this.

In summary, we have demonstrated there are substantial effects of divorce on children. There are substantial effects of divorce on the health of individuals. And we have also outlined a number of the benefits of marriage.

It is very important that we as a Nation and as a Congress emphasize the importance of stable marriages for the well-being of our Nation, our citizens, and especially our children.

□ 1515

This resolution is one small way we can do that, and I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 280, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECEIVERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3995) to establish procedures governing the responsibilities of court-appointed receivers who administer departments, offices, and agencies of the District of Columbia government, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3995

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO RECEIVERS WITH RESPONSIBILITIES OVER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Each District of Columbia receiver shall be subject to the requirements described in section 3.

(b) *DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECEIVER DEFINED.*—In this Act, a "District of Columbia receiver" is any receiver or other official who is first appointed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or the Superior Court of the District of Columbia during 1995 or any succeeding year to administer any department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.

(a) *PROMOTING FINANCIAL STABILITY AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY.*—Each District of Columbia receiver who is responsible for the administration of a department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia shall carry out the administration of such department, agency, or office through practices which promote the financial stability and management efficiency of the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) *COST CONTROL.*—Each District of Columbia receiver who is responsible for the administration of a department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia shall ensure that the costs incurred in the administration of such department, agency, or office (including personnel costs of the receiver) are consistent with applicable regional and national standards.

(c) *USE OF PRACTICES TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT AND COST-EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION.*—Each District of Columbia receiver who is responsible for the administration of a department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia shall carry out the administration of such department, agency, or office through the application of generally accepted accounting principles and generally accepted fiscal management practices.

(d) *PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF BUDGET.*—

(1) *CONSULTATION WITH MAYOR AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER.*—In preparing the annual budget for a fiscal year for the department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia administered by the receiver, each District of Columbia receiver shall consult with the Mayor and Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

(2) *SUBMISSION OF ESTIMATES.*—After the consultation required under paragraph (1), the receiver shall prepare and submit to the Mayor, for inclusion in the annual budget of the District of Columbia for the year, the receiver's estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the department, agency, or office for the year.

(3) *TREATMENT BY MAYOR AND COUNCIL.*—The estimates submitted under paragraph (2) shall be forwarded by the Mayor to the Council for its action pursuant to sections 446 and 603(c) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, without revision but subject to the Mayor's recommendations. Notwithstanding any provision of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, the Council may comment or make recommendations concerning such estimates but shall have no authority under such Act to revise such estimates.

(4) *EXCEPTIONS.*—This subsection shall not apply with respect to—

(A) any department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia administered by a District of Columbia receiver for which, under the terms of the receiver's appointment by the court involved, the Mayor and the Council may revise the annual budget; or
(B) the District of Columbia Housing Authority receiver appointed during 1995.

(5) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—This subsection shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2001 and each succeeding fiscal year.

(e) *ANNUAL FISCAL, MANAGEMENT, AND PROGRAM AUDIT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—An annual fiscal, management, and program audit of each department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia administered by a District of Columbia receiver shall be conducted by an independent auditor selected jointly by the receiver involved (or the receiver's designee) and the Mayor (or the Mayor's designee), and each District of Columbia receiver shall provide the auditor with such information and assistance as the auditor may require to conduct such audit.

(2) *EXCEPTIONS.*—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to—

(A) any department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia administered by a District of Columbia receiver for which, under the terms of the receiver's appointment by the court involved, audits are conducted by an auditor selected jointly by the parties to the action under which the receiver was appointed; or
(B) the District of Columbia Housing Authority receiver appointed during 1995.

(f) *PROCUREMENT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In carrying out procurement on behalf of the department, agency, or office of the government of the District of Columbia administered by the receiver, each District of Columbia receiver—

(A) shall obtain full and open competition through the use of competitive procedures; and
(B) shall use the competitive procedure or combination of competitive procedures which is best suited under the circumstances of the procurement.

(2) *EXCEPTIONS.*—

(A) *ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENT.*—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a District of Columbia receiver may use alternative methods to carry out procurement if—

(i) the amount involved is nominal;
(ii) the public exigencies require the immediate delivery of the articles or performance of the service involved;

(iii) the receiver certifies that only one source of supply is available; or

(iv) the services involved are required to be performed by the contractor in person and are of a technical and professional nature or are performed under the receiver's supervision and paid for on a time basis.

(B) *HOUSING AUTHORITY.*—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the District of Columbia Housing Authority receiver appointed during 1995.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT.

Nothing in subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code may be construed to waive the application of the provisions of such subchapter which apply to officers or employees of the District of Columbia government to any District of Columbia receiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3995, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3995, the District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000. The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, which I chair, of the Committee on Government Reform, is currently examining the status of the City's agencies that are overseen by court-appointed receivers. Presently, there are three outstanding agency receiverships: the Child and Family Services; the Commission on Mental Health Services; and the Corrections Medical Receiver for the District of Columbia Jail.

Each of these agencies has languished in receivership for a substantial period of time and has continued to be plagued by systematic problems in the delivery of expected services. Since these agencies are under the authority of the court system and not the District Government, expedient congressional action is necessary to induce comprehensive reforms within the receivership to return them to the jurisdiction of the District Government.

The Child and Family Services agency was brought under the glare of the public spotlight with the tragic death of young Brianna Blackmond. While Brianna was under the care of the Child and Family Services agency, her life was tragically cut short, at 23 months, by a blunt force trauma injury to the head. As the proud father of three children myself, I can say that stories such as Brianna's stab us in the heart and leave us wondering in amazement at how this could have happened.

Unfortunately, Brianna's death is not a story of a one-time case slipping through the cracks of an otherwise well-functioning child welfare system. Brianna is just one example of many heart-wrenching stories of children adversely affected by the systemic problems of the District of Columbia's child welfare system.

The two other district agencies in receivership have also demonstrated extreme deficiencies in their operations. The Commission on Mental Health Services agency has actually become worse since becoming a receivership. There are currently more mentally ill homeless people on the streets than ever before. Group homes for the mentally ill are poorly run and neglected,

and treatment is difficult to come by. The lack of improvement in their services has recently led the receiver to resign.

The D.C. Jail Medical Services receivership's financial management is in dire straits as well. For example, the receiver recently issued a contract to a private entity which had the D.C. contract as its only contract and had never been in the business, at a cost of three times the national average.

This year alone, these three agencies combined will cost the District of Columbia taxpayers \$352 million in court-controlled spending. In answer to these deafening receivership problems, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and I have joined together to introduce H.R. 3995, the District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000 to provide management guidance to these receiverships and make them more accountable to the District of Columbia Government and the City's taxpayers. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her leadership and compassionate interest in repairing these ailing District agencies.

Specifically, the bill places affirmative duties on all the receivers in the areas of best practices. Each receiver should conduct all operations consistent with the best financial and management practices by regional and national standards.

Annual audit by independent auditor. Each receiver must submit to an annual financial and program audit conducted by an independent auditor selected jointly by the receiver involved with the mayor.

Controlling costs. Each receiver must ensure that costs are consistent with applicable regional and national standards. This requirement may be waived in a few exceptional circumstances.

Consultation with City officials on the budget. In preparing the annual budget for the entity in receivership, the receiver must consult with the mayor and the chief financial officer of the District of Columbia. After this consultation, the receivers must prepare and submit their budget to the mayor for inclusion in the City's annual budget. The council may comment and may make recommendations on the receivers' budget estimates.

Procurement practices. When entering into contracts, each receiver must fully comply with generally accepted procurement practices.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000 is a significant step towards inducing progressive reforms within the receiverships in order to return them in proper working order to the District of Columbia. I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting to support this vitally needed piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for their support of H.R. 3995 the District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000 and for the attention they have consistently shown to moving bills that affect the Nation's capital. With so much of the District's vital affairs dependent upon actions by the Congress, I particularly appreciate the attention that the chairman and ranking member have given to the City's bills and concerns.

I particularly want to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for his consistently strong leadership on District of Columbia matters and for his support in moving this bill, in particular, forward. H.R. 3995 was passed unanimously by the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on May 5, 2000 and the full Committee on Government Reform on May 18, 2000.

I appreciate the quick action and serious attention the subcommittee chairman has afforded problems in receiverships that control three D.C. functions. When the chair learned of these problems, he asked me to join him in initiating a GAO study of the District's receiverships, beginning with the receivership for the Child and Family Services agency. We began there because of the tragic and clearly preventable death of the infant Brianna Blackmond; the confusion and uncertainty in assessing responsibility for the child's death; and evidence of disarray the tragedy brought to public view that could mean other children under the care of the receivership may not be safe.

I appreciate as well the concern of the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who came personally to testify before the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia in the first of our three public hearings on the outstanding D.C. receivership, the foster care receivership.

In addition, the D.C. jail receivership appears to have excessive costs and irregular procurement practices. And the mental health receivership had problems that were so severe that the receiver had to be replaced. The public housing receivership will end this year and the agency will be returned to District of Columbia control. That receiver, David Gilmore, stands out for the success of his tenure, which took a very complicated agency with the longest history of failure and dysfunction and reformed all of its functions; operations, social services, physical infrastructure, and public safety.

Action by the Congress on the receiverships is necessary because the courts and not the District of Columbia Government have control over the functions. H.R. 3995 responds to the early

evidence we have received regarding basic deficiencies in D.C. receiverships by placing best practice requirements on agencies in receivership in the District of Columbia in seven areas:

One. Financial stability and management efficiency. Receivers must carry out the administration of the agency under receivership through practices which promote the financial stability and management efficiency of the District of Columbia.

Two. Cost controls. Receivers must ensure that costs incurred in the administration of the agency are consistent with applicable regional and national standards.

Three. Best practices. Receivers must carry out the administration of the agency through the application of generally-accepted accounting principles and generally-accepted fiscal and management practices.

Four. Budget preparation. Receivers must consult with the District of Columbia mayor, chief financial officer, and city council prior to submitting the agency budget.

Five. Annual audit. Receivers must submit to an annual fiscal and management audit by an independent auditor selected jointly by the receiver and the city.

Six. Procurement. Receivers must use best procurement practices that foster full and open competition.

Seven. Anti-Deficiency Act. This provision clarifies that the Anti-Deficiency Act applies to District agencies in receivership.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is non-controversial and strongly supported by the mayor and the city council of the District of Columbia. I urge passage.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also want to thank the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), for his interest and his understanding and his leadership on the bill. He was a very active participant in helping to move this legislation forward and craft it so it would achieve the goals that we all had in mind, and that is to prevent problems like we had with Brianna Blackmond in the future.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3995, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE CHARTER AMENDMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4387) to provide that the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 shall take effect upon the date such Act is ratified by voters of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4387

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

SECTION 1. WAIVER OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE CHARTER AMENDMENT ACT OF 2000.

Notwithstanding section 303 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act or any provision of the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000, the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 shall take effect upon the date such Act is ratified by a majority of the registered qualified electors of the District of Columbia voting in a referendum held to ratify such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4387, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4387, introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), waives the 35-day congressional review period on the upcoming June 27 referendum. It will allow the results of that referendum to be enacted immediately. If the referendum is successful, the District of Columbia may move forward with the creation of a hybrid school board. This waiver will allow candidates for the new school board to be on the ballot for the November 7 election. H.R. 4387 will allow the choice that District residents make on June 27 to go forward without the delay it would otherwise face due to our own shortened legislative calendar.

The mayor and the D. C. Council have come together to craft this compromise referendum that will return accountability to the D.C. school board and to the District of Columbia schools. The new school board will be

comprised of five elected and four mayoral-appointed members. I believe this reasonable compromise will remove much of the politics that has characterized the D.C. school boards in the past.

Most of all, this was not crafted from Congress, this was crafted from the city itself and the city leaders working together. I think if we want to continue to have democracy to be successful in the city, we have to allow them this flexibility. So I am eager that once this referendum is passed, or whatever happens to it, that we can move ahead and enact it immediately in time for the November 7 election.

I hope that the new school board will return to its primary mission of oversight and management of the schools. It is my goal to assist the city in returning accountability to the schools. For too long the education system has not worked for the children of the Nation's capital. The mayor and the council have worked together to ensure that this situation does not continue. I commend them for their dedicated efforts to achieve reform.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for his expeditious consideration of this waiver. I urge passage of this legislation so that the District may move forward on June 27.

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

□ 1530

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the action of the chairman of the full committee in moving this bill forward. Had it not moved, there would have been a cascading effect on a referendum that is required in order to settle the matter of the school board in the District of Columbia, the central issue facing the City at this time.

The School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 waives the congressionally mandated 35-day layover period for a D.C. referendum that will be considered by the voters in the special election of June 27. The referendum restructures the D.C. School Board to have five elected and four appointed members.

This local legislation is a result of an agreement between D.C. Mayor Tony Williams and the City Council. If the referendum passes, H.R. 4387 would waive the layover period so that candidates can seek signatures and run for the new board without legal challenge. This waiver is necessary because petitions for signature will be available on July 7 and the expiration of the 35-legislative-day congressional layover period may not come until early October. The waiver of the layover period will allow elections of the new school board to proceed without legal challenge on November 7.

H.R. 4387 is also noncontroversial and was unanimously passed in subcommittee and full committee. It has the full support of the mayor and the City Council of the District of Columbia. I strongly urge passage.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just summarize. Again, I thank the gentlewoman for taking the lead on an issue that was very controversial at one point in terms of how we structure the school system in the District. There is no question that it has failed.

I think we need to understand that before there was an elected D.C. Council, before there was an elected mayor, there was an elected school board. This has been a long Democratic tradition in the city.

We also, though, recognize there is a need for accountability in the decisions being made at the school system. I think when we got all the entities together, this was the compromise that they have worked out. They are going to submit it to the voters. I do not think anything could be clearer or fairer than that. We just need to give it a chance to succeed.

So, again, I thank my colleague for stepping up to the plate on this. I know this has been an issue of some controversy in the city, but it is that kind of leadership that is going to turn this city around.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want only to note that at a time when it was not clear that the mayor and the City Council would come together, the chairman stepped back and let them see if they could reach an accommodation. They did reach an accommodation that is now before the people of the District of Columbia and they will decide.

I thank the gentleman very much for his work on this bill and on so many other bills for the District of Columbia.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4387.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1927

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA) at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 761, ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-670) on the resolution (H. Res. 523) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 761) to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4578, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-671) on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Before we move into the Committee of the Whole, I thought that an understanding was being reached about the sequence of an amendment. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, it is our understanding based on our agreement of last week that we would take the Obey amendments as they appeared in the bill.

Mr. OBEY. The problem is that one of the Members who would offer those amendments is called away to another meeting and so we wanted to ask unanimous consent before the House went into the Committee that that amendment be taken out of order simply so that she could leave.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield further, is that one of the amendments that we had agreed to in the unanimous consent?

Mr. OBEY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would find no objection to accommodating that Member. But I expect that the same agreement of the time limitation would still apply.

Mr. OBEY. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I have no objection to that.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 10 DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider amendment No. 10 notwithstanding that portion of the bill may have been passed in the reading of the bill for amendment, but otherwise subject to the order of the House of June 8, 2000.

□ 1930

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 518 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4577.

□ 1930

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on

Thursday, June 8, 2000, the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 19, line 21.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I rise to enter into a colloquy with our distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who is standing in for our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) prepared to enter into that colloquy with me?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is affirmative.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for his outstanding leadership of the subcommittee and because we have the unique opportunity of having the chairman of the full committee here, I also want to thank him for his leadership of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is not in the colloquy, but I want to say with great assurance there is not a fairer, more thoughtful chairman of any standing committee in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who chairs the Committee on Appropriations.

It is with great affection and great respect that I rise and thank him for participating in this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the funding level for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention of childhood immunizations. The operations and infrastructure account, which provides grants to States for outreach and education on immunization, has, Mr. Chairman, as you know, decreased from \$271 million in 1995 to \$139 million in 2000, almost cut in half.

While this bill increases funding for the operations and infrastructure account by \$15 million this year, it is my hope that this funding would increase by an additional \$60 million for a total of \$75 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about the vaccine purchase account within the Childhood Immunization Program at CDC. The President requested, as you know, an increase of \$10 million this year and funding has remained level. I would like to see funding in this account increased by the \$10 million President Clinton requested, plus an additional \$10 million on top of that.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for his hard work on this bill, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), in his absence, for his hard work on this bill.

Given the constraints of the budget resolution, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Florida have

done an outstanding job of writing what has proved to be a difficult bill for Members on both sides of the budget debate.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may work together on this account in conference.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and I both appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on this issue.

As the gentleman knows, our allocation was not nearly as high as we had hoped, and we prepared the best bill that we could while under the current budget constraints.

With that said, I agree that the operations on infrastructure portion of the program provides the important funding for State immunization initiatives, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and I both would be very happy to work with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on this issue as we move forward in the process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, (Mr. GREEN), a very good friend of mine and someone who has been tireless in working towards increased funding for immunizations.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for organizing this colloquy this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for your pledge to work to increase funding for section 317, the immunization program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and I have introduced the resolution calling for an increase in section 317 funds for children's immunizations, and I am pleased that thanks to the efforts of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), this year's Labor, HHS bill does include a slight increase in section 317 funding. However, much more is needed.

While immunization rates in most States are improving, we are not doing as much as we could do if one of four American children are not receiving the immunizations that he or she needs. In Houston, which I represent, and Chicago over 44 percent of the children are not getting one or more of the immunizations.

Section 317 infrastructure funds are used by the States and cities to identify needs, conduct community outreach, establish registries, open clinics, deal with disease outbreaks, and undertake educational and tracking efforts, among other things.

These infrastructure funds have been reduced rather dramatically, as my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), mentioned in the past 5 years from 271 million to 139 million.

The need for increased infrastructure funding is particularly important in light of the recent Journal of the American Medical Association survey that shows over 50 percent of American children are either under or overvaccinated.

The JAMA study shows that 21 percent of toddlers receive at least one extra immunization, while 31 percent missed at least one. In other words, close to 50 percent of American children are receiving too few or too many vaccinations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Again, section 317 funding increase is supported by the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, and this increase is also supported by the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, Every Child by Two, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and the Association of County and City Health Officials.

Most important, an increase in the 317 funds, Mr. Chairman, is supported by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his support; and hopefully in conference committee we will get that additional funding if we can see the allocations increase.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for his comments. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank him and congratulate him for his work on this subject.

Obviously, we have talked a lot about in the previous decade, previous century about prevention, about how health care would be much cheaper if we prevented illness as opposed to treating illness. Nothing has been so successful, I think, in that regard as has childhood immunization.

We have, in effect, eliminated some diseases that have afflicted children and human beings for centuries really; and, therefore, this investment in immunizations plays an incredible dividend. It is probably as good an investment as we can possibly make, so not only is it the right thing to do to keep

children healthy and to protect them from diseases, but it is also, from a financial standpoint, a very worthwhile investment that saves us a very geometric savings for every dollar invested.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership and would be glad to yield to him for any comment he might have.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding. I see our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) from Chicago, and knowing that both Houston and Chicago, 44 percent of our children are either getting more or less the immunizations they need.

I know in my own district in Houston, our population turns so quick, that we may do a great immunization program 2 or 3 years ago, but we have so many new children who are coming in to urban areas in our country that this money, this infrastructure money will help create a registry so we will know that a child does not over-immunize or hopefully not under-immunize, and we will get those immunizations and the registry will help the States.

I know the State of Texas is supporting this, and State health commissioners and, of course, our cities to provide that registry so we will spend a dime today and save us a dollar tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman makes a very cogent observation. I had the opportunity to meet just within the last 30 days with the Secretary of the Department of Health in Maryland, and he made that exact point, needing such a registry. So that not only would it assist school officials and health officials, but it would preclude children from being overimmunized, as well as making sure that children who are not get that which they need. So that it has both sanguine effects from that standpoint.

I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

Does the gentleman from Texas want additional time?

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his efforts on the committee, and, again, I thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for the efforts and the commitment to try and have more money during conference process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I had the opportunity to meet a little earlier today with representatives of PerkinElmer, a corporation which is a high-technology company based in Wellesley, Massachusetts; and we talked about neonatal screening for treatable, inherited disorders.

I mention that only in the respect that, again, we were talking about prevention and early intervention. These dollars, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) have pointed out, are dollars well spent; and the only reason, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) pointed out that they have not been included in this bill at this point in time is because the budget numbers were so very tight.

I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) as well for their willingness to work with us over the next few months to try to increase substantially the numbers dedicated to the immunization program so that we can make sure that every child in America receives the shots and immunizations that he or she needs to ensure at least to the safety that we can accord with those immunization shots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 31, line 14, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and opened to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 20, line 1 through page 31, line 14 is as follows: TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, VII, VIII, X, XII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V and section 1820 of the Social Security Act, the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, as amended, and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, as amended, \$4,684,232,000, of which \$25,000,000 from general revenues, notwithstanding section 1820(j) of the Social Security Act, shall be available for carrying out the Medicare rural hospital flexibility grants program under section 1820 of such Act: *Provided*, That the Division of Federal Occupational Health may utilize personal services contracting to employ professional management/administrative and occupational health professionals: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$250,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act: *Provided further*, That for the collection of fees authorized by section 1128E(d)(2) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of oper-

ating the Healthcare Integrity and Protection Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act: *Provided further*, That no more than \$5,000,000 is available for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 104-73: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$238,932,000 shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: *Provided further*, That amounts provided to said projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office: *Provided further*, That \$554,000,000 shall be for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized by section 2616 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 502(a)(1) of the Social Security Act, not to exceed \$109,148,000 is available for carrying out special projects of regional and national significance pursuant to section 501(a)(2) of such Act.

For special projects of regional and national significance under section 501(a)(2) of the Social Security Act, \$30,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2001, and shall remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That such amount shall not be counted toward compliance with the allocation required in section 502(a)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be used only for making competitive grants to provide abstinence education (as defined in section 510(b)(2) of such Act) to adolescents and for evaluations (including longitudinal evaluations) of activities under the grants and for Federal costs of administering the grants: *Provided further*, That grants shall be made only to public and private entities which agree that, with respect to an adolescent to whom the entities provide abstinence education under such grant, the entities will not provide to that adolescent any other education regarding sexual conduct, except that, in the case of an entity expressly required by law to provide health information or services the adolescent shall not be precluded from seeking health information or services from the entity in a different setting than the setting in which the abstinence education was provided: *Provided further*, That the funds expended for such evaluations may not exceed 3.5 percent of such amount.

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS
PROGRAM

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended. For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, including section 709 of the Public Health Service Act, \$3,679,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM
TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed \$2,992,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 301, and 501 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, \$3,290,369,000, of which \$145,000,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities, and in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, up to \$71,690,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act, to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used to advocate or promote gun control: *Provided further*, That the Director may redirect the total amount made available under authority of Public Law 101-502, section 3, dated November 3, 1990, to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That the Congress is to be notified promptly of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for the development and construction of laboratory building 18 may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.232-18: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 may be available for making grants under section 1509 of the Public Health Service Act to not more than 10 States.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, \$3,793,587,000.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, \$2,321,320,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL AND CRANIOFACIAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental disease, \$309,007,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney disease, \$1,315,530,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, \$1,185,767,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, \$2,062,126,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, \$1,548,313,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, \$984,300,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, \$514,673,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, \$506,730,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, \$790,299,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, \$400,025,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to deafness and other communication disorders, \$301,787,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, \$102,312,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, \$349,216,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to drug abuse, \$788,201,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, \$1,114,638,000.

NATIONAL HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to human genome research, \$386,410,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, \$832,027,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants: *Provided further*, That \$75,000,000 shall be for extramural facilities construction grants.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, \$50,299,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications,

\$256,281,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available until expended for improvement of information systems: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2001, the Library may enter into personal services contracts for the provision of services in facilities owned, operated, or constructed under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to complementary and alternative medicine, \$78,880,000.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, \$342,307,000, of which \$48,271,000 shall be for the Office of AIDS Research: *Provided*, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: *Provided further*, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the total amount made available in this or any other Act to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That no such appropriation shall be decreased by more than 1 percent by any such transfers and that the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer: *Provided further*, That the National Institutes of Health is authorized to collect third party payments for the cost of clinical services that are incurred in National Institutes of Health research facilities and that such payments shall be credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund: *Provided further*, That all funds credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund shall remain available for one fiscal year after the fiscal year in which they are deposited: *Provided further*, That up to \$500,000 shall be available to carry out section 499 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 499(k)(10) of the Public Health Service Act, funds from the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health may be transferred to the National Institutes of Health.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the study of, construction of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, including the acquisition of real property, \$178,700,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$47,300,000 shall be for the National Neuroscience Research Center: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for the development and construction of the first phase of the National Neuroscience Research Center may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.232-18.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer Amendment No. 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY)?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman most certainly is.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order are reserved under the order of June 8. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Ms. PELOSI:
Page 31, after line 23, insert the following:
In addition, \$600,000,000 for such purposes:
Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 8, 2000, the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. PELOSI) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for allowing me to be the designee on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to this amendment, which would increase funding \$600 million to reduce the demand for drugs here in America. Specifically, it would fund State and local drug treatment and prevention activities.

It recognizes that if America's drug controlled policy is to succeed, our policy must not focus only on supply reduction. We must balance our policy by including domestic efforts by including demand reduction services. We must address America's enormous drug treatment and prevention needs.

More than 5.7 million Americans are in severe need of substance abuse treatment, and 3.6 million lack needed treatment; 5.7, 3.6, just over 2 million Americans are receiving the substance abuse treatment, have access to treatment. And I am not even saying they have all that they need, but 3.6 have none.

Just 2 months ago, I offered a drug treatment amendment during the supplemental appropriations bill consideration. I tried to offer my amendment on the House floor for a straight up and down vote. At the time the chairman of the committee said this amendment should go through the regular process and not be dealt with on the supplemental.

It was said to wait for the appropriation subcommittee and the committee markups. They offered to work with me at the time through the appropriate process to fund domestic demand reduction strategies; however, this is the regular process. We had no success at the subcommittee/full committee and

now is the time, the amendment is before this committee. I look for your support.

□ 1945

Please know that treatment and prevention are more effective than any other drug control options. A Rand Corporation study sponsored by the United States Army and the Office of Drug Control Policy determined that to reduce cocaine consumption, funds invested in drug treatment, drug treatment, were 23 times more effective than source country control. In addition, this is 11 times more effective, drug treatment and prevention, is 11 times more effective than interdiction at the border, and 7 times more effective than even law enforcement.

Certainly we want to reduce the supply and we want to interdict at the border and we must have a balance between treatment and incarceration, but this Rand Commission study says that treatment is 23 times more effective. In other words, if you wanted to reduce demand in the U.S. by 1 percent, you could spend \$24 million by having treatment on demand in the U.S., or you could spend over \$700 million in the source country in order to reduce demand by 1 percent in the U.S.

My amendment increases funding \$600 million for the substance abuse block grant and community treatment services, it invests \$400 million for the block grants and \$200 million for local treatment services via competitive grants. It provides treatment for an additional 150,000 addicted individuals and proven prevention services to an estimated 690,000 youths. It expands existing service infrastructure.

This investment leverages additional local and State funds, it strengthens State and local coordination and helps integrate service delivery. The amendment focuses on youth, while allowing communities to invest these funds according to local priorities. It helps our youth avoid a life of drugs and helps current drug users to turn their lives around. We must reduce domestic drug use and increase funding for drug treatment and prevention.

In September of 1999, America's drug czar, General McCaffrey, wrote an op-ed stating, "It is a sad time when the number of incarcerated Americans exceeds the active duty strength of the Armed Forces. A Rand Corporation study," the one I referenced, and this is the McCaffrey quote, "found that increasing drug treatment was the single-most cost-effective way to reduce domestic drug consumption."

We know treatment and prevention are more effective than any other options. How cost effective is this? Each \$1 invested in drug abuse prevention saves \$15 in reduced health, justice and other societal costs. Each \$1 invested in drug prevention will save communities \$4 to \$5 in costs for drug abuse

counseling and treatment. The National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study evaluated SAMSHA's substantive abuse treatment services and found significant and lasting benefits, including 50 percent decrease in drug and alcohol use 1 year after completing treatment, 43 percent decrease in homelessness, and 19 percent increase in employment.

Mr. Chairman, I contend this is a dollar well spent, and certainly an investment we should make. It is a small step. We still will have millions of people in our country not receiving the substance abuse treatment that they need, but it is a step in the right direction, and, as we consider giving all kinds of military assistance to Colombia in order to reduce drug consumption in the U.S., we must consider that \$1 is worth \$23 spent that way, \$1 spent on treatment in the United States. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young), the Clerk will read the subsequent paragraph which is being amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES

For carrying out titles V and XIX of the Public Health Service Act with respect to substance abuse and mental health services, the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, and section 301 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to program management, \$2,727,626,000.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to our colleagues that this amendment was offered in the full committee and it was debated at great length followed by a recorded vote. The amendment was not agreed to. It was not so much that we did not agree with what the gentlewoman would like to accomplish, but we did not have the money. The budget approved by this House and by the other body put a severe restriction on the funds available. If the gentlewoman would have offered some way to pay for this or offered an offset somewhere else in the bill, we might be more friendly toward the amendment, but, unfortunately, that is not the case.

I would like to point out also for the benefit of our colleagues, this bill provides the President's budget request for the Substance Abuse Block Grant, \$31

million more than last year's level. I know it is not as much as the gentlewoman would like. It is not as much as I would like, but it was the best we could do, given the allocation that we had.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, to speak to this amendment, and would say to our distinguished chairman that if we did not have to have a very expensive tax cut, we would have enough money to meet the treatment needs in our country to reduce demand for drugs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to refresh our memories as to what is going on here. What is happening is that we are offering a series of amendments, but under the rule under which this bill is being debated we will not be able to get votes on those amendments. The reason we will not is because the majority party, in order to squeeze out enough room in the budget for their huge tax packages, they have scaled back substantially on virtually every domestic appropriation bill that we will bring to this floor. That is why this bill is \$3 billion below the President on education, almost \$2 billion below on worker protection and job training, and over \$1 billion below on health care.

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do with this and other amendments is to illustrate that we think there ought to be a different set of priorities than those which are guiding the majority party. Last week the majority party passed a tax bill which, over the next 10 years, will give over \$200 billion in tax relief to the richest 400 Americans in this society. I have nothing against those folks, but it seems to me that it is a much higher priority for this country to meet its education obligations, its health care obligations and its job training obligations.

What the Pelosi amendment is trying to illustrate is that this Congress and the administration are apparently both supporting an expensive new proposition to fight a drug war in South America, but that this Congress is refusing to add funding to the budget to deal with drug treatment here at home. When we have only 37 percent of the Americans who are presently in need of drug treatment able to get treatment because of insufficient drug treatment slots, it seems to me that we have a terrible imbalance in our Congressional priorities.

So I recognize this amendment is not going anywhere, because we cannot even get a vote on it under the rule,

but I think this is just another example of the price we pay in terms of increased crime, in terms of increased drug addiction, because this Congress is hell-bent on providing some huge tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this society, while it is ignoring our needs to deal with the concrete problems that affect and afflict virtually every community in the country.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Members for being late, but my plane was delayed. As I came over here and passed one of the television screens, I heard the gentlewoman from California saying that she could not offer this, she was told, in full committee markup, but that she could offer it here on the floor because this was regular order. But I suggest to the gentlewoman that if you do not offer an offset, it is not regular order. It is not fiscally responsible.

I just heard the gentleman from Wisconsin saying that we refused to add money. We funded this account, which is a very important account, at exactly the level the President of the United States requested. So I would ask the gentlewoman, she is adding \$600 million. Where did that figure come from?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the \$600 million relates to what we think we could hopefully get passed here. If I just may say, with the gentleman's yielding, just to clarify what is here on the floor, when I offered this amendment at the time of the emergency supplemental, when no offset would have been required, it was rejected by the majority in the full committee saying that we should go through the regular order, even though drug use in America is an emergency, and that is why we were having an emergency supplemental to send military assistance to Colombia. It was declared an emergency.

So then when they said go the regular order, we go to full committee and were defeated, and are now bringing it to the floor to point out the imbalance in our values, where we will give a tax cut instead of giving drug treatment to reduce drug consumption in America. So the \$600 million relates to that.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman

knows very well we are not in the process here of moving money from tax cuts to spending. That is not the regular order. The order here is that if you have an amendment to offer, you have to find an offset, because we live within limits.

Mr. Chairman, I very much agree with the gentlewoman that the President of the United States was wrong in allocating \$1.6 billion to drug interdiction and crop eradication in Colombia. That money would have been better spent on treatment programs or prevention programs here at home.

The difficulty is that the gentlewoman is never willing to take the money from a lower priority and allocate it to a higher priority. It seems to me that the great flaw in the argument coming from the other side, on all of these amendments, is that you simply want to add money, without the responsibility for the bottom line of living within some standard. The standard is not what we need. We need a lot more in a lot of programs. The standard is that we have to live within a budget, and that is what we have to do. So we have to make the tough decisions over here, and over on that side you simply say, "Let's add money to this, let's add money to that, let's add money to other program." There is a need; of course there is a need. But somebody has to be responsible that we do not go off the graph in spending.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say we tried to provide this funding on the same footing that the funding was provided for the drug war in South America. We were told by the majority party at that time, come back and deal with it on the regular bill. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said that, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) said that, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) said that, and several others.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I may say to the gentleman, the gentleman did not do that. The gentleman had the opportunity, but he did not.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we did try to do it. We have tried on numerous occasions to cut back the amount of money that you are providing for your tax cuts, including the budget resolution we brought to the floor. All you would have to do to be able to fund this and every other amendment is to cut back your tax cuts by 20 percent.

Now, the rules of this House prevented us from getting a vote on that proposition, but that does not mean that we do not have an obligation and

conscience to bring it up to demonstrate what we believe to be the skewed priorities of the majority.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman made that point over and over again, and I might agree with the point, but this is not the regular order. Regular order is to be responsible and to cut something if you want to increase something.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in fairness to the gentleman, since he is being so generous with his time, I want to use the first phase of my time from him to praise him for his leadership as chair of our subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. Maybe that is all the time I will yield.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I was going to say so much more about the gentleman, but I have another amendment, so I will spend some time then, because we have been very pleased by his leadership on the committee.

So great a leader is the gentleman that he was very clever in this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I think it would be instructive to the Members of this House to know that in this bill there is money allocated for different programs, that the entire amount is designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to Section 251(b).

□ 2000

That says that one must adjust the caps if the President includes designation of the term as an emergency request.

Mr. PORTER. Let me reclaim my time.

Ms. PELOSI. This is an emergency request.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reclaim my time and reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) controls the time. He must yield time.

Mr. PORTER. The gentlewoman can get the time from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I have other speakers on my side. In fact, the gentlewoman better yield some time to us now.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this \$600 million amendment adds \$400 million to States through the substance abuse block grant program. It adds \$200 million to local communities through competitive grants for critical substance abuse treatment services in collaboration with the States. That is what this amendment is about. It is very, very clear that these resources are necessary.

Now, what is also a bit confusing is that during the emergency supple-

mental markup the President of the United States requested of that committee \$1.6 billion for the Colombian aid package. We sought during that hearing to add a comparable amount of money, not just on the supply side of the narcotics problem, but also on the demand side, because we know that to reduce cocaine consumption, funds invested in drug treatment were 23 times more likely and more effective than source country control, that they were 11 times more effective than interdiction and 7 times more effective than law enforcement in reducing cocaine consumption. So we sought to match that on this side.

Now during the course of that discussion, the majority added money for agricultural products, \$4 billion, several billion in increased defense spending above the \$300 billion appropriation, more than the Defense Department was even asking for, and the emergency supplemental for \$1 billion on crop eradication in Colombia became a \$14 billion bill in emergency supplemental that I believe is still stuck in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, all we have sought to do under regular order, which the chairman of the full committee asked us to do, was to offer an amendment on the demand side of the problem in our own country. That amendment was flatly rejected by the full committee; and we are here today, Mr. Chairman, raising similar concerns to show the American people, but also to show the full committee, Mr. Chairman, that there are Members of Congress who want to do something not only on the supply side but also on the demand side.

I congratulate the gentlewoman for offering her amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we went through this drill in the subcommittee, the same 10 amendments, the same increase in every single one of them, just to show that Republicans want to cut.

We have increased, including Head Start, education \$2 billion, increased over last year.

Let me give a good idea. One of these amendments increases special education. When the Democrats had control of this House, they promised to increase special education up to 40 percent of the funding. The maximum they ever funded was 6 percent. Republicans, in 5 years, have doubled that spending for special education. This bill increases special education funding \$500 million; but yet we will see an amendment come forward to spend another billion dollars without any offsets, just to say that Republicans are cutting special education. That is the logic that they use.

Why? Every single one of these bills is brought forward just for the election coming up in November, to show how those mean Republicans want to cut education and cut the other socialized programs.

Well, there is a party with fiscal responsibility. There is a party also that wants to tax and spend and spend and spend, just like they did when they were in the majority.

Let us take a look at it. Look at education. It was a disaster when they left office. Education construction was destroyed. The infrastructure is terrible. We are last in math and science, because they put more money into it, just kept pouring more money, more money, more money, without any quality or responsibility into it.

We have changed that. Look over the 5 years, test scores are starting to go up but at the same time those that are entering colleges are still having to take remedial education. That is wrong. We need to do more in education. I agree with my colleagues on that. We have increased it \$2 billion.

Now, how did they plan on paying for this? We will hear tax breaks for the rich, tax breaks for the rich. Well, I want to say, any tax relief limits the amount that they spend on these social programs. It will only be for the rich. We will never find them supporting tax relief. Every single bill. The same liberals fought against the balanced budget because it limited their amount of spending. They fought against welfare reform because it limited their amount of spending. They fought against the Social Security lock box because when they were in the majority for 30 years they took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund and put it up here for new spending, and then they increased taxes every year so that they could pass more for increased bureaucracy.

Now every one of these amendments we are going to see they want more, they want more, they want more. Every single appropriations bill, except for defense, they will increase. They will cut defense also to pay for more socialized spending.

Excuse me. I know I am not supposed to have this on the floor, but God says he does not want this amendment. I am sorry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the Member from California that personal electronic devices may not be used on the floor of the House and should be disabled when they are brought into the Chamber.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In 1993, they had the highest tax possible. They stole every dime out of the Social Security trust fund, even the gas tax. Does one think they put it in a transportation fund? Absolutely not. They put it in the general fund so they could spend more money. There was no hope of a

balanced budget. Debts were destined to go up. The budget went beyond \$200 billion every single year, but yet we will see the exercise here tonight from my colleagues on the other side to spend more money. Reject the amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), a champion fighting against substance abuse in our country.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment to increase drug treatment funding by \$600 million. This Nation has a problem with drug addiction, and we cannot continue to incarcerate our way out of this health crisis. With less than 5 percent of the world's population, the United States has one quarter of the world's prisoners. The rapid expansion of the U.S. prison industrial complex has been fueled by the so-called war on drugs. While all of our communities are suffering, inner city, rural, black, white, Asian, Native American, name it, we have a problem.

I am stunned and outraged by a report that was released last week by the Human Rights Watch which said that African American men are imprisoned for drug crimes at 13 times the rate of white men even though black and white rates of drug use are similar, with overall far more white than black users.

This is an American problem. In our Federal system, 60 percent of the prisoners are drug law violators with no violent criminal history. According to the latest Bureau of Justice statistics, 55 percent of convicted jail inmates are using drugs in the month before the offense. Let us stop politicizing this. Let us do something about it. Support the Pelosi amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). We must focus our health and drug control policy on drug use prevention and drug treatment. The fact is that millions and millions of Americans are in severe need of substance abuse treatment. We can start now. We can focus not only on supply reduction but also on demand reduction. To do this, we must focus on prevention and treatment. The funding provided by the Pelosi amendment will help our youth avoid a life of drugs, and it will help those that are currently drug users turn their lives around.

This investment will leverage additional local and State funds for important health services and will strengthen State and local coordination. This crucial amendment focuses on youth while allowing communities to act according to their own local policies. For

each dollar invested in drug use prevention, we will save those communities 4 or 5 dollars. That is the offset we should account for.

Effective prevention programs engage youth interactively. I urge all my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), a member of the committee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for allowing me to speak on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), in offering this amendment, correctly states that drugs are a huge problem in the United States. They destroy lives. They destroy lives of people who voluntarily get involved with drugs. I would hope that we would put some emphasis on self-responsibility into any debate such as this.

I know that the gentlewoman is wanting to give assistance through drug treatment programs to help people that have gotten themselves caught in drugs to get out of it. That is good, but it is not as though we are not doing anything. Among the multiple billions and billions of dollars of tax money that is spent to combat drugs, on top of the private plans and the private money that goes to combat them, but one part of the tax money that we already have is \$2.7 billion for the very program to which the gentlewoman wants to add another \$600 million. Yet to hear some people talk, one would think that we are not doing anything and that somehow the people who are not using drugs are responsible for those who are using drugs.

Now, we want to help them. We want to help them get out of that cycle, but it is not done by trying to say it is penny-pinching Republicans that somehow are at fault. No. It is the people who use drugs that are at fault, and we are trying to help them. We are trying to help society. We have a \$2.7 billion substance abuse treatment program already. So let us not pretend that nothing is being done. For goodness' sakes, let us have some priorities. We have an overall budget of the amount to spend because one of the other things that has drained so much from this country is when we have had these massive Federal deficits that obscenely push debt on to our kids and our grandkids and destroy their futures, just as drugs destroy them. One of the drugs is addiction to Federal spending.

When we have had deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars each year, it is because people offer amendments that say let us just spend another \$600 million; I do not know where it will come from, but let us just spend it.

They say, well, our proposal is do not lower anyone's taxes. We had a vote on

lowering taxes in this House last week. It received bipartisan support; two-thirds of the House, on the estate tax, on the death tax. That is one of many tax proposals. I know some people say look, do not give relief to people that have been supporting the highest level of taxes since World War II. We have an addiction here in Washington that many people have to spending and just spend and spend and spend.

□ 2015

That is every bit as damaging to this country as the addiction of people that are on drugs. We have got to break both of those habits. So we are funding substance abuse programs. We are funding huge amounts of it. But let us also make sure that we set an example and not have Washington politicians that are addicted to spending and say, to stop one addiction, we will feed another. That is not going to work.

This amendment, if the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) wants to offer a cut someplace else to offset that spending, that might be in order. I cannot support the adoption of this amendment. I urge a no vote.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a Congresswoman who has worked very hard to fight substance abuse in our country.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, of course, we have to be careful how we spend money, but it is not just how much, it is how wisely we spend the money. We might as well put our money on programs that we know work. We know that treatment and prevention are more cost effective than other options. Each dollar invested in drug abuse prevention saves \$15 in reduced health and social and criminal justice and other societal costs. Each dollar invested in drug abuse prevention will save communities \$4 to \$5 for drug abuse, counseling, and treatment.

Recent studies show that substance abuse treatment services have lasting and significant benefits; 50 percent decrease in drug and alcohol use 1 year after completing treatment; 43 percent decrease in homelessness; 19 percent increase in employment.

We can win a war on drugs. We know how to spend money. It is not with helicopters in Colombia, but it is with the Pelosi amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who is a former prosecutor, member of the freshman class, who knows of what she speaks on this substance abuse challenge in our country.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. It is

important that we invest money in treatment. Having served as a judge for 10 years and a prosecutor for 8 years, I have seen how treatment works.

We spend a lot of money building jails to keep people in jail and spend no money for treatment. People go to jail with an addiction. They come out of jail with an addiction. It is important that we as a country recognize the need for treatment, the demand for treatment, and put money in treatment. That is where it works. We know it works. We spend money building jails. Let us spend some money on treatment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to close.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have very eloquently pointed out what a good investment that treatment on demand and prevention are to our people in need of substance abuse treatment in our country. They have also pointed out that it is a wise investment, that it saves money, that it is 23 times more effective than a source country control that we are proposing that is being proposed in the supplemental bill.

But I want to make another point, Mr. Chairman; and that is that this Committee of the Whole could make this \$600 million investment and save us a great deal of money in the short and long run.

We could follow the lead of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), our distinguished chairman. In this bill, he has reported out of the committee \$500 million worth of spending that has been designated emergency, that has not required any offset as long as there is a request of an emergency requirement as defined by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

So this is not going afield. It is following the example. If the Republicans could find this emergency standing for their priorities, why cannot we do it for people who need help in our country on the substance abuse side?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we can agree about the importance of drug treatment and drug prevention; and for that reason, we funded this account at the exact amount that the President asked us in his budget to fund it.

Someone said a minute ago, we are spending no money on drug treatment. We are spending \$1.631 billion on drug treatment. It is a lot of money. I would readily admit there is more need there, but we are funding at the level the President requested. We are acting within our responsibility. That is our job. That is what we are doing.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, regretfully, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is correct on his point of order. The Republican majority has not allowed us to bring this bill, this amendment, to the floor in the same fashion that other priorities that the gentleman put in the bill coming out of full committee received protection under emergency standing.

This \$600 million for treatment in demand is at least as important as the priorities that received that emergency status coming out of the full committee. So the idea that this should not apply, we should not be able to bring this here because we do not have an offset we just want to be treated like the Republican priorities. By that, I do not mean the Republican priority of giving a tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of our people, giving a \$200 billion tax cut to 400 Americans, to 400 Americans when we have 3.5 million people in our country who need substance abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) will confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. PELOSI. Further to the point of order, there is a lot of money in the supplemental bill, if that ever sees the light of day, for treating the drug abuse problem in our country by sending military assistance to Colombia. We think this is a better way.

So I wish that it were in order. But I have to concede that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is correct. The Republicans protect the tax cut, they protect their own spending priorities, but they do not protect that.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, acknowledge the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for his kindness and hard work on this issue along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) knows that I testified in front of the subcommittee on the issue of mental health services for children. So I had intended during this process, this appropriations process, to offer an amendment to do more than what the administration has done. Frankly, I do not think it is enough.

The administration asked for \$86 million, and I know that the bill has fund-

ed children's mental health services at \$86 million, but let me explain why I have come to suggest that we need to do more. We will look forward to working with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is ably a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has done a phenomenal job as it relates to mental health across the board on expressing the consternation about dealing with mental health, period, in this Nation.

First all, we have the question of parity and stigma. So I want to raise the issue of what is happening to our children. I fully believe that Columbine and Jonesboro, the 6-year-old little boy that shot his 6-year-old classmate, the 13-year-old boy that shot his teacher, the little boy in Pontiac, Michigan, who shot someone at age 11, and the tragedy that has happened in my own 18th Congressional District where, just yesterday, on Sunday, a 14-year-old girl shot and killed a 16-year-old boy tends to, not only the issue of guns, but it deals with the holistic approach to children.

We need better mental health services for our children. My amendment was to add \$10 million more to mental health services for children. It is because of articles like this on the front cover of *Ebony*, "Out of the Closet, the Mental Health Crisis in Black America." It comes to the hearing that was held in my district with Senator PAUL WELLSTONE, "Panel told of mental health ills," when over 30 witnesses talked about the crisis that they feel in their own families, with their own children, or setting the National Congress for Hispanic Mental Health, and the Hispanic community is crying out for more resources, or the Mental Health Awareness Campaign that shows that we need to do something about people in crisis.

Today more than 13.7 million children suffer from mental health problems. The National Mental Health Association reports that people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

Although one in five children in adolescence has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that could lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

That is why we must increase the funding for comprehensive children's mental health services to reach the 75 to 80 percent of children suffering from mental illness.

Both the National Mental Health Association and the Federation of Families for Children Mental Health Services support increased funding for children's mental health and agree that we

need to focus this Nation's attention and intervention measures so that we can prevent tragedies like Columbine, Paducah, Littleton, and Jonesboro.

I, too, believe that there can be relief for those who need some form of tax relief. But I do believe that we are, if you will, harvesting dollars for big tax cuts, rather than looking at the basic quality-of-life needs of our children.

The grant programs funded under the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services programs are critical to ensure that children with mental health problems and their families have access to a full array of quality and appropriate care in their communities. They simply do not have it.

Some of the testimony that came was the frustration of parents that said I do not know where to go. I cannot leave out of my apartment or my rental house and go down the street to a community health clinic and get the kind of mental health services that I need. That stifles the opportunity to heal and to cure these children who need us to listen and need us to protect them and need us to heal them. To date, there have not been sufficient funds to award grants to communities in all of the States.

The story of Kip Kinkle, the 15-year-old student who shot his parents and went to school to kill several others, is tragic, yet illuminating. For 3 years before this horrendous event, Kip suffered from psychosis and he heard voices. Yet, no one did anything to address this situation. No teacher sent him to the nurse, and no one asked his parents to take him to a doctor to find out what was wrong.

When they did, what they talked about was that he was using profanity in class. He was, but he was responding to the voices in his head.

Kip Kinkle needed help. He needed help in his school. He needed help at home. This is not to blame the parents. It is to provide the kind of resources that are necessary.

I have worked diligently to bring attention to this most devastating problem.

As I indicated, I want to applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his forward-thinking leadership in years past. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that, again, I am gavelled down on an important issue; but I am gratified to have the opportunity to make the case.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this Amendment to increase the funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration by \$10 million dollars by decreasing the funding for the Chronic and Environmental Disease Prevention under the CDC.

For technical reasons, I realize that this Amendment does not specifically earmark the funds for comprehensive children's mental health services, but that is the intent of the Amendment. Children's Mental Health needs to be a national priority in this country today.

Currently, we spend 10 times the amount on research into childhood cancer, than on children's mental health, yet one of five children is affected by some sort of mental illness.

Today, more than 13.7 million children suffer from mental health problems. The National Mental Health Association reports that most people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

Although one in five children and adolescents has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that can lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

This is why we must increase the funding for comprehensive children's mental health services to reach this 75 to 80 percent of children suffering from mental illness.

Both the National Mental Health Association and the Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health Services support increased funding for children's mental health and agree that we need to focus this nation's attention on intervention measures so that we can prevent tragedies like Columbine, Paducah, Littleton and Jonesboro.

The grant programs funded under the comprehensive community mental health services program are critical to insure that children with mental health problems and their families have access to a full array of quality and appropriate care in their communities. To date, there have not been sufficient funds to award grants to communities in all the states.

The story of Kip Kinkle, the fifteen year-old student who shot his parents and went to school to kill several other students is tragic, yet illuminating.

For three years before this horrendous event, Kip suffered from psychosis and heard voices, yet no one did anything to address this situation. No teacher sent him to the nurse and no one asked his parents to take him to a doctor to find out what was wrong.

I have worked diligently to bring attention to this most devastating problem in our society by holding not one, but two hearings on children's mental health. The first was through the Congressional Children's Caucus and the second, in my district in Houston along with Senator PAUL WELLSTONE.

At the joint hearing in Houston we had over 30 witnesses to speak on the need to increased diagnostic services for children's mental health. Additionally, we discussed the link between suicide and mental health disorders.

According to the 1999 Report of the U.S. Surgeon General, for young people 15–24 years old, suicide is the third leading cause of death behind intentional injury and homicide.

Persons under the age of 25 accounted for 15 percent of all suicides in 1997. Between 1980 and 1997, suicide rates for those 15–19 years old increased 11 percent and for those between the ages of 10–14, the suicide rates increased 99 percent since 1980.

Within every 1 hour and 57 minutes, a person under the age of 25 completes suicide. The fact that 8 out of 10 suicidal persons give some sign of their intentions also begs the

question, why do we not make children's mental health a national priority.

We know that more teenagers died from suicide than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, strokes, influenza and chronic lung disease combined.

Because childhood depression is so very prevalent, we must recognize the dire need for increased services to treat our youth. Almost 12 young people between the ages of 15–24 die everyday by suicide.

Nationwide, 20.5 percent of high school students have stated on self-report surveys that they have seriously considered attempting suicide during the preceding 12 months. These are just some of the alarming statistics related to children's mental health.

Last week's killing of a Florida teacher by a 13-year-old honor student is just a most recent attempt in a series of increasingly violent attacks perpetrated by adolescents in the past few years. Columbine, Littleton, and Paducah are just a few indicators that the possible lack of access to mental health services has resulted in an increase of children becoming involved in criminal activity and becoming involved in the juvenile justice or child protective systems.

Our children need to be listened to . . . they need to be heard. Children are complex human beings. Although they are young, they send us signals when they are troubled; the real tragedy occurs when adults do not listen to those signals or provide them with the help that they need. Effective mental health resources in our communities and schools can help in many instances prevent these acts of violence and suicide among our youth.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that provides the additional funding necessary to address mental illness so that our children will not continue to suffer needlessly because of a lack of mental health resources.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the Houston Chronicle article entitled "Panel Told of Mental Health Ills," as follows:

PANEL TOLD OF MENTAL HEALTH ILLS
SUICIDE ATTEMPTS BY CHILDREN CITED

(By Janette Rodrigues)

Alma Cobb trembled with nervous tension Thursday as she told a roomful of strangers the ways her 14-year-old son, David, has tried to commit suicide since his first attempt at age 5.

But her voice was surprisingly firm. "He tried to hang himself, stab himself and electrocute himself," Cobb testified during a hearing Thursday on children's mental health needs called by U.S. Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee, D-Houston.

A transcript of the hearing will go into the congressional record. Jackson Lee and Sen. Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., who also attended the hearing, hope to use the transcript in getting Congress to pass legislation improving children's mental health services.

Studies estimate that 13.7 million American school children suffer from mental health, emotional or behavioral problems. In the Houston area alone, more than 178,000 will need mental health care during their school years.

Suicide and entry into the juvenile criminal justice system are by-products, advocates say, of a society that shuns the issue and hasn't exerted the political will to address preventable problems.

Cobb's story and that of other such parents, services providers and mental health professionals was compelling, and sometimes moving.

But what Cobb has experienced is startling.

Her daughter, Clara, 14, also suffers from emotional and behavioral disorders. She first tried to kill herself at age 7. She and her brother have been absent from school because of their diagnosed mental illness and numerous hospitalizations related to suicide attempts.

Despite documentation of that fact, Cobb said later, the district where her children attend school considered her children truants, not sick, and fined her more than \$3,000 and took her to court.

"Sometimes, my children can't attend school because of their mental illness and suicide attempts, but schools don't understand it," Cobb said, "They just understand their regulations."

Regina Hicks, deputy director of child and adolescent services for the Harris County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Authority, is familiar with the Cobb family's story. The children receive services through the agency.

Hicks said their struggle with the school district is unusual but, unfortunately, not unheard of in cases involving children.

Studies show that at least one in five children and teens in America has a mental illness that may lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide.

Most such schoolchildren don't receive adequate help because of the stigma attached to their condition, the lack of early intervention and scarce resources, mental health care professionals and service providers told the hearing.

Speaker after speaker voiced the need for increased funding.

"In Texas, we must be particularly concerned that the state budget for children's mental health services has remained virtually flat since 1993, despite growth in both population and need," said Betty Schwartz, executive director of the Mental Health Association of Greater Houston.

"Current budget discussions offer little hope for improvement in the coming legislative session."

Harris County Juvenile Court Associate Judge Veronica Morgan-Price said the piece of MHMRA's budgetary pie for juveniles is small.

She and others spoke of their frustration that the juvenile justice system has become a surrogate for mental health facilities.

Many said it's the norm in Harris County for mentally ill juveniles to get adequate help only after they commit an act that ends with them in a detention facility.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 37, line 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 32, line 1 through page 37, line 12 is as follows:

AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act, and part A of title XI of the Social Security Act,

\$123,669,000; in addition, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed \$99,980,000.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, \$93,586,251,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 2001, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 2001 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, \$36,207,551,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, section 278(d) of Public Law 97-248, and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, \$70,381,600,000.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, titles XIII and XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, not to exceed \$1,866,302,000, to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act; together with all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act and such sums as may be collected from authorized user fees and the sale of data, which shall remain available until expended, and together with administrative fees collected relative to Medicare overpayment recovery activities, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds derived in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9701 from organizations established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act shall be credited to and available for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That \$18,000,000 appropriated under this heading for the managed care system redesign shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services is directed to collect fees in fiscal year 2001 from Medicare+Choice organizations pursuant to section 1857(e)(2) of the Social Security Act and from eligible organizations with risk-sharing contracts under section 1876 of that Act pursuant to section 1876(k)(4)(D) of that Act: *Provided further*, That, for the current fiscal year, not more than \$630,000,000 may be made available under section 1817(k)(4) of the

Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(k)(4)) from the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to carry out the Medicare Integrity Program under section 1893 of such Act.

HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE FUND

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1308 of the Public Health Service Act, any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of outstanding obligations. During fiscal year 2001, no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$2,473,800,000, to remain available until expended; and for such purposes for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, \$1,000,000,000.

For making payments to each State for carrying out the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children under title IV-A of the Social Security Act before the effective date of the program of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) with respect to such State, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the sum of the amounts available to a State with respect to expenditures under such title IV-A in fiscal year 1997 under this appropriation and under such title IV-A as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 shall not exceed the limitations under section 116(b) of such Act.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), for the last 3 months of the current year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$1,100,000,000, to be available for obligation in the period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002.

For making payments under title XXVI of such Act, \$300,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For making payments for refugee and entrant assistance activities authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422), \$423,109,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated pursuant to section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the costs of assistance provided and other activities through September 30, 2003.

For carrying out section 5 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-320), \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out sections 658A through 658R of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), in addition to amounts already appropriated for fiscal year 2001, \$400,000,000; and to become available on October 1, 2001 and remain available through September 30, 2002, \$2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002, \$19,120,000 shall be available for child care resource and referral and school-aged child care activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for fiscal year 2002, \$172,672,000 shall be reserved by the States for activities authorized under section 658G of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), such funds to be in addition to the amounts required to be reserved by the States under section 658G.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 12 as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. HOYER:

Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$417,328,000)".

Page 39, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

Page 39, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

Page 49, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$400,000,000)".

Page 50, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Page 50, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Page 50, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise that, under the unanimous consent agreement propounded by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) on June 8, all points of order against each of the designated amendments to be offered by Rep. OBEY or his designee shall be considered as reserved pending completion of debate thereon.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of that, if I may advise the Chair; but I simply want to reserve the point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

□ 2030

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$416 million to the bill for title I grants, \$600 million to the bill for Head Start, \$400 million to the bill for the 21st Century After School Centers, and adds \$417 million to the bill for child care development block grants.

Mr. Chairman, before I start, I want to respond to a couple of the allegations that have been made from the other side. First of all, that somehow we are forced to do this. I want to say first to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who rises on the floor and says, gee whiz, we are forced to do that, and if the rest of us are responsible we will have to live within these limits. Let me tell my colleague something I learned a long time ago, and that is to not accept the premise of those who are arguing against me.

The premise of the gentleman is incorrect, Mr. Chairman. It is irresponsible to accept the parameters that have been placed on this bill. It is irresponsible to the children that I am going to talk about and the families that I am going to talk about to live within the parameters of the bill.

Why do we have those parameters? Not because they are in a rule, not because they were given to us by some extrinsic force, they are in the rule because of the majority party's tax cut. Now, they may not like that, but that is the fact. That is the fact.

Now, let me tell my colleague from California, who talks about fiscal responsibility. A, I support defense; B, I supported the welfare reform; and, C, as the gentleman knows, I supported the balanced budget amendment. But the fact of the matter is I did so with the premise that we would keep sufficient revenues to meet our responsibilities.

The most fiscally irresponsible administration in the history of this country was under Ronald Reagan. Hear me now. Here are the facts. Back in 1950, 125 percent of GDP we were in debt. That came down. It came down to less than 23 percent, 24 percent. It flattened out for a few years and then, guess what happened on Ronald Reagan's watch? It went through the ceiling, and added \$4 trillion to the debt.

Do not preach to this side of the aisle about fiscal responsibilities, my colleagues. At no time did we have the votes to stop a Ronald Reagan veto of spending. At no time. This is Ronald Reagan's spending. It was not a question of fiscal responsibility, it was what he wanted to spend the money on. He wanted to spend the money on defense. I happened to think he was right.

Where he was not right was doing the same thing my colleagues are doing

this year. He wanted to cut and did cut revenues precipitously. But he did not have the courage of his tax-cutting convictions, because the courage of his tax-cutting convictions would have been to cut spending. But he did not want to do that because he may have paid a political price for it.

Now, let me tell my colleagues what this amendment does, quickly. We add, as I said, \$416 million for title I. The conference agreement on the Republican budget resolution requires \$7 billion in cuts, or 6 percent below the fiscal year 2000 level, last year's level. Premising large tax cuts on unrealistic spending cuts makes the conference agreement a fiscally unsound and risky budget plan.

That is why we are here, Mr. Chairman. I am offering an amendment today to fix a few of the problems. We do not have offsets within this bill because the offset premise that the gentleman from Illinois wants us to accept would be incorrect for us to do, because it is irresponsible for the gentleman to have forged, well, the gentleman did not do it, he did not vote for it, and we admire the gentleman for that, but the fact of the matter is many of the gentleman's colleagues did. They fashioned these numbers. My amendment, as I said, adds a total of \$1.8 billion.

Now, that sounds like a lot of money. But let it not surprise anybody that that figure is approximately the figure that has already been adopted by the Republican majority in the Senate. So if we are irresponsible, I guess our colleagues in the Senate over there are as well.

We ask for increases for title I funding. Head Start, 21st Century After School Centers and the child care and development block grant. The four parts to my amendment do this: Adds \$416 million, as I said, to title I.

Now, that \$416 million means that 650,000 children in America who qualify for services, and who are not now getting it, 650,000 disadvantaged children, will get services if my amendment passes. That is not paper, that is not rhetoric, those are real kids from real families who need help to compete in this world economy. Is the tax cut more important than those 650,000 kids?

We add \$600 million to Head Start, a program everybody says works, making the total increase for fiscal year 2001 equal to \$1 billion. That is an additional 50,000 low-income children who will be served and 3,000 infants and toddlers who will be served. That is 53,000 children. This is not about rhetoric and numbers, this is about real kids.

We add \$400 million to the 21st Century After School Centers. We all know that crime is up after school. Why? Because kids do not have families at home. This amendment will allow 900 additional communities above the gentleman's bill to establish 3,000 centers

servicing 1 million children. Is that irresponsible, I ask my chairman? Is it fiscally responsible to tell those 1 million kids to get out on the street; that we do not have enough money in the richest Nation on the face of the Earth to provide them with those centers? Those children, 1.6 million children, will be denied service because of the Republican tax cut.

Lastly, we add \$417 million for the bill for child care and development block grant for 2001 funding. Eighty thousand more children will be served if we pass this amendment.

My colleagues, we are talking about real kids here and programs that work. The chairman says and said in the committee when we marked this bill up that he thought this funding is okay. He told me that I was probably right, that we probably need to do this, but that we cannot do it because of the constraints. Those constraints are self-imposed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I was kind of surprised. I thought there was an overwhelming Democrat majority during the Reagan years. We cannot blame him for vetoing, because he vetoed very few bills. So there is no argument about we did not have the votes to override his veto.

But I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), since he has become the chairman of this subcommittee. When I think of the amount of money that has been spent prior to his coming on as chairman, and the fact that no one paid any attention about whether it was a quality program or was not, my hats are off to him.

Let us talk about a couple of the areas. Child care and development block grant, \$1.6 billion for fiscal year 2001. That is a \$400 million increase over last year. Let us talk a little bit about Head Start and how we denied children for 12 years any opportunity of getting a head start because the only thing my colleagues wanted to talk about was that we must cover more, we must cover more. No one paid any attention to whether there was any quality in the program. What a tragedy.

It was not until 1994 that we were able to get anybody to think about quality. I was able to get 25 percent of any new money at that time toward quality. But it was not until 1998 that we really got serious about it. Yet

every study, every study told us over and over again that the children are not getting a head start. Why? It became a jobs poverty program. It became a baby-sitting program. What a tragedy, because we could have done something to help them. Many of them would not be in special education today because they would have had the reading readiness programs that they should have had at that time.

But, again, it was not until 1998, until we seriously thought about quality rather than quantity. And I want to thank this Secretary, because she is the first Secretary who has shut down 100 Head Start programs. I could not get anybody to do that. Thank goodness. Rather than coming up, as she was instructed to do, she was to come up every time and say we must cover more, we must cover more, we must cover more, she did not say that. Because every time I would say, we need to talk about quality, and she would say, that is correct.

So, again, we put a lot of money into Head Start, and the chairman again is increasing Head Start. It will be up to \$5.7 billion. And finally, hopefully, they will be quality programs.

Then technology in the 21st Century Community Learning Center program. Again, we have seven technology programs on the books, five of which are funded. When we just had a reauthorization program, they offered amendment after amendment to add a couple more technology programs. No one paid any attention to the fact that having five spread over every agency we were accomplishing very little.

So if we get the other body to act, we will be talking about one technology program. So if they need to improve the preparation of the teacher to use the technology, they can do that. If they need hardware, they can do that. If they need software, they can do that. But instead of spreading them out over five different programs, spread over every agency downtown, we are going to make a real difference.

But, again, we are looking at a \$2 million increase, \$2 million above the President's request, in the area of technology.

Then, when we talk about 21st Century Community Learning Centers, funded at \$600 million, \$147 million above last year, we need to understand that, more importantly, this program just started in 1995 and it was at \$750,000. Now we are at \$905 million.

We just had a hearing, and in that hearing all sorts of questions were being raised as to whether as a matter of fact they are using the money the way the Congress intended it to be used. So, again, I cannot compliment the chairman enough for his efforts not only to bring more money to all of these programs but to insist that there are quality in those programs.

Title I, same story. Child after child after child denied an opportunity to

get a part of the American Dream because, again, no one paid any attention to quality. One of the largest school districts, maybe the largest, used 55 percent of their title I money for teacher aides. And guess what? Sixty-some percent of those did not even have a high school diploma. To make matters worse, they were teaching without any supervision. So we have tried to change and redirect that.

So, again, hats off to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER). He has done an outstanding job to not only give us more money but to give us quality in programming.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to remind me who was in charge of the Department of Education from 1981, as he was lamenting that nobody cared about quality and that nobody cared about whether these were operating effectively on behalf of children. Who was in charge of the Department of Education, Department of Human Services from 1981 to 1993?

Congress was not in charge. We did not run them. The fact of the matter is, as the gentleman pointed out, the first Secretary to tell a Head Start program it could not operate because it was not doing what we wanted for children was Donna Shalala. The gentleman was correct on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

□ 2045

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland. We have given so much lip service and a lot of discussion nationwide about the importance of education. For years this has been the national dialogue coming from the grassroots. But in those days when we were talking about education, it was always there is a deficit, we cannot possibly add to the funding for education.

Finally, we now have a surplus. And what do we do? We come to the floor with a self-inflicted strait jacket ordained from somewhere that we cannot spend this money as the national electorate would want us to spend it.

Certainly we are for quality education. Certainly we are for quality Head Start and all the other programs. But quality costs money. It seems to me that it is absolutely tragic and reprehensible that the appropriators come to the floor and discuss to cut \$1.8 billion from the President's request. It means thousands of people are going to be denied the opportunity to have help in Head Start, in child-care programs, in after-school programs, in math instruction and reading, all the things

that will narrow the divide between the poor and the rich children of this society.

We always talk about equal educational opportunity. The place to do it is for the poor children in the early-education programs and in child care.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my subcommittee chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is really an amendment about four important programs: to add money to title I, grants to LEAS, to Head Start, 21st Century After-School Centers, and child care CCDBG for fiscal year 2001.

But as with most of these amendments, from my Democratic colleagues, it turns out to be an opportunity for discussion about Republican tax cuts. And for my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), just a few moments ago, it turned out to be an opportunity to denounce the record of President Ronald Reagan, who did lead this Congress in 1981 to cut taxes on the American people so that they could keep a little more of their money.

My friend from Maryland suggests, and I believe I am quoting him correctly, that President Reagan was willing to do without revenues, to cut back on revenues, so that he could cut taxes.

Well, I have here in my hand a document entitled Table B-80, Federal Receipts and Outlays. It is for the past 60 past years, 1940 to the year 2000. And it shows very clearly, when we talk about total revenue to the Nation, that, back in 1981, when President Reagan persuaded a Democrat House to go along with the Senate of the United States in cutting taxes, that revenues then were \$678.2 billion per year.

This document, put out by the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget, and I defy any Member of this House of Representatives to show me that it is incorrect, shows that, under the Reagan years after those tax cuts, revenues went up each and every year after these tax cuts that had been denounced by my friend from Maryland.

In 1982, revenues went up from \$678 billion to \$745 billion dollars. They went up in 1983. They went up in 1984. Until in 1989, the last year of the Reagan administration, revenues, not spending, but revenues to the Federal Government, even after these substantial tax cuts, had virtually doubled to \$1.143 trillion. And this is even after the tax cuts that Democrats supported and that Republicans supported in 1981.

What it shows, and what it has shown every time is that when we have cut taxes on the people of America, that they have used the money wisely, that the economy has grown. It happened

again in 1997. It happened as far back as the 1960s, when President Kennedy cut taxes. Every time we cut taxes, there is an enhancement of economic activity and revenue increases.

Now, also, another point that my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), made is that President Reagan had an opportunity to veto the spending that occurred during his term in office. And that is true. But I will tell my colleagues one thing that President Reagan did not have an opportunity to veto is the increase in entitlement spending that went on from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1989.

And as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) well knows, that is where the growth in Federal expenditures came, not in appropriation bills that President Reagan could or could not have vetoed, but in entitlement spending.

So I will just say to my friends that, while we are hearing tonight and we heard last week, we can and undoubtedly we will hear again tomorrow before this bill is passed and probably we will hear on every appropriation bill, that we are having to cut back on important programs because Republicans want to cut taxes, actually the opposite is true. Every time we have cut taxes under Democrat Presidents, under Republican Presidents and even under this Democrat President, there has been more economic activity, there has been more revenue to spend, and the American people have been the beneficiaries thereof.

I defy anyone from the Democratic side of the aisle to dispute the fact that revenues went up during the Reagan administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about bipartisanship in terms of the estate tax. And indeed that is what happened. But how about some partisanship in terms of the education of our children? We cannot balance the budget on the backs of kids who cannot defend themselves.

I rise in strong support of the Hoyer amendment to significantly increase funding for our Nation's children.

Many of my colleagues have emphasized on both sides of the aisle that this amendment could be a lifeline perhaps. It will ensure that our children have a chance for a better education and growth opportunities.

In my hometown of Paterson, New Jersey, we have seen the tangible benefits of so many of the programs. These are not puristic victories. These are victories of substance with children who would have no other means of support in the classroom.

Our Head Start and after-school programs have brought thousands of children into nurturing environments. In an age of unprecedented wealth and the lowest peacetime unemployment rate, cities like Paterson and Passaic still have double-digit unemployment.

I understand tomorrow we even introduce an amendment to cut the after-school programs that are already in existence. This is unconscionable.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman who just spoke that the amendment of the gentleman makes additions in four different line items; items we have increased over the last year by almost a billion dollars.

There are no cuts here, none at all. They are important accounts. We gave them substantial increases, except in one case, \$947 million of increases. I think we have done the very best we can within fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hoyer amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a short amount of time, but I think there is something we should talk about very seriously.

After-school programs do work. Unfortunately, we are going to see cuts in New York State alone. I was in my schools this morning. And I know our schools want it, our parents want it, and certainly our children want it.

We are seeing more and more children being left alone after school. We can take that time, and we can use that time to make sure our children are enriched with academic programs, making sure they are in a safe environment, and certainly raising their intellect on everything else.

Why am I doing this? Why am I supporting this? Because I happen to think that is one way of reducing crime, because I happen to think that is one way of making sure our young people do not go into drugs and alcohol and then violence.

This is a program that can work, it should work, and certainly we should be supporting this.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just re-educate that this bill increases education, if we include Head Start, \$2 billion. There is no one wanting to take education away from kids. It increases it \$2 billion over last year if we include Head Start.

If we take a look, it increases special education \$500 million, not cut, but \$500 million. Impact aid, which the President zeroed out, is increased under this bill, which is very important to Native Americans and also to the military.

Plus, the Ed Flex bill that we passed last year with bipartisan support gives the schools the ability to use the dollars as they see fit, not as Washington rules down the mandates which ties up the schools. That is one of the reasons the charter school movement that we pushed for years is so important.

So we have not cut education, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just speak to one part of the Hoyer amendment which deals with the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

The Hoyer amendment would provide an additional \$418 million for this program. This is flexible funds to our States to provide for child care for our children.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means has held a hearing, and we found that affordable quality day-care is not available to too many children in our country. Only five States set the eligibility for the funds at the maximum allowed under Federal law, 85 percent of the median income.

Forty-five States are below that. My own State of Maryland set it at 40 percent. Only one out of every 10 children who are eligible today for the funds can get the money because of the lack of Federal funds.

The Hoyer amendment provides help for 80,000 children in this category. We should be supporting this amendment today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, what we are arguing about here is not crime, is not child care, is not education. What we are arguing is how much of an increase the House mark increases funding for all these programs.

What the Democrats are trying to do with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is increase it further.

We certainly support after-school child care. We certainly support the block grants. We are a strong supporter of Head Start. That is why it has increased every year under Republican leadership.

But the Hoyer amendment fails to make the case as to why these funding levels were picked. Could he explain why he decided that when we go from \$600 million on the 21st Century After-School Centers he goes to a thousand, why that level?

□ 2100

Was there scientific? Was there research? Was there testimony to that effect? No, there was not. All the Democrats are trying to do is increase our

increase to show that they measure compassion by dollars spent. It is not going to do the job.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, if we can pass a defense appropriations bill that is \$20 billion more than last year, if we can find the money for nuclear weapons, if we can find funding for a misguided missile defense system, surely, surely, we can pass the Hoyer amendment to help our most vulnerable children.

As I look at the provisions in this bill, I ask myself, who is taking care of our children? Where will our children go after school? Where will our children find the guidance they need? Who will help poor children prepare to enter school? The Hoyer amendment restores some of the most damaging cuts in H.R. 4577, cuts that deny nearly 2.4 million children the help that they need to get a better start in life.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), whose predecessor I might say, Mr. Chairman, Louis Stokes, was one of the great leaders on our committee.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me say this. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) said that the studies have shown that Head Start does not work so we should not give any more money to Head Start. The studies have shown that jail does not work so why do we keep building jails? If I adopt his perspective of spending more money on jails, then let us at least spend the same amount of money that we spend on child care and day care and Head Start, because Head Start works and our children ought to have at least the benefit of a great education in the beginning and hopefully they do not end up in jail.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I will close as I began. First of all, I do not adopt the premise it was an irresponsible budget that was adopted. The gentleman from Illinois has acknowledged that these expenditures are good. Secondly, the gentleman from Georgia asked, where do these numbers come from? Frankly they came from the President, adopted by the United States Senate, as well, and I think they ought to be adopted by us. Thirdly, I would say to my colleagues, this is about real children, disadvantaged children, 2.4 million children who will be served if this amendment passes that will not be served at the level you suggest.

Now, maybe you think there are not 2.4 million children in America who need help. Maybe you think like, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said, that it is those 400 people

who are going to get \$200 billion under the tax cut that are more important than those 2.4 million children. That is quite a balance; 400 very rich people getting \$200 billion while we cut \$1.8 billion in this amendment for 2.4 million children. What kind of Nation has that kind of priority? It is a Nation that will not long succeed. It is a Nation whose children will not compete effectively in world markets. It is a Nation who will see itself increasingly becoming a Nation of the rich and the poor. Let us adopt this amendment. Let us set our priorities straight. Let us act to help those 2.4 million children.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say once again, the gentleman says that it is irresponsible not to adopt these amendments. The fact is the amendment are in violation of the budget resolution. The budget resolution was adopted by the majority of both Houses of the Congress. We have to live within it even though the gentleman does not feel bound by it.

Let me add that the gentleman could have offered responsible amendments that have offsets within the limits of that budget resolution and within the limits of our allocation but the gentleman chose not to. In fact, it is crystal clear year after year that nobody on that side of the aisle is willing ever to cut anything, but always add.

We have to operate within a budget resolution that is fiscally responsible. We have added \$947 million, almost \$1 billion to these four line items. We are doing the best we can. They are important priorities.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will state his point of order.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has made a point. Mr. Chairman, would I have been in order to offer an amendment to add \$1.883 billion to serve those 2.4 million by reducing the tax cut that is proposed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not entertain a hypothetical question.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am raising a point of order with reference to whether I would be in order to offer such an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not address a hypothetical question.

Mr. HOYER. Shall I offer the amendment and then have it ruled on?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 8,

2000, House Report 106-660. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to address the point of order?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, I do wish to address the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the point of order. I offered an amendment. The amendment under consideration by the Chair now as to whether or not it is in order is an amendment to add \$1.883 billion to the bill for the purposes of including 2.4 million children within the ambit of the bill. This bill deals at its base with individuals who are getting child care services, getting Head Start services, getting educational services generally, getting before- and after-care at school. This would expand that.

Mr. Chairman, this is extraordinarily relevant to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing the point of order, if I may suggest.

Mr. HOYER. I am addressing the substance of the bill and the relevancy of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HOYER. I am about to say that but for the tax cut, there would be revenues available to have paid for this amendment. I understand the Chair is going to rule it out of order because the Committee on Rules has not protected it and therefore has dictated the ruling of the Chair. I regret that, but more importantly than that, the 2.4 million children of America who will not be served regret that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members that wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I understand on this point of order, though, and make it abundantly clear to all Members of the House that if this amendment had offsets to make up for these additional massive spending increases by simply taking the dollars and reducing them elsewhere in the bill, this amendment would, in fact, be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not address hypothetical questions.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that an amendment providing a net increase in new discretionary budget authority greater than \$1 million would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on its face proposes to increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill by greater than \$1 million.

As such, the amendment would violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois as to what his intention is with respect to proceeding with this bill at this point. As he knows, in the discussion which occurred that was attendant to the approval of the unanimous consent request last week, when he propounded that unanimous consent request, I would read from page H4106 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When the gentleman asked unanimous consent that the agreement be approved under which we are now operating, I said as follows:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply would note under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, that I have no objection to this arrangement, with the understanding that when the House returns to this bill, it will not be at a time when Members are still flying back to Washington on their airplanes, and that it will not be debated in the dead of night.

I did that because this is the major priorities debate for the session. We feel very strongly on this side of the aisle that if we cannot get votes on amendments, at least we ought to be able to debate them at a time when Members are here and someone is at least paying attention to the debate. And we offered to have other appropriation bills on the floor tonight rather than this one so that that could be accommodated and we could still finish the scheduled work this week. We had been told this morning that it was understood on the majority side of the aisle under those conditions this bill would come up this evening but that we would not proceed past 9 o'clock.

So I am asking the gentleman at this point what his intention is with respect to proceeding with the bill beyond this point since it is now 9:12.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PORTER. It is my understanding that we have pending to be completed this week in addition to this piece of legislation the appropriations for the Department of Interior and the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and that we also have pending a conference report on military construction. As the gentleman well knows, tomorrow morning we have in full committee the Commerce-Justice-State appropriation. There is a great deal of work to do. I do not know where we are going to get the time to get it accomplished unless we are willing to work to some reasonable hour. I would suggest to the gentleman that it would be appropriate if we would continue longer this evening and try to complete some of these additional amendments

if we possibly could so that we can complete this bill by tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply then observe, Mr. Chairman, that the unanimous consent agreement was agreed to with the understanding that is stipulated in the RECORD. There is no question about being willing to work, but it is not the fault of the minority that the majority party went home Friday without even getting a rule out of the Committee on Rules for the Interior bill, for instance, which could have easily been on the floor tonight.

I think what is going on here, not certainly on the part of the gentleman because I think in his heart of hearts he agrees with me, but I think what is going on here is a determination by the majority party to debate this bill at a time of day when it will be the least noticed of any major appropriation bill before the House. If we cannot rely on each other's word around here, and I am certainly not speaking about the gentleman from Illinois, but if we cannot rely on each other's word around here, then we do not have any civility at all left in this place.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION: OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

□ 2115

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were ayes 15, noes 17.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 202, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—187

Abercrombie	Clayton	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Clement	Frost
Allen	Clyburn	Gejdenson
Baca	Conyers	Gonzalez
Baird	Costello	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Coyne	Hall (OH)
Baldwin	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Crowley	Hill (IN)
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Hilliard
Becerra	Davis (FL)	Hinchev
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Berkley	DeFazio	Holden
Berman	DeGette	Holt
Berry	Delahunt	Hooley
Bishop	Deutsch	Hoyer
Blagojevich	Dicks	Inslee
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Bonior	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Borski	Doggett	(TX)
Boucher	Doyle	Jefferson
Boyd	Edwards	John
Brady (PA)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Capps	Evans	Kaptur
Capuano	Farr	Kennedy
Cardin	Filner	Kildee
Carson	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Clay	Ford	Kind (WI)

Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge

Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky

Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—202

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella

Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis

McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump

Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry

Thune
Tiahrt
Traffant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Weldon (FL)

Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—45

Andrews
Baker
Bateman
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Cook
Cox
Danner
DeLauro
DeMint
Dooley
Ewing
Fattah
Gephardt

Gillmor
Goodlatte
Gordon
Hansen
Hoefel
Kasich
Largent
Lazio
Linder
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Metcalf
Myrick

Ney
Owens
Payne
Pickett
Sabo
Shuster
Stark
Toomey
Towns
Vento
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wise

□ 2136

Mr. CANNON and Mr. BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. OBEY:
Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000)”.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in the process of offering an amendment to the child care section of this bill. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wanted to have a colloquy. Did the gentleman want to have that before I offered the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. YOUNG is recognized for 5 minutes on a pro forma amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word so we can have this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been discussing the order of business for the balance of the evening and for the completion of this bill. I would like to say that this is the first time in 3 years that this bill has come to the floor as a separate independent individual piece of legislation, and I think it is important that we deal with it expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, there are a substantial number of amendments that have been printed in the RECORD. I am satisfied that Members who have had them printed would probably want to offer them. I think it would not be a bad

idea if Members would let their respective subcommittee leaders know whether or not they intend to offer those amendments.

I make this suggestion for this purpose: I understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and many Members would like for the committee to rise and continue our work tomorrow. It is extremely important that we complete this bill tomorrow. Otherwise the rest of our appropriations schedule will fall considerably behind, and I do not think any of us want that to happen. So the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been discussing how do we get out of here at a reasonable time tonight and also be able to complete this bill tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman for his comments on this subject.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say this: On this side of the aisle, because this bill has not been on the floor for 3 years, we want to see this bill voted on. Speaking very frankly, politically, we would be delighted to finally see this House vote on this bill, and substantively we would also be delighted to see us vote on the bill and would like to see it done tomorrow.

We are operating under a unanimous consent agreement under which some 11 Democratic amendments have been laid out in the unanimous consent request with time limits attached to them. We would be very happy to attach time limits to all remaining amendments. We believe that 80 percent of the amendments on the Democratic side will not be offered. Of those that will be offered, our understanding from talking to most of the Members is that they will be offered and withdrawn after an explanation of what the Member was trying to do for 5 minutes. I know of only two or three amendments on our side that do not fit that category and on which we need to do further work, but we are willing to work out time limits on all of those.

The problem as we see it is that there is a significant number of amendments that on our list are tentatively listed to be offered by Members on your side of the aisle. We do not have the capacity to work with your Members to work out time agreements. We are happy to agree to time limits on those as well, but we cannot do the work on the majority side with your Members. Your leadership staff and you need to do that.

All we want is what I said when I agreed to the unanimous consent request on Friday, that when this bill is debated, it not be debated in the dead of night, because it has been 3 years since this bill has been on the floor.

□ 2145

So I want to assure what I honestly believe would be best is if we could rise on this bill tonight, I do not know what the gentleman has scheduled for the remainder of the week in terms of the order but it seems to me that overnight your leadership staff, your committee staff ought to be able to get together with your members and reach an understanding so before we come back on this bill tomorrow we can enter into a unanimous consent request which we can both agree to, which would enable us to finish the bill tomorrow. That would be our goal as well, but if we waste 4 hours' time we are not going to get past this point in the bill tonight, I assure you. That does not do anybody any good, and I think the time would be better spent simply consulting with Members to see how much time they think they need on their amendment and whether they, in fact, need to offer it at all, that is legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, let me suggest to the gentleman that the unanimous consent agreement that the gentleman and I developed last week, had a time limit on the specific amendments but there was no time limit on when the House would complete its business today.

Secondly, the time that we spent last week on this bill, and today, has been on amendments from your side of the aisle. There are a substantial number of amendments that will probably be offered from our side of the aisle that have already been printed in the RECORD, and certainly each Member has the option to offer those amendments. Now my suggestion would be that we take up the next amendment and during that time we sit down and see if we can develop another unanimous consent request to propound that would be agreeable to the House; that would put some time limits on the rest of the amendments as we did on the first series of amendments, and guarantee the Members that we will complete action on this bill by tomorrow night.

Also, tonight we would like to appoint conferees on the military construction bill, which would also become a vehicle for a large portion of the supplemental that the House passed very early in the year, which is important to very many Members who are serving here in the House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to repeat, and I am reading from page H4106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, when the unanimous consent request was propounded at that time under which we agreed to a time limit on the 11 amendments that we are now operating on, I

said the following: I said, "Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would note that I have no objection to this arrangement with the understanding that when the House returns to this bill it will not be at a time when Members are still flying back to Washington on their airplanes and that it will not be debated in the dead of night."

We were then assured today that we would be out of here on this bill at least by 9:00 tonight. Now I am told something else and if that is the case, then as the gentleman knows, this unanimous consent request was offered because we had 160 amendments to the bill. If we are not going to stick to the agreement we had, we are going to offer all 160 amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman to read the next line and see who responded from our side to agree to the 9:00 adjournment tonight.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman full well knows what conversations took place both publicly and privately. If we cannot count on the majority to keep their word, then we might as well know it now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is what I am asking the gentleman, who agreed on our side to the 9:00 adjournment tonight?

Mr. OBEY. Your leadership staff told us today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. It was not part of the RECORD that you just read, is that correct?

Mr. OBEY. You asked for a unanimous consent agreement. I told you under which conditions I would give it, and I told you both privately and we did it in the RECORD, as you well know.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Is the gentleman willing to try to work out a unanimous consent agreement that would complete consideration of this bill by tomorrow night, whatever time it might be?

Mr. OBEY. I told you, I am perfectly willing to put limits on every amendment, but I cannot control which amendments are going to be offered on your side of the aisle. We have done our work on this side of the aisle and identified Members who were going to offer amendments and they have largely agreed not to offer them.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, I understand what the gentleman is saying and, as I said earlier, all of the time so far on this bill has been spent on the amendments from your side. So there would obviously be time required on our side to offer amendments, but I am prepared to make a recommendation to my side of the aisle on a time limitation in order to complete this bill by tomorrow night, if you are willing to sit down and to try to reach an agreement on that.

Mr. OBEY. All I can tell the gentleman is that I want to finish tomor-

row night, but I have no way of guaranteeing we are going to finish tomorrow night until I know what the plans are on the gentleman's side of the aisle with respect to amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If we get a unanimous consent agreement, a unanimous consent agreement is binding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) proceeding without objection, and now the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) may proceed for 5 minutes on amendment No. 24.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of 160 amendments that we intend to offer to this bill. This amendment adds \$1,000 to the Child Care and Development Block Grant. I am offering this amendment because it is the only way under the rule under which this bill is being considered that we can have a discussion about the effect of the majority party's tax cuts on each and every individual program that delivers services to the people that we represent. The majority party has decided in the last 2 months to do the following: They have passed a minimum wage bill that provided \$11 billion worth of benefits to minimum wage workers but they required, as the price for passage, that we also add \$90 billion worth of tax benefits to people who make over \$300,000 a year.

They took a tax bill which they called the marriage penalty and under the guise of providing relief for the so-called marriage penalty they produced a tax bill which gave 73 percent of those benefits to people who made over \$100,000 a year. Then last week, the majority passed through this House an inheritance tax package that gave over \$200 billion in potential tax relief to the wealthiest 400 people in this country.

Yet we are prevented, because of the budget resolution and the limits imposed by that resolution, we are prevented in the appropriations process from trying to make our case by demonstrating on a program by program basis what they have had to squeeze in order to do that.

What they have done on child care is to cut the President's request by 400-and-some million dollars. Now they say, well, that is not really a very deep cut in the President's budget, and it is no cut at all because of what we provided last year. They forget the fact that we are only providing child care to about 1 out of every 10 children who are presently eligible for assistance under Federal law.

I can only offer an amendment to add a thousand dollars to this.

The \$417 million cut in the President's program means that 80,000 fewer children will be served. Under the

rules, I can only offer an amendment raising this amount by a nominal amount, and I do so simply because at this point that is the only way that we can make our point about the misplaced priorities in the majority party's budget resolution.

I would have preferred that we go through this in a systematic fashion, have a short 30-minute debate on each of the major items in the bill at a time of day when we are not being buried, after this bill has been hidden from public view for more than 3 years, but that is not to be. So I guess instead of having the orderly subject by subject discussion that I had hoped we would have, we are going to have to offer a series of amendments to every line of this bill. In that way we will indicate our strong objection to what the majority party has done and our profound belief that their priorities are fundamentally misguided and misbegotten. It seems to me that child care, it seems to me that education, it seems to me that health care, it seems to me that job training are more important to the country than to provide giant tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country.

I am all for targeted tax cuts, targeted at those who need it the worst, those who need it the most but certainly the 400 richest Americans are not among them and that is one of the points we are trying to debate and illustrate in comparative priorities this evening.

□ 2200

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, to add \$1,000 to this particular item, Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I rise in support of this meager amount because we need to show a sign that we are willing to support the children of this Nation. At a time when we have a \$179 billion surplus, we are cutting programs for children and families.

It seems to me in this well-performing economy where we are creating more and more millionaires day in and day out, we would be willing to support children and families. At a time when we can have Members wax eloquently about getting people off of welfare, it seems to me we would support families for safe and secure child care so that parents and single mothers in particular could go to work, could seek out additional educational opportunities, and feel comfortable that their children are being taken care of in safe environments. If we cannot support a meager \$1,000 increase, then I think that we cannot be credible as we talk about trying to pass this appropriation from the floor of Congress.

It is important that we understand that most eligible children are denied assistance. Nationally, only one of 10 children who is eligible for child care assistance under Federal law receives any help.

No State is currently serving all eligible families. States are severely limiting access to assistance. Only five States set their income eligibility guidelines at the maximum level allowable under Federal law, 85 percent of their State median income in 22 States; a family of three earning \$25,000 a year does not qualify for help. In three States, Alabama, Missouri, and South Carolina, a family of three earning \$18,000 a year, 130 percent of poverty, cannot qualify for help.

It is unconscionable that we cannot agree from both sides of the aisle to do what we know we could do in this budget for children. Let me just add that, in addition to this cut, this denial of care for children in this block grant, the idea that we cannot support the President's budget for Head Start is appalling to me.

I worked in Head Start prior to coming to Congress. I served first as an assistant teacher and went on to become the supervisor of Parent Involvement and Volunteer Services. Head Start is the best thing that ever happened to this country. We empower children and families.

Last Friday, when I left here, I went to the 26th anniversary of one of the Head Start programs in my district, training and research. Ninety percent of the parents whose children were enrolled in the program that I attended last Friday were enrolled in school themselves. They were inspired by their involvement in Head Start to get back into school and to get an education so that they cannot only determine their children's educational destiny, but that they could better themselves and their families.

Head Start has been excellent for America. We have children who have had an opportunity for early childhood development who never would have had an opportunity. At one time in this country, early childhood education was only for the rich and the well off. For us not to support the President's budget on Head Start is again unconscionable.

This \$1,000 amendment will show us for what we are if we do not support it. I am sorry that we have to be in a protracted debate about supporting child care and education and health care for children. This is America. This is an America that is doing extremely well.

I would ask all of my colleagues to please support this amendment in an indication that they care about children.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for members of the committee to real-

ize what is going on tonight. It is hard to imagine that the author of the amendment is serious about adding a mere \$1,000 to this very important program. But it does give Members on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to get up and talk about a program which both the majority and the minority in this House of Representatives feel very strongly about; that is the Child Care Block Grant.

But it also gives the minority party in this committee an opportunity to get up and say that there has been a substantial cut in child care appropriation when, actually, that is the farthest thing from the truth. The truth of the matter is that the Child Care Block Grant under this very bill that we are debating tonight has been increased by \$400 million over the expenditure of last year.

Now, it is true that the President in his budget came up with an increase of over \$800 million requested in his budget, and it is easy to request money in the national budget. But the fact of the matter is that this committee, in a responsible manner, provided a substantial increase to Child Care Block Grants. It is incorrect to come before this body and say that those funds have been cut; \$400 million more than last year is an increase.

Now, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the previous speaker, also mentioned a very valuable program, Head Start. It is a program that is dear to my heart. It has been supported by Members of both parties. It has been supported by administrations of both parties.

But it is inaccurate to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has cut Head Start. Indeed, we did not give the President all of the money he requested. But the fact of the matter is that this bill that we are debating, although it does not touch on this amendment, this bill that we are debating increases Head Start again by \$400 million.

\$400 million more for Head Start in this bill, \$400 million more for child care in this bill. That is hardly a cut. I just wish that we could get the facts straight and not be suggesting things that are not part of the bill.

I oppose the amendment because I do not believe it is offered seriously, but I hope that no one in this House or no one in this committee will be under the mistaken impression that these two programs have been cut. Indeed, they have received substantial increases thanks to the leadership of this subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, for bringing this amendment up because, not that I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), because there are

some increases in this legislation, the problem is that when we see the need that we have, the increases that they have are still not meeting the needs of our communities.

This is a great example of this one little amendment talking for \$1,000 increase in child care grants that talk about where our priorities are here on this House floor. I am not faulting the Committee on Appropriations. I understand they have the rules they live by. We gave them those rules with the budget resolution that had the wrong priorities, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the reason this amendment is here is to talk about child care, and I will go into that. But let us talk about some of the other priorities that our appropriations process is leaving out, again not to fault the members of the committee or the chairman, because they are doing the best they can with the guidelines that we gave them.

Expanded educational opportunity. Trying to fix the infrastructure of our schools in our country. Prescription drugs for seniors may be a part of this, we do not know. Expanded health care for our children. Congress made an effort in 1997, the Balanced Budget Act, for the CHIPs program. We still have a long way to go.

Following the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on the Head Start, granted there is more funding in this appropriations bill for Head Start, but it still falls very short of the need in my own district in Houston, Texas, and I am sure everywhere else in the country. There are so many children who are Head Start qualified that the money is not there because we are not willing to put our money where our mouth is.

That is just to talk about a few of the human needs, Mr. Chairman. Let us talk about other issues that we need to address: defense of our Nation, protection of our borders, continue to see our crime rate drop needs to continue the community policing that we hopefully will see in the appropriations bills that come.

The problem is our priorities are wrong. We spent last Friday talking about an estate tax cut which only benefits 2 percent of the people in this country, and then the amendments rejected that will take that down to 1 percent.

So that is why our priorities are wrong. That is what is wrong. That is why I am glad our ranking member came up with this amendment that talks about the new investment in child care that is needed.

States now cannot keep up with the need of child care assistance even with our TANF funds, and I know that from my own experience again in Texas. Most eligible children are denied assistance. Nationally, only one out of 10 children who are eligible for child care

assistance under Federal law receives any help.

No State is currently serving all eligible families with child care. States have severely limited access to assistance. Only five States set their income eligibility guidelines at the maximum allowable under Federal law, 85 percent of their State median income. In nearly half the States, 24 States, a family earning \$25,000 a year does not qualify. In three States, Alabama, Missouri, South Carolina, a family of three earning \$18,000, 130 percent of poverty cannot qualify for help.

Even with low eligibility cut-offs, States have long waiting lists. California has 200,000 families that are waiting. In Texas, we have 36,000 families that are waiting for child care assistance.

That is why this amendment is so important. It gives us the opportunity to talk about our priorities. We need to put our priorities in the needs of our country, because those children that need that child care, Mr. Chairman, those are the ones hopefully that will be serving here someday. We need to prepare them for that. All of us were prepared when we were growing up.

Today's children need even extra help with what we do, whether it is child care, whether it is Head Start, whether it is quality education. Again, most of the funding comes from the local level, but we can help our local communities and provide assistance and smaller class sizes and building reconstruction.

The limited resources lead to inadequate policies and force parents to have to make really difficult choices. Assistance policies keep quality care out of the reach of low-income children. Nearly one-third of our States are paying rates based on out-of-date market surveys, making it unaffordable for programs serving low-income children that invest in quality.

When one thinks about it, despite expert recommendations, over a third of our States, of our parents, pay 10 percent of their income. When one says 10 percent, that does not sound like much. But if one has a poor family, how much of that is housing? How much of that is health care? How much of that is utilities? How much of that is transportation hopefully to get to that job from the welfare reform bill that we passed on this floor.

Basic health and safety protections are lacking in many States. Only 10 States meet the national recommendation for child-staff ratios in their licensing requirements.

□ 2215

And only 10 States require all family child care providers to meet any requirements and regulations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, consider the case of Sue and Dan Williams. I am going to

change the name a little bit, but they are real people. Sue was on welfare for several years, trapped in the hopeless welfare cycle and then during welfare, because of welfare reform, decided, okay, it is time to get a job. And she was a little scared about it, but she got a job and needed to have some child care. And that is a mother's primary concern, which it should be. And we all admire mothers for that. That is why in the welfare reform bill there was \$20 billion in child care for people like Sue and Dan Williams for their children, \$20 billion.

In addition to that, when the senior citizens and their family have to live with them, there is dependent care, a tax credit for families like that. There is social services, block grants. There is child care to States and entitlement programs to the tune of \$8.8 billion in Federal support for the child care programs through the year 2001.

These programs are strongly, strongly supported by Congress on both sides of the aisle, programs such as Head Start, Even Start, the Campus-Based Child Care, IDEA Services for Preschoolers and Infant Programs for after school.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to some of these after-school programs. These children are learning things. They are learning life skills. They are learning to work with each other. They are learning play acting and things that build their self-esteem. These are very good programs.

The chairman of this committee has worked hard to support this stuff. He has gone out in the field. He has not stayed in the ivory tower of Washington and waited for the White House to hand down some irresponsible number, some risky scheme from the Gore-Clinton administration. He has gone out and said, how do these programs actually work? How do they affect real people?

This is not a matter of political rhetoric. This is not a matter of, well, we are going to spend more money than them. It is a matter of Sue and Dan Williams and their children and their parents and caring for them. I think the committee and the chairman of the committee have done the right thing on this.

What I would say to my colleagues across the aisle, we keep hearing how, well, if we have to have more money, well, maybe we do, but maybe we ought to look at the efficiency of these programs, as well. Is it possible under the Clinton-Gore model that too much of the money is being squandered by wasteful Washington bureaucrats? Is it possible that a lot of that money never leaves Washington, D.C., and if we go down to HUD or if we go down to some of these Federal Government agencies we can find the money on the sixth

floor, third office down to our right because it never gets out of that bureaucrat's hands and to the streets where it can help the children of the Williams.

That is what the committee mark is all about. The committee has made a significant commitment in this and will continue to. Think about Head Start alone increased by \$400 million, 8 percent above last year's in order to serve an additional 20,000 kids. Think about the level. It is the highest in the 35-year history. That is very, very significant. The Child Care Development Block Grant is increased by \$400 million, 34 percent.

The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) has gone out and reviewed these programs. He has asked the bureaucracies to be more efficient. But he has also said we have got to help as many children as possible and he has done it in the best interest of America's kids.

It is sad to me that people would come up with arbitrary numbers to irresponsibly use children as a pawn in some political chess game. It upsets me. Because they know in their heart of hearts this money comes from Social Security, it does not come from some other area. If they want to spend this money irresponsibly, they have to go home and tell our seniors, well, do you know what we did? We did what we did for 40 straight years, we dipped back into that Social Security Trust Fund. And they should not be doing that, Mr. Chairman, because Social Security should be handled on a bipartisan basis.

It is not a matter of Democrat versus Republican. It is a matter of putting our seniors first. That is why I do not think we should just irresponsibly and arbitrarily come up with numbers to increase programs for political purposes. We have to do what is best for children. We have to do what is best for seniors.

That is why I support the mark of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) on this and I think we should reject, respectfully reject, the Obey amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the old adage over and over again about a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon we are talking about real money.

This amendment is a real amendment because we are talking about a thousand dollars to people that in three States, a family of three making \$18,000 a year, cannot qualify for help to get child care for their family.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members in this body are listening because I am sure that people out in the country are listening. A thousand dollars to them, when they are making \$18,000 a year and they are working sometimes

two and three jobs and the most important thing in the world to them is their children, this amendment is important.

Yes, it is important because we are talking about differences in priorities tonight at 10:20 Washington, D.C., time. And maybe we will be here until 2:20 and maybe we will be here all day tomorrow talking about education. I hope we are. This is the most important issue to me and the single most important reason why I picked the Committee on Education and the Workforce to serve on in this body.

A thousand dollars to a family of three making \$18,000 a year in three States where they cannot qualify for any help to get child care to take care of their children while they work, this idea behind this amendment can help some real people with real problems address their dire need for quality and affordable child care.

We have heard some people on the other side of the aisle talk about, oh, this bill does not cut anything, it does not cut programs that make a difference for working people or people concerned about getting their children educated.

Let us talk about some real cuts. The adult job training program is cut by \$93 million below last year's appropriated level. The dislocated workers, \$207 million cut below last year's appropriated level. That is \$300 million, Mr. Chairman, when we are in a world economy today where we are engaging in trade, where we all know that we are going through the information and knowledge revolution in America today, where businesses are all saying the most important thing we can do in Washington is help them with doing more in education, and where our workers, whether they be underskilled or unskilled or whether they be dislocated because of trade, that we do something to help these workers make sure that, as we engage in trade with Mexico and China and other countries, that we make sure we help our working families get trained for new jobs if they are dislocated from an old one.

That is fairness. That is help in education in the new economy.

Now, I also hear Mr. Chairman, and I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is absolutely with us on this point, that we need more resources if we are going to get more accountability and quality in our education programs.

I was a fighter for more charter schools, and we did that. I fought for more public choice in education, and we are doing that. I fought and authored the bill last year for education flexibility to give our local schools more choice over what they do with Federal money. We are doing many of these things, giving the local school more quality programs to pick from but they choose what they want to do.

Why can we not deliver more resources for dislocated workers, under-

skilled workers, who need to move from a toolbox to a robotic arm in a computer. Let us help these workers out in this new economy with these new challenges and this new workplace that we are creating. Let us help our children in inner-city schools and rural schools in Indiana. As we improve accountability, as we improve the quality of these programs, let us get more resources for our local schools to determine whether they want to use that money for school construction, whether they want to use that money for new curriculum ideas, whether they want to use that money to try to develop more professional training programs to get their teachers skilled on the technology of the future.

So we are hopeful that we can work with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who I think wants more resources for these education programs, to fight for these programs.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we should first realize that this amendment is not an amendment that has an offset. The only amount involved here is a thousand dollars. And the reason it is offered is simply to gain time to make the points that the minority wishes to make. The reason the amendment is in order is that there is a small amount of unobligated budget authority and outlays from which to draw these small amendments.

The point that the minority continues to make is that we are not spending enough money on matters that they think are priorities. I simply want to take this time, Mr. Chairman, to point out all of the ways where we are meeting needs by making very substantial increases in many programs that we think are very, very important.

Let me begin with community health centers, which we have funded at \$1.1 billion dollars. That is \$31 million above the President's request. The Job Corps at \$1.4 billion. That is \$7 million above the President's request. Graduate medical education we have doubled to \$80 million. We have funded Ricky Ray Hemophilia at \$100 million, a 33-percent increase. We have funded Ryan White AIDS at \$1.725 billion. That is \$130 million above last year and also above the President's request.

We funded the CDC at \$3.3 billion. That is \$189 million above the President's request and \$369 million greater than last year. We have funded infrastructure needs at CDC at \$145 million. That is above the President's request. We funded Head Start at \$5.7 billion, a \$400-million increase, or 7.5 percent increase this year. We funded special education at \$6.255 billion. That is a half-billion-dollar increase over last year.

□ 2230

We funded Pell Grants at the President's requested level, a \$200 increase to the maximum grant, to \$3500. We have increased after school centers by \$146 million to \$600 million. We have funded Impact Aid at \$215 million above the President's request and \$78 million above last year. We have increased child care \$400 million over last year, at \$2 billion in forward funding subject to a sequester to stay within the budget cap. We have increased the National Institutes of Health by \$1 billion over last year and funded it at the President's request.

The point that the minority is making that we are underfunding accounts is simply not a valid point. There are not any cuts in the bill. If there are, they are very small ones. In almost all cases there are increases, and in some cases that I have just described substantial increases over the amounts that the President has requested.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 196, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—182

Abercrombie	Davis (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)
Allen	DeFazio	Kanjorski
Baca	DeGette	Kaptur
Baird	Delahunt	Kennedy
Baldacci	Deutsch	Kildee
Baldwin	Dicks	Kilpatrick
Barcia	Dixon	Kind (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Doggett	Kleccka
Becerra	Doyle	Klink
Bentsen	Edwards	Kucinich
Berkley	Engel	LaFalce
Berman	Eshoo	Lampson
Berry	Etheridge	Lantos
Bishop	Evans	Larson
Blagojevich	Farr	Lee
Blumenauer	Filner	Levin
Bonior	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Ford	Lipinski
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Boucher	Frost	Lowe
Boyd	Gedjenson	Lucas (KY)
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Luther
Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Markey
Capps	Hill (IN)	Mascara
Capuano	Hilliard	Matsui
Cardin	Hinche	McCarthy (NY)
Carson	Hinojosa	McDermott
Clay	Holden	McGovern
Clayton	Holt	McIntyre
Clement	Hooley	McKinney
Clyburn	Hoyer	McNulty
Conyers	Inslee	Meehan
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Meek (FL)
Coyne	Jackson-Lee	Meeks (NY)
Cramer	(TX)	Menendez
Crowley	Jefferson	Millender
Cummings	John	McDonald

Miller, George	Rangel	Stupak
Minge	Reyes	Tanner
Mink	Rivers	Tauscher
Moakley	Rodriguez	Taylor (MS)
Mollohan	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Moran (VA)	Rush	Thurman
Murtha	Sanders	Tierney
Nadler	Sandlin	Turner
Napolitano	Sawyer	Udall (CO)
Neal	Schakowsky	Udall (NM)
Oberstar	Scott	Velázquez
Obey	Serrano	Visclosky
Oliver	Sherman	Waters
Ortiz	Sisisky	Watt (NC)
Pallone	Skelton	Weiner
Pascarell	Slaughter	Wexler
Pastor	Smith (WA)	Weygand
Peterson (MN)	Snyder	Woolsey
Phelps	Spratt	Wu
Pomeroy	Stabenow	Wynn
Price (NC)	Stenholm	
Rahall	Strickland	

NOES—196

Aderholt	Goss	Portman
Armey	Graham	Pryce (OH)
Bachus	Granger	Quinn
Balleenger	Green (WI)	Radanovich
Barr	Greenwood	Ramstad
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Regula
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Reynolds
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Bass	Hayes	Roemer
Bereuter	Hayworth	Rogan
Biggert	Herger	Rogers
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	Rohrabacher
Bilirakis	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bliley	Hobson	Royce
Blunt	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Boehlert	Horn	Ryun (KS)
Bonilla	Hostettler	Salmon
Bono	Houghton	Sanchez
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Sanford
Bryant	Hunter	Saxton
Burr	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Burton	Hyde	Schaffer
Buyer	Isakson	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Istook	Sessions
Calvert	Jenkins	Shadegg
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Sherwood
Castle	Kelly	Shimkus
Chabot	King (NY)	Shows
Chambliss	Kingston	Simpson
Chenoweth-Hage	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coble	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Collins	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Combest	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Condit	Largent	Souder
Cooksey	Latham	Spence
Crane	LaTourette	Stump
Cubin	Lazio	Sununu
Cunningham	Leach	Sweeney
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
DeLay	LoBiondo	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Manzullo	Terry
Doolittle	McCrery	Thomas
Dreier	McHugh	Thornberry
Duncan	McInnis	Thune
Dunn	McKeon	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Mica	Trafficant
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Upton
English	Miller, Gary	Vitter
Everett	Moran (KS)	Walden
Ewing	Morella	Walsh
Fletcher	Nethercutt	Wamp
Foley	Northup	Watkins
Fossella	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Nussle	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Ose	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Packard	Wicker
Gallely	Paul	Wilson
Gibbons	Pease	Wolf
Gilchrest	Petri	Young (AK)
Gilman	Pickering	Young (FL)
Goode	Pombo	
Goodling	Porter	

NOT VOTING—56

Andrews	Baker	Boehner
Archer	Bateman	Campbell

Coburn	Hall (OH)	Pelosi
Cook	Hansen	Peterson (PA)
Cox	Hefley	Pickett
Danner	Hoeffel	Pitts
DeLauro	Kasich	Roukema
DeMint	Linder	Sabo
Dingell	Maloney (NY)	Shuster
Dooley	Martinez	Stark
Emerson	McCarthy (MO)	Stearns
Fattah	McCollum	Toomey
Ganske	McIntosh	Towns
Gekas	Metcalfe	Vento
Gephardt	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Gillmor	Ney	Waxman
Goodlatte	Owens	Weldon (PA)
Gordon	Oxley	Wise
Gutierrez	Payne	

□ 2327

Mr. HUTCHINSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 256, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the majority and minority have come to an agreement on the further course of this bill. At the appropriate point, I will move that the Committee rise. The debate will begin tomorrow morning. Under that agreement, there should be no further votes this evening and the intention of both sides is that we proceed until the bill is completed sometime tomorrow.

□ 2330

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask at which point it is appropriate for me to withdraw the amendment now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the deep cuts that this bill makes in Medicare contractor management. The funding is not just inadequate, it is grossly inadequate, so inadequate that it is bound to impair the quality of service delivered to millions of elderly and disabled Americans—many of whom rely solely on Medicare for their health insurance.

Although the Administration requested \$1.3 billion for contractor management, an increase just over 4%, the committee rejected any increase and instead cut funding by 6%. In years past, when there were funding cutbacks and shortfalls, HCFA ordered Medicare contractors to cut service to beneficiaries. Medicare payments for patient care were delayed. HCFA told its contractors to cut back human contact and make more use of voice mail.

Voice mail menus are frustrating for everybody, but imagine how exasperating they are for an elderly person who wants a knowledgeable, caring person to answer a question about Medicare or solve a problem.

The demands placed upon contractors will only be aggravated by elderly and disabled Americans who are the victims of the managed care companies pulling out of Medicare+Choice. In just one Medicare+Choice company that recently announced its pullout, there are over 100,000 elderly and disabled Americans. They will have no choice but to move back to the fee-for-service program, and this will increase the work load for Medicare contractors far more than anyone previously predicted.

In making its budget request, the Administration assumed a 3.5% increase in claims. The pull-out of Medicare+Choice firms will add to that; and if funding is cut by 6%, the cuts cannot help but strain the Medicare contractors, who are already stretched out, and degrade the services they provide to elderly and disabled Americans and their healthcare providers. This cut in funding will:

Curtail beneficiary and provider outreach programs that educate and answer questions. Delay responses to telephone calls, written inquiries, and reviews of "medical necessity." Postpone waste, fraud, and abuse investigations. Make it difficult for contractors to respond to HCFA initiatives.

As a consequence, elderly and disabled Americans will not receive the level of customer service they expect and deserve. More providers who participate in Medicare but are increasingly vocal in their dissatisfaction will leave the program. And if Medicare contractors, who pride themselves on their business and want to deliver a good product and good service do not have the resources to administer the program, they too will exit the business. Many of them already have, and more of them will if this cut in funding goes through.

For all these reasons, we should meet the President's modest request for Medicare contractor management, and undo these self-defeating cuts. If their purpose is to impair Medicare fee-for-service, and make beneficiaries cynical about Medicare and seek another program, they may achieve that effect. But if our purpose is to give the elderly and disabled a Medicare program with the care, service, and attention they need, these cuts should be reversed, and the President's request should be filled.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I will get to the point, who could not support Head Start, a program that provides comprehensive developmental services for America's low-income children—ages birth to five years?

Research has told us time and again that this is the most critical stage of a child's mental and emotional development. Adding \$600 million would provide additional services to 53,000 additional low-income children.

I represent the third-fastest growing metropolitan statistical area in the U.S. and yet, we have one of the highest rates of poverty, and a very young population.

For almost 30 years, I have been involved with education issues. This experience has taught me that children, regardless of income level or race, have the same potential for high

achievement and healthy development. We must give them that chance.

Head Start has successfully served 17 million children and their families since 1965 * * * Lets's not jeopardize that.

To my colleagues who say no to Head Start: I say is that your final answer? I hope not.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership has once again succeeded in bringing to the floor a labor, health and education appropriations bill designed to please only themselves and their right-wing friends. H.R. 4577 fails to make needed investments in public education and the domestic workforce, and, as the result, would undermine American competitiveness in the 21st century. This bill has already received what has now become its customary and well-deserved veto threat from the Clinton administration. It is clearly going nowhere, and should be soundly defeated.

This bill was doomed from its inception, because the economic premise upon which it is based is flawed. Earlier this year, before the appropriations process began, the Republican leadership decided to resume its efforts to push for big tax cuts for the rich. They attached hundreds of billions of dollars of these tax cuts to the minimum wage bill and the budget resolution. This decision to squander the surplus, rather than invest it, severely reduced the funds available to meet many of our nation's critical needs.

Overall, the bill provides \$2.9 billion less than the President requested for the Department of Education, and \$1.7 billion less for the Department of Labor. As the result, education, job training, workplace safety, and other programs are either frozen or cut, significantly reducing the level of services that can be provided.

For example, the bill would slash Title I funding, forcing school districts to cut back on assistance to disadvantaged students. The Clinton/Clay class size reduction initiative is gutted, leaving school districts without the resources to hire and train 20,000 more top-quality teachers. Adequate funding is denied for after-school and summer programs intended to improve student achievement and reduce juvenile crime. And no funds are provided to renovate crumbling and unsafe schools.

At the same time efforts are ongoing in the Congress to erase limits on the immigration of foreign workers to fill high-tech jobs, this bill would make steep cuts in the funding of training programs aimed at helping domestic workers fill them and other positions. Dislocated workers and at-risk youth are particularly hard hit by these cuts, even though they are the one most in need of skills training. By failing to adequately invest in our own workforce, the Republican leadership is jeopardizing American competitiveness and prosperity.

This bill also jeopardizes worker health and safety by shortchanging OSHA and blocking issuance of the ergonomics rule intended to prevent about 300,000 workplace injuries a year. The Wilson amendment would add insult to injury by cutting \$25 million more from OSHA.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill is a disaster. It fails to adequately invest in edu-

cation, and in the development and security of the nation's workforce. I urge a no vote on H.R. 4577.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4577 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 418 and the order of the House of June 8, 2000, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

One, pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Two, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 106-657;

Three, the remaining amendments listed in the order of the House of June 8, 2000, as previously modified;

And four, the following additional amendments by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), regarding across-the-board reduction; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), regarding reductions in Education for the Disadvantaged, Impact Aid, School Improvement Programs, and Bilingual and Immigrant Education and increase in special education; further, by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in education research, statistics, and improvement and increase in special education; by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in Even Start and increase in special education for grants to States; by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in Job Corps Training and increase in special education for grants to States; by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in the United States Institute of Peace and increase in special education for grants to

States; by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), regarding fetal tissue research; by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), regarding a report of the impact of PNTR on United States jobs; by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), regarding NIH; by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), regarding additional funding for Meals on Wheels; and the amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XXVIII and numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 189, 190, 191, 192, 196, 198, and 201.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request or a designee or the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-674) on the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4577, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4425, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4425) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OLVER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4425, be instructed to disagree with the Senate amendment and provide funding for National Missile Defense Initial Deployment Facilities at a level equal to the lower level as provided in the House passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple motion. It should not be controversial. These United States are on the verge of embarking on what could be a \$60 billion National Missile Defense program. This House included more than adequate funding to start the early lead construction items of the National Missile Defense as it is now conceived. The other Chamber has funded this item at a substantially and unnecessarily higher level.

This motion instructs the conferees to insist on the more prudent level of spending in the House bill; 367 Members of the House supported this level of spending when we passed the bill several weeks ago, and it is important that we maintain our position.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and would urge its adoption.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of the House bill, and Division A of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HOBSON, PORTER, TIAHRT, WALSH, MILLER of Florida, ADERHOLT, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. GOODE, YOUNG of Florida, OLVER, EDWARDS, FARR of California, BOYD, DICKS, and OBEY;

For consideration of the Division B of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, ROGERS, SKEEN, CALLAHAN, OBEY, MURTHA, and Ms. PELOSI and Ms. KAPTUR.

There was no objection.

□ 2340

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). 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.

INDIA IN NEED OF THIS COUNTRY'S ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take the well at this very late hour because I want to talk about an issue that is, I think, vitally important not only to this country but to the stability of peace in the world community.

I had the occasion to take a trip with my wife and several others to Pakistan in India, and to Kashmir about a month, or month and a half ago, and it indeed was one of the more interesting things I have done in my 28 years of political life. I came away more convinced than ever that the United States has a proactive role to play in helping with the challenges that are faced in South Asia.

I think everyone now is aware that South Asia is a nuclear flash point; that the Indian Government and the Pakistanis have fought now three times since partition in 1947 from the British, and as a result of those wars, the recent skirmish in addition to that in the Kargil region, which claimed a thousand lives this past summer, it is a very dangerous place, with both countries now having the nuclear capability

to destroy each other and inflict incredible destruction on not only that region of the world but the planet in general. So it seems to me that we need as a Nation and as a world community to focus our attention more and more on bringing peace and stability to the people of Kashmir. It is clearly in their interest.

The people of Kashmir have suffered through 50 years of broken promises. If we recall our history, the United Nations called for a plebiscite on self-determination in Kashmir in 1948, but of course that has never been carried out, and this legacy of neglect has fostered distrust, it has fostered hopelessness among many in Kashmir, especially the Muslim majority, which has spawned a cycle of protest and of violence and of repression.

As many as up to 70,000 Kashmiris in the last decade have died as a result of this war that is going on in their country. It is an incredibly beautiful place. Lush green valleys, enormously pristine sparkling lakes surrounded by the Himalayas' snow-capped mountains. Its beauty is only contrasted by the pain and the suffering of indeed this brutal repression and war that is raging now that, as I have said, has claimed as many, some say up to 70,000 lives. A staggering total.

Indian security forces number in the neighborhood of somewhere between 500,000 and 700,000 troops in the States of Kashmir and Jammu, and they wage, along with the militants who are crossing the border and fighting in this region, a day-to-day campaign of terror and repression. And the Kashmiri people are caught in the middle. The human rights abuses are every bit as outrageous and repugnant as they have been in the Balkans as we have seen recently. The number of rapes and torture and all the things that go along with this type of international catastrophe is present in Kashmir.

Independent human rights' groups report on these rapes and these tortures. Often they are not allowed into Kashmir. Amnesty International is not, and other human rights' organizations have had a difficult time getting in and verifying some of these atrocities. Common disappearances occur all the time. People lose their loved ones.

When we were up in Srinagar, which is the summer capital in Kashmir, we could just see the besieged nature of this once incredibly crystal beautiful land. The look of weariness and longing and hunger on the faces of the people beg for a solution and a way out of this quagmire of violence that they find themselves in.

And their most precious resource, their children, the Kashmiri children, are being driven away by this violence. When the young people are old enough to go, they go. So whole families are being broken up as a result of this.

Tourism, which could be as profitable and as abundant and as prosperous as

anyplace in the world because of this incredible beauty is almost nonexistent. It is in ruins. We need to do something about this as a country.

When the young people in Kashmir start to immolate themselves, burn themselves alive, because of the hopelessness that they feel; that there is no way out of this, it speaks clearly and loudly to just what has happened and how far they have come on the road to despair.

Violent acts, such as the massacre of dozens of Sikh villagers in Kashmir during the President's visit to India have shown that the killings will continue unabated unless something is done to stop it.

Now, I would like to just briefly, in the short time that I have here before we adjourn, touch upon the significance of doing this for Pakistan, for India, and for the United States. For Pakistan, the meaning of the conflict in Kashmir goes really to the heart and the soul of people in Kashmir. The people of Pakistan feel a deep sense of kinship with their brethren in Kashmir. Muslim countries. Muslim areas both.

The crisis in Kashmir has drained Pakistan of its resources, leaving unmet needs for efforts to alleviate their poverty, their illiteracy, their health care needs, their infrastructure needs. I was told, and I do not know how completely accurate this is, but I have a sense that it is close to accurate, that of the budget in Pakistan, where they have roughly 130 million people, 60 percent of their budget goes to just servicing their debt. Imagine that, 60 cents on the dollar going to service the debt. Thirty percent goes to the military, nuclear development and their military establishment, and only 10 percent of their meager budget goes to dealing with the problems of illiteracy, health care, infrastructure, and all the things a civilized society would want to invest in.

With Indian troops and a nuclear capability amassed on one border, and with the Taliban ever present and presenting a threat on the other in Afghanistan, Pakistan has devoted much of its income to the military, and, as I say, to the development of nuclear weapons.

□ 2350

Stopping the incursions of militants into Kashmir is in the interest of the leaders of Pakistan so they can focus in on their internal concerns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). As there is no speaker for the majority on his designated time, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, so unless confidence is restored with the Indian Government, a lasting peace will never occur.

I had the chance when I was there to meet with the Pakistani leaders. I met

with General Musharraf, who is the chief executive of Pakistan, the head of state. I came to that meeting prepared to meet a military man who engaged in a coup and was not quite sure what to expect.

In my discussions with people in Pakistan, in my discussions with him in the meeting I had with him, I came away with the understanding that he wants to break the cycle of corruption and impotence on the people of the party politically, he wants to do something to change the internal dynamics of his country, and he wants to do it in a transition way that can lead to the reestablish of democracy in his country.

There are some signals and some signs that he is doing some things that will move in that direction. While I was there, they had the first human rights conference that they ever have had in Pakistan. And they dealt with the question of honor killings, which had been ignored for a very long time, where male members and heads of families would kill and beat and torture their wives if they suspected infidelity or thought perhaps it might even have occurred. This he has taken on strongly and has enforced since that conference.

He has taken on the question of child labor and moving in the direction of making sure that children are not abused at the work site and are provided an opportunity for an education.

In the area of empowering people, for the first time they are redoing all the roles of government in Pakistan, the voter roles. They have allowed the 18-year-olds to vote. And in November of this year, there will be under these new regimes of empowerment local elections throughout the country. And, of course, the supreme court recently ruled in Pakistan that there would be national elections within a 2½-year period in which General Musharraf has agreed to.

So on the democracy front, on the human rights front, on dealing with corruption, he has commissioned people within his government to act forcefully at trying to stop the corruption that is so endemic to that society and which was responsible to a large extent for the failures of the Bhutto and the Sharif governments.

So there is a strong movement to fight corruption, to establish an economic system that is fair and equitable and honest.

As my colleagues can tell, Mr. Speaker, I came away with some hope when I was not really expecting to. But I have watched, even in recent days, the minister in Pakistan who deals with the question of terrorism issue some statements. There was an article recently on Saturday in the New York Times that showed that they are on the offensive to deal with this important aspect of their national and international obligations.

So there are some things that are happening here. General Musharraf has offered on numerous occasions, and he did to me when I was with him in our visit, that he in fact wants to dialogue with the Indian leaders, with the Indian Government, and that he understands the necessity to stop this cycle of violence.

The sense of distress between the people of Kashmir and the Government of India and the tensions between India and Pakistan have stalled every diplomatic effort that has been made to stop these killings. But we have a chance now, because I think it is in everybody's interest to get this done, Pakistan, and it is in India's interest. And if I could just move to them for a second. Their government has a compelling interest to resolve this Kashmir question, as well.

India shares Pakistan's challenge with poverty, with illiteracy, with health care, with their infrastructure needs. They do not want 600,000 troops stationed in Kashmir. That takes an enormous amount of resources, and it drains their ability to deal with these other problems. They do not want this continuing and escalating violence in Kashmir. They want, it would seem to me, to resolve this issue, as well.

And there are some signs of hope. The Indian Government has allowed some Kashmiri political and civil leaders out of jail. I met with them when I was in Kashmir. I met with the conference leaders, some of whom just recently were let out of jail, and they are asking for a dialogue with the Indian Government. And while there has been intimations that that dialogue would occur, it has not. And I would encourage the Indian Government to engage in it.

Kashmiris must have a responsible role in deciding their own fate, and this will only occur when we continue to build confidence-building measures, such as opening preliminary discussions, allowing people to exercise their leadership, freeing them from jail, stopping the violence of incursions of militants across the border. These are all pieces that have to take place in order for this to come together.

The Indian Government, as I said, has participated in some of these. Other things they have not, they have not shown an interest. And we need, as a Government here in the United States, to move them in that direction and to get them to stop the torture and the other repressive measures that they are taking in Kashmir against the Kashmiri people.

Now, I see a way forward but only if we, as the United States, are willing to invest more time and resources to bring these parties together. And I think we have an obligation to do that. I think we have a moral responsibility to do that.

During the war in Afghanistan, the United States armed Pakistan's neigh-

bors and the militants. And then we sort of casually abandoned the region, and that left the region in a state of militarism with enormous amounts of weapons and ammunitions.

Now we have an obligation, it seems to me, to do our part to help establish stability in South Asia. It is in our interest to do so. The threat of nuclear conflict in South Asia is very, very real. We must reduce this threat and halt the arms race in South Asia. And unless Kashmir is addressed, that will not happen. We cannot make progress unless people in the world community are willing to tackle this issue.

The United States has called for democracy to take root in South Asia, but this will not happen on its own and it surely will not happen without a resolution to this very important question.

And by "democracy," I am talking about not only democracy in form but I am talking about supporting democracy through helping Pakistan develop some of those institutions for democratic action, and we have ways to do that here. Instead of withholding support for Pakistan, who has been a great front for this country throughout its history, one of our best allies and best friends, instead of engaging in embargoes, we ought to be financially helping Pakistan move forward.

Because democracy works well when there is an economic component. When you give people a sense of home for their economic life, that works very well with establishing and enhancing the democratic life of a country. Democracy by itself, without any support economically, is going to be a very fragile democracy.

If we turn our attention away from the region, as we did after the war in Afghanistan, we risk further erosion, violence, and disillusionment.

We are, as a country, as a superpower, as a country that is engaged in the Middle East and in Ireland and in Africa and in other places recently, in Latin America, we have a role to play here. And as a long-standing ally of Pakistan as an emerging friend of India, we are in a position to bring people together. And given the stakes in South Asia, punitive economic sanctions, as I said, are clearly counterproductive.

While we have our differences, we must never forget that Pakistan, as I said, has been a long-standing ally of the United States. Democracy will be strengthened not by economic sanctions but by economic aid and by taking the know-how of our democratic institutions and trying to provide those kinds of expertise and know-how with those who are struggling for an expanded democracy in Pakistan.

So I think everything is in place to make this work. And because of the nuclear potential, the world needs desperately to focus in on this region. And

because of the promise that was made to the Kashmiris over 50 years ago, we need to desperately take hold of this issue and focus our attention and try to develop a process by which we can reach some resolve.

People in Kashmir are exhausted from the violence. They are exhausted from the war. They are exhausted from the economic inactivity. We can make a big change in a very important part of the world if we will devote some of our energies, some our good will, some of our resources to making that happen.

So I look forward, as I told the President when I discussed this with him briefly at the White House, I look forward to working with him and our administration and our allies in bringing Pakistan and India together and bringing the Kashmiris into discussions so that both countries can live in peace and the Kashmiris can have the right to express their views and work for a better situation economically and politically and democratically for their people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BALDWIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of airport delays.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and until 4:00 p.m. on June 13 on account of the birth of Bridget Kathleen Toomey.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and June 13 on account of attending a family funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OLVER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred a follows:

S. Con. Res. 121, concurrent resolution, congratulating Representative Stephen S. F. Chen on the occasion of his retirement from the diplomatic service of Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1953. To authorize leases for terms not to exceed 99 years on land held in trust for the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians and the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians of the Guidiville Indian Rancheria.

H.R. 3639. To designate the Federal building located at 2201 C Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, currently headquarters for the Department of State, as the "Harry S Truman Federal Building".

H.R. 2484. To provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, June 13, 2000, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

8078. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 99-076-2] received May 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8079. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Oversight, transmitting the Office's final rule—Implementation of the Equal Access to Justice Act (RIN: 2550-AA08) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8080. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Energy Program [Docket No. EE-RM-96-402] (RIN: 1904-AB01) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8081. A letter from the Special Assistant to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Establishment of a Class A Television Service [MM Docket No. 00-10] received May 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8082. A letter from the Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—DotCom Disclosures About Online Advertising—received May 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8083. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 013-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8084. A letter from the Chairwoman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Inspector General's Semi-annual Report for the period ending March 31, 2000 and the Semiannual Management Report for the same period; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8085. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Southern and Western Colorado Appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AI95) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8086. A letter from the Director, Family-Friendly Workplace Advocacy Office, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Agency Use of Appropriated Funds For Child Care Costs For Lower Income Employees (RIN: 3206-AI93) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8087. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Determination of Threatened Status for the Koala (RIN: 1018-AE43) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Concession Contracts (RIN: 1024-AC72) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8089. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—1999-2000 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1018-AF52) received May 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8090. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Currently Effective Indian Health Service Eligibility Regulations (RIN: 0917-AA03) received April 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8091. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 000307061-0061-01; I.D. 013100D] (RIN: 0648-AN46) received May 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8092. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific cod by Catcher Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 000211040-0040-01; I.D. 042400A] received May 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8093. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 33 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 000407096-0096-01; I.D. 040300C] (RIN: 0648-AN51) received May 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8094. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Refugee Resettlement Program Requirements for Refugee Cash Assistance and Refugee Medical Assistance—received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8095. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the draft bill, the "HCFA User Fee Act of 2000"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

8096. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "Water Resources Development Act of 2000"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Commerce, and Resources.

8097. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the management of the Department of Defense and to the transfer of naval vessels to foreign countries; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Government Reform, International Relations, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 3995. A bill to establish procedures governing the responsibilities of court-appointed receivers who administer departments, offices, and agencies of the District of Columbia government; with an amendment (Rept. 106-663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 4387. A bill to provide that the School Governance Charter Amendment Act of 2000 shall take effect upon the date such Act is ratified by the voters of the District of Columbia (Rept. 106-664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4504. A bill to make technical amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 106-665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4079. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department of Education; with an amendment (Rept. 106-666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 4022. A bill regarding the sale and transfer of Moskit anti-ship missiles by the Russian Federation; with an amendment

(Rept. 106-667). Referred to the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 4118. A bill to prohibit the re-scheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba; with an amendment (Rept. 106-668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3048. A bill to amend section 879 of title 18, United States Code, to provide clearer coverage over threats against former Presidents and members of their families, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-669). Referred to the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 523. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 761) to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-670). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 524. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-671). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 90. Resolution withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization (Rept. 106-672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4601. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 213(c) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt; with an amendment (Rept. 106-673 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALSH: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4635. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on the Budget discharged. H.R. 4601 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4601. Referral to the Committee on the Budget extended for a period ending not later than June 12, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 4635. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 4636. A bill to amend chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, to modify rates relating to reduced rate mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4637. A bill to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal lands in Clark County, Nevada, and to provide for the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of environmentally sensitive lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 4638. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require States to provide Federal highway funds for projects in high priority corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 4639. A bill to assure that recreation benefits are accorded the same weight as hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits as well as environmental restoration benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4640. A bill to make grants to States for carrying out DNA analyses for use in the Combined DNA Index System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide for the collection and analysis of DNA samples from certain violent and sexual offenders for use in such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4641. A bill to provide trade adjustment assistance for certain workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

349. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 288 memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funding for increased Bovine Tuberculosis Testing and Research in Michigan and for Federal Indemnification and Financial Assistance for the Federal Indemnification and Financial Assistance for the Federally Required Destruction of Michigan Cattle; to the Committee on Agriculture.

350. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate

Joint Memorial No. 8019 memorializing Congress to continue to help meet the unique special needs of gifted students by including formula grants to states for gifted and talented education programs (HR 637 and S 505) in its consideration of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

351. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 42 memorializing the West Virginia Congressional Delegation to take immediate legislative action to amend existing surface mining laws to reverse the effect of the decision in Bragg, et al. v. ROBERTSON, et al. on West Virginia mines and miners; to the Committee on Resources.

352. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America for submission to the states for ratification prohibiting federal courts from ordering a state or political subdivision thereof to levy or increase taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

353. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 68 memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from federal income taxes the income received by the holders of bonds issued pursuant to the provisions of Senate Bill 175, the "West Virginia Pension Liability Redemption Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

354. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 68 memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from federal income taxes the income received by the holders of bonds issued pursuant to the provisions of Senate Bill 175, the "West Virginia Pension Liability Redemption Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 363: Mr. HINGHEY.
 H.R. 632: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 914: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 1111: Ms. STABENOW.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 1248: Mr. QUINN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1271: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 H.R. 1586: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 1594: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1885: Ms. STABENOW.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 2059: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 2451: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2596: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 2749: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 2790: Mr. MOORE.
 H.R. 2814: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3100: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 3301: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3327: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3463: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3633: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3677: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 3697: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3732: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3844: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3891: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 3915: Mr. BACA, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. REYES, Mr. TALENT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. EHRlich, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 4001: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4071: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4079: Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 4093: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4149: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 4189: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 4210: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 4246: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 4248: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 4271: Mr. WEINER and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 4272: Mr. WEINER and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 4273: Mr. WEINER and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 4281: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4283: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4328: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 4329: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 4357: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 4395: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4410: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 4453: Mr. WYNN and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4483: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 4492: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 4495: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4503: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 4504: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 4600: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 4601: Mrs. NORTHUP and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4621: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. GOODE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 343: Ms. CARSON.

H. Con. Res. 350: Mr. FARR of California.

H. Res. 280: Mr. MCKEON.

H. Res. 388: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 461: Mr. KLINK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DEFazio.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Board of Commissioners and Board of Equalizers, Ferry County, relative to Resolution No. 2000-16 petitioning the federal government to change the Endangered Species Act to provide incentives for the protection of endangered species through empowering citizens and communities to freely and voluntarily assist in protection of endangered species; which was referred to the Committee on Resources.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTKNECHT

AMENDMENT No. 27: Insert before the short title the following title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the amounts made available in this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be expended to provide to any person (including a pharmacist or wholesale importer) a drug-importation warning letter issued pursuant to section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. HOEKSTRA

AMENDMENT No. 202: Page 50, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$116,000,000)”.

Page 51, line 21, insert after the first dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$78,548,000)”.

Page 52, line 12, insert after the first dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$158,450,000)”.

Page 53, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$30,765,000)”.

Page 53, line 17, insert after the first dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$383,263,000)”.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHAFFER

AMENDMENT No. 203: Page 64, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 306. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by decreasing the amount made available under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT” for the research activities, and by increasing the amount made available under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION” for grants to States, by \$10,356,700.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHAFFER

AMENDMENT No. 204: Page 84, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 518. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by decreasing the amount made available in title III under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED” for the Even Start program, and by increasing the amount made available in title III under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION” for grants to States, by \$100,000,000.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHAFFER

AMENDMENT No. 205: Page 84, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 518. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by decreasing the amount made available in title I under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION—TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES” for the Job Corps program under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and by increasing the amount made available in title III under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION” for grants to States, by \$42,224,000.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHAFFER

AMENDMENT No. 206: Page 84, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 518. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available in title III under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION” for grants to States, and by decreasing the amount made available in title IV under the heading “RELATED AGENCIES—UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE—OPERATING EXPENSES”, by \$15,000,000.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT No. 207: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 503(c) of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFazio

AMENDMENT No. 10: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to assess a fine or take any other law enforcement action against a person for failure to pay a fee for a vehicle pass imposed under the recreational fee demonstration program authorized by section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (as contained in section 101(c) of Public Law 104-134; 16 U.S.C. 4601-6a note), regarding parking at trailheads and dispersed recreation sites in the National Forest System.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFazio

AMENDMENT No. 11: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into any new commercial agricultural lease on the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges in the States of Oregon and California.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 12. On page 66, line 21, strike “\$67,000,000” and insert: “\$103,740,000”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 13. On page 85, line 7, strike “\$98,000,000” and insert: “\$125,000,000 of which \$27,000,000 shall not become available until September 29, 2001”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 14. On page 85, line 21, strike “\$100,604,000” and insert: “\$110,344,000”.

of which \$9,740,000 shall not become available until September 29, 2001”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 15: On page 66, line 21, strike “\$67,000,000” and insert: “\$34,260,000”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 16: On page 85, line 7, strike “\$98,000,000” and insert: “\$115,260,000 of which \$17,260,000 shall not become available until September 29, 2001”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 17: On page 52, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . Any limitation imposed under this Act on funds made available by this Act related to planning and management of national monuments, designation of new wild-life refuges, or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan shall not apply to any activity which is otherwise authorized by law.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 18: On page 108, after line 3, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . Any limitation imposed under this Act on funds made available by this Act related to planning and management of national monuments, designation of new wild-life refuges, or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan shall not apply to any activity which is otherwise authorized by law.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 19: On page 52 strike lines 12 through 15.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 20: On page 108 strike lines 4 through 8.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT No. 21: On page 108, strike lines 9 through 14.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. DOOLITTLE

AMENDMENT No. 22: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Forest Service may be used—

(1) to purchase a motor vehicle for the use of Forest Service personnel that is painted in the base color identified as Federal Standard 595, color chip no. 14260, or painted in any other base color, except the color white as made available by the manufacturer; or

(2) to paint any Forest Service motor vehicle in any base color other than white.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. HILL OF MONTANA

AMENDMENT No. 23: Page 56, line 5, before the period insert the following: “, of which \$2,000,000 shall be for acquisition of Traveler’s Rest, Montana”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. HOEFFEL

AMENDMENT No. 24: On page 102, strike Section 327.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. HOEFFEL

AMENDMENT No. 25: On page 108, strike Section 335.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MRS. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT No. 26: Page 24, beginning line 6, strike “transportation and gathering expenses, processing, and any contractor costs required to aggregate and market royalty production taken in kind at wholesale market centers” and insert “transportation and processing of royalty production taken in kind”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. ROYCE

AMENDMENT No. 27: Page 66, beginning at line 21, strike “\$67,000,000 shall not be available until October 1, 2001” and insert “\$326,000,000 shall not be available until October 1, 2001”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 28: Page 67, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$45,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$3,500,000) (increased by \$9,500,000) (increased by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 67, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$23,500,000)”.

Page 67, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 67, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$3,500,000)”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 29: Page 69, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. SUNUNU

AMENDMENT No. 30: Page 5, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 15, line 15, after the first dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 7, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 9, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 54, line 25, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 67, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$126,500,000)”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. WU

AMENDMENT No. 31: Page 53, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$14,727,000) (increased by \$14,727,000)”.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. YOUNG (of Alaska)

AMENDMENT No. 32: Insert at the appropriate place:

SEC. ____ . Notwithstanding 36 Code of Federal Regulations 223, Subpart A and Subpart B, and associated provisions of law, the Forest Service shall implement the North Prince of Wales Island (POW) Collaborative Stewardship Project (CSP) agreement dated June 7, 1999, regarding a pilot project for negotiated salvage permits.