SENATE—*Friday, June 9, 2000*

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

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, pastor, St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Brothers and sisters, listen to the words of the Prophet Isaiah:

Cry out full throated and unsparingly,
Lift up your voice like a trumpet blast;
Is this the manner of fasting I wish,
Of keeping a day of penance:
That a man bow his head like a reed,
And lie in sackcloth and ashes?
Do you call this a fast,
A day acceptable to the Lord?
This, rather, is the fasting I wish,
Releasing those bound unjustly,
Untying the thongs of the yoke;
Setting free the oppressed,
Breaking every yoke;
Sharing your bread with the hungry,
Sheltering the oppressed and the homeless;
Clothing the naked when you see them,
And not turning your back on your own.
Then your light shall break forth like the dawn,
And your wound shall quickly be healed;
Your vindication shall go before you,
And the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard.
Then you shall call, and the Lord will answer,
You shall cry for help, and he will say: Here I am!
If you remove from your midst oppression,
False accusation and malicious speech;
If you bestow your bread on the hungry
And satisfy the afflicted;
Then light shall rise for you in the darkness,
And the gloom shall become for you the midday;
Then the Lord will guide you always
And give you plenty even on the parched land.

Let us pray:

Blessed are you, Lord, God of mercy, who through Your Son gave us a marvelous example of charity and the great commandment of love for one another. Send down Your blessings on these United States, and send Your blessings on the men and women who serve in this Senate. Give them wisdom; Give them insight; Give them courage; Give them strength. Let them faithfully serve You in their neighbor. Glory and praise to You for ever and ever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable L. CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE) The Senator from Alaska.

SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill. Under the order, there will be up to 10 minutes of debate on the pending Grassley amendment regarding accounting, with the vote to occur at approximately 9:40 on that amendment.

Following the vote, the Senate will continue debate on this Appropriations bill, with further amendments expected to be offered.

Again, Senator INOUYE and I invite our friends to bring amendments to the floor now so that we might consider adopting them at this time.

It is hoped that the consideration of the Defense appropriations bill can be completed early next week.

We hope it will be by Tuesday so that we can take up one of the other bills. We will have several bills ready to take up by midweek next week. We hope to be able to get to them and get them to conference before the Fourth of July recess.

We thank our colleagues for their cooperation on this bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator JOHN KERRY, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to be absent from the service of the Senate on Friday, June 9—today—due to family illness.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4576, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Grassley amendment No. 3279, to require the Department of Defense to match certain disbursements with obligations prior to payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate on amendment No. 3279 with the time equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume, obviously up to the limit, but I will not use all of it.

I will make a few brief remarks about the pending amendment which I laid down last night and spoke shortly on that particular time. My amendment requires the Department of Defense to match disbursements with obligations before making payments.

I know this sounds like commonsense stuff—it is really basic accounting 101—but it goes to a very major problem we have within the Department of Defense. They don't always make payments based on invoices. They don't always match the check being mailed out for certain goods or services received.

I am sure my colleagues must be wondering why the Senator from Iowa has to offer an amendment such as this. They must be asking themselves this question: Isn't DOD already doing it?

Unfortunately, the fact remains that the Pentagon bureaucrats are not doing it.

Businesses do it on a routine basis. And most citizens do it, too. You just don't write out a check and pay a bill until you are absolutely certain that you owe the money. You must first verify that you have a legitimate obligation to pay the bill. And you have enough money in the bank to cover it.

This amendment and device that has been used now for several years to try to straighten things out in the Pentagon is a handy device also for deterring fraud. And it helps to prevent mismanagement and other abuses in the Pentagon's vast financial accounts.

This policy has been incorporated in the last six appropriations acts.

Each year we have ratcheted down the threshold or dollar level where the matching must be done.

In 1995, we started out with payments of $5 million.

Each year since then, we have gradually lowered the threshold but always keeping the pressure on for reform.

Last year the Senate voted to lower the threshold to $500,000.

This year—in the amendment—I am recommending that the threshold be maintained at $500,000.

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

I think we should keep it at the current level for another year. I am not sure DOD is ready to move to a lower level—not meaning that it wouldn't be right to move to a lower level. But if they don't have the mechanical capability of moving to a lower level, we want to make sure that we make progress in this area. However, we don't want to hold up the normal way of doing business or the process of doing business in the Defense Department.

The General Accounting Office will look at this issue again and determine when and how the threshold should be lowered in the future, and in future years I would follow their recommendations.

I also take this opportunity to thank my good friend from Alaska, the chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, and my good friend from Hawaii, the ranking minority member, Senator INOUYE, for their support of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

I yield the floor.

If it is the desire that other Members yield back the remainder of their time, I will yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I and Senator INOUYE welcome the cooperation of the Senator from Iowa to keep the current level for next year. We are trying our best to have the ability to take it down to zero in the near future.

For now, we do thank the Senator for once again calling the attention of the Department of Defense to the fact that Congress wants good accounting procedures followed. He is right that this is the procedure followed by profit and nonprofit entities in our country.

I ask my friend if he desires any time.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I join my chairman in supporting the measure.

Mr. STEVENS. With that, I yield back our time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3279. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote ''yea.''

Mr. REID. I announce the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) is absent because of family illness.

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—88

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bunning	Kerry	Rockefeller
Conrad	McCain	Torricelli
Domenici	Murray	Voinovich
Hollings	Nickles	Wellstone

The amendment (No. 3279) was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from North Carolina has an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair and the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to deliver my remarks from my desk.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3280

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on bringing peace to Chechnya)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask it be read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 3280:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BRINGING PEACE TO CHECHNYA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Senate of the United States unanimously passed Senate Resolution 262 on February 24th, 2000, which condemned the indiscriminate use of force by the Government of the Russian Federation against the people of Chechnya and called for peace negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected Government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate received credible evidence reporting that Russian forces in Chechnya caused the deaths of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 other residents of Chechnya and committed widespread atrocities, including summary executions, torture, and rape;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation continues its military campaign in Chechnya, including using indiscriminate force, causing further dislocation of people from their homes, the deaths of noncombatants, and widespread suffering;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to participate in peace negotiations with the democratically elected government of Chechnya;

(5) the war in Chechnya contributes to ethnic hatred and religious intolerance within the Russian Federation, jeopardizes prospects for the establishment of democracy in the Russian Federation, and is a threat to the peace in the region; and

(6) it is in the interests of the United States to promote a cease-fire in Chechnya and negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected government of Chechnya that result in a just and lasting peace;

(7) representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya, including his foreign minister, have traveled to the United States to facilitate an immediate cease-fire to the conflict in Chechnya and the initiation of peace negotiations between Russian and Chechen forces;

(8) the Secretary of State and other senior United States Government officials have refused to meet with representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya to discuss proposals for an immediate cease-fire between Chechen and Russian forces and for peace negotiations; and

(9) the Senate expresses its concern over the war and the humanitarian tragedy in Chechnya and its desire for a peaceful and durable settlement to the conflict.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation should immediately—

(A) cease its military operations in Chechnya and participate in negotiations toward a just peace with the leadership of the Chechen Government led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(B) allow into and around Chechnya international missions to monitor and report on the situation there and to investigate alleged atrocities and war crimes; and

(C) grant international humanitarian agencies full and unimpeded access to Chechen civilians, including those in refugee, detention, and so-called ''filtration camps'', or any other facility where citizens of Chechnya are detained;

(2) the Secretary of State should meet with representatives of the government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov to discuss its proposals to initiate a cease-fire in the war in Chechnya and to facilitate the provision of humanitarian assistance to the victims of this tragic conflict; and

(3) the President of the United States, in structuring United States policy toward the Russian Federation, should take into consideration the refusal of the Government of the Russian Federation to cease its military operations in Chechnya and to participate in peace negotiations with the government of Chechnya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. First of all, I compliment the distinguished clerk because there was a name or two that was difficult to pronounce. I probably will have the same difficulty. In any case, I wanted the amendment to be read to serve notice that this is a matter of great importance and one that bothers me tremendously.

It grew out of a meeting yesterday morning with Mr. Ilyas Akhmadov, the Foreign Minister of Chechnya, who represents Chechnya's democratically elected President. He is visiting Washington hoping to discuss with the Clinton administration his government's efforts to bring an immediate cease-fire to the brutal war that has wrought so much misery and destruction upon the Chechen people. His proposals to achieve a cease-fire and peace negotiations deserve close consideration by Russia and, indeed, the entire international community.

I find it incredible that Mr. Akhmadov's requests for a meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and other senior U.S. Government officials have been flatly rejected. As a matter of fact, I resent the fact that they conducted themselves as they did because this is an outrage.

The United States should be working to facilitate peace in Chechnya, not to encourage the Kremlin to further its brutal campaign against the Chechen people.

There is simply no excuse for the Secretary of State to refuse even to meet with Mr. Akhmadov. Any meeting to discuss the democratically elected Government to Chechnya's legitimate peace proposal would not constitute a de facto recognition of Chechen independence. And the Secretary of State and others know that.

But this refusal even to meet with Mr. Akhmadov will certainly be interpreted, by Russia's President Putin, as yet another green light from the Clinton-GORE administration to continue its indiscriminate campaign of violence against the Chechen people—a campaign that has led to the death, starvation, and torture of countless of innocent people in Chechnya.

In our meeting yesterday morning, Mr. Akhmadov and I discussed the atrocities that Russian forces are committing against the Chechen population. He shared with me, with tears in his eyes—and these were not pretended tears; this man was almost distraught about what is happening to his people—he gave me a grim picture of life in Chechnya under the repeated and indiscriminate assault by the Russian military.

Countless families continue to be bombed out of their homes. Chechens are still rounded up and sent to what are called ''filtration camps'' where they are tortured, raped, and then executed.

For too long, our President has refused to use his power and influence to pressure the Kremlin into genuine negotiations to end the bloody conflict in Chechnya which already has cost countless thousands of lives of men, women, and children.

Aside from empty rhetoric from the administration, not one finger has been lifted to make clear the outrage of the United States at the atrocities committed by Russian forces against innocent Chechen civilians.

Worse still, the administration has even legitimized Russia's military campaign in Chechnya with public declarations comparing this conflict to the Civil War in the United States.

For this reason, I submit this amendment to the Defense authorization bill. It calls upon the Kremlin to cease immediately its military operations in Chechnya.

It calls upon the Kremlin to grant international humanitarian organizations access to the victims of this conflict and do it immediately. And, this amendment calls upon Secretary of State Albright to meet with Mr. Akmadov to at least consider his proposal to bring an end to this terrible war in Chechnya.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this, and I will not take any length of time. I think we are on the Defense appropriations bill. I don't know whether his intent was to offer this on Defense authorization or Defense appropriations. My colleague does not have to rise.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am absolutely amazed that any Senate Democrat, particularly my long-time friend from Connecticut, would talk about offering legislation on appropriations bills. I hope he won't take this further because I will cite hundreds of instances in the last 2 years where his side has bollixed up the operation of the Senate.

Mr. DODD. My colleague said he was amending the Defense authorization bill. This is the Defense appropriations bill. I just wondered if he was clear as to what bill we were dealing with at this moment.

Mr. HELMS. Let me tell you something, my friend. I will put this amendment on anything I can, if it does one ounce of benefit for the Chechen people.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that.

Mr. HELMS. And if it will encourage your President to at least stop some of his other activities and look at what is happening over there.

Mr. DODD. I had not seen the proposal that my good friend and colleague from North Carolina offered, but he made two observations. I don't disagree with the substance of his sense-of-the-Senate resolution, whether it is on an authorization bill or an appropriations bill. This body has spoken out unanimously expressing outrage over the atrocities in Chechnya.

I will say, on behalf of the Secretary of State and the President, that this matter has been raised by them with their counterparts at the highest levels, including a summit a few days ago when the President met with President Putin in Russia. I know the Secretary of State has raised it on numerous occasions in conversations I have had with her and others have had in hearings.

There is a sense, somewhat, of redundancy here, in that all of us have expressed this view, at the executive branch level and at the legislative branch level. I think the word has certainly gone forth directly to Mr. Putin on behalf of the President of the United States through our Department of State and through resolutions passed here.

I have no objection at all to the resolution and don't disagree with any of the substance of it. But Madeleine Albright has conducted herself admirably in this regard, as has the President. We all hope the tragedy there will end and a political resolution will be what results from their efforts, and that the atrocities will stop.

It is obviously up to the floor managers on how they want to consider this, but I don't have any objection to it being on this bill or any other bill. I just wanted to make an observation. That was all I was trying to suggest to my friend and colleague. I do believe that Madeleine Albright and the President have done a good job expressing how all Americans feel about this. Nonetheless, we will support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut. I know he is sincere in every word he says. But let me tell him what my friend and his friend, Madeleine Albright's crowd, did down at the State Department. This gentleman with whom I met yesterday was told: Well, we will send some functionary from the State Department to meet you in a restaurant somewhere, but we will not meet with you at the State Department. Now, come on; that is the worst example of ''get aside, we

are not interested in you'' to the Chechen people. I resent it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3280.

The amendment (No. 3280) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes as in morning business.

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

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking Democrat for their patience.

Every day that we have been in session over the last several weeks, the Democratic leader or his designees have identified those people who on this date in the year past lost their lives to gun violence in the United States. It is a way in which we have tried to highlight the significance of this issue. We have talked about Columbine High School and the tragedy of people losing their lives on that day.

The point the leader and those of us who support his efforts in the area of gun control have tried to make is that every single day in this country, there is a Columbine High School, and there has been for some time. So today, in that spirit of reminding our colleagues and the country again of the ongoing tragedy that occurs every single day in the United States, I will read the names of those people who on June 9, 1999, all across our country, lost their lives.

This is not the complete list in that this list only represents 100 cities with a population of more than 12,000 people. There are many other communities for which we don't have data.

The names are the following: Humberto Albear, Houston, TX; Jeffrey Barbush, St. Louis, MO; Guido Colomo, Houston, TX; Maria Cruz, Philadelphia, PA; Bernard Freeman, Chicago, IL; Scott Hawkins, Baltimore, MD; Robert Koch, Davenport, IA; Johnnie Martin, Chicago, IL; Martin Mendoza, Memphis, TN; Terrance Morrison, Boston, MA; John Rice, Philadelphia, PA; Gerardo Rios, Charlotte, NC; Cherie Shaw, Charlotte, NC; Chon Tang, Houston, TX; Tracy Taylor, Chicago, IL; Oscar J. Tunales, Laredo, TX; unidentified male, Norfolk, VA.

Mr. President, the violence still continues in this country. While there is no simple answer, including gun control, there are many other aspects that provoke and cause this level of violence. There are several measures that could be adopted by the Congress that would reduce this wave that continues every single day in our country.

In memory of these 17 people and more—I assume, since we do not reflect communities of 12,000 or more who lost their lives, that almost that many will lose their lives today somewhere in this country—it is our fervent hope that we will do a better job in reducing this level of violence in our country.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, when we were debating the authorization bill earlier this week, it had come to my attention that there would be an amendment offered dealing with the testing program of the National Missile Defense System and that some criticism was going to be cited in support of that amendment attributed to Mr. Ted Postol, who is a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

That amendment has not yet been offered. We are now on the appropriations bill. I expect we will hear, during the debate on this bill, suggestions that we are either appropriating too much money for national missile defense or the program is flawed or in other ways criticism of this program on various—some imagined, some maybe real—bases, complaining about the national missile defense appropriations and theater missile defense appropriations contained in this bill.

I am rising today almost as a preemptive debate against these criticisms which I expect will be made by some Senators. They will use Mr. Ted Postol from MIT as the authority for their arguments. So I wish to give the Senate some background, particularly in view of the New York Times article this morning as an example of merchandising, again, of a lot of these arguments that have been made by Mr. Postol.

On May 11, Mr. Ted Postol, a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, wrote to a number of Clinton administration officials claiming to have discovered evidence that the National Missile Defense system now being tested will be easily defeated by simple countermeasures, that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's own data proved this, and that BMDO and its contractors conspired to hide this information by tampering with flight test data. Mr. Postol also claimed that BMDO had altered the National Missile Defense flight test program in order to hide the truths he claimed to have discovered.

Mr. Postol says he discovered the fatal weakness in the NMD system after studying BMDO data from Integrated Flight Test 1A, which was conducted in June, 1997, and was a test of a prototype kill vehicle built by the Boeing Company for the NMD interceptor missile. The test was not an attempt to destroy the target, but only to understand the seeker's performance. It was intended specifically to understand how well the infrared sensor on the kill vehicle performed, compared to expectations, when it encountered a target warhead and a number of decoys and other penetration aids.

Mr. Postol contends that the results of Flight Test 1A showed that the NMD kill vehicle could not distinguish between a simple balloon decoy and an actual warhead, and that the entire test program, beginning with Integrated Flight Test 2, was restructured using far simpler targets to cover up this deficiency in the capacity of the vehicle to operate properly.

This contention by Mr. Postol is just not true. The facts are that Flight Test 1A involved a kill vehicle built by the Boeing Company. Flight Test 2 was conducted with a kill vehicle built by Raytheon, and used exactly the same target complex as Flight Test 1A, contrary to Mr. Postol's claims. Simpler targets were used in Flight Tests 3 and 4 because these tests had different objectives. Flight Tests 1A and 2 were intended to characterize the performance of the competing seekers; Flight test 3 was the first attempt to intercept and destroy a target warhead. Just as testing of any new aircraft begins with a taxi test, then a simple takeoff and landing, the first NMD intercept testing began with a single warhead accompanied by a balloon decoy. Subsequent tests will become progressively more difficult, an approach which follows the recommendations of a panel of experts headed by retired Air Force Chief of Staff Larry Welch. In fact, the Welch panel recommended that the Defense Department attempt its first intercept without countermeasures of any kind, in order to begin the testing as simply as possible, but BMDO believed it was worth the risk to attempt a more complicated test.

Mr. Postol appears to be unaware that the Boeing kill vehicle is no longer being used in the flight test program. The competing kill vehicle built by Raytheon, which has independently developed software, was selected for the NMD system and has been used in every test since Flight Test 1A.

Mr. Postol claims to have discovered in the data from Flight Test 1A that—and I quote—''the Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) will be defeated by the simplest of balloon decoys.'' The fact is that in Flight Test 3, on October 2, 1999, exactly the opposite happened, when the EKV disregarded a balloon decoy and successfully destroyed its target.

This isn't the first time Mr. Postol has been notoriously wrong about our missile defense program. In 1994, when the United States was preparing to conduct the first flight test of its Theater High Altitude Area Defense—or THAAD—system, he and some of his

colleagues at MIT, in an article in Arms Control Today, claimed to have demonstrated that theater missile defenses like THAAD would—and I quote—''almost certainly have significant capabilities against strategic RVs [reentry vehicles]'' and that any agreement permitting such capabilities would—I quote—''significantly erode the ability of the ABM Treaty to control strategic defenses by allowing systems that could defend areas of tens of thousands of square kilometers.''

As it turns out, in spite of that suggestion by Mr. Postol and his colleagues from MIT, even the government of Russia never complained about THAAD or similar systems which Mr. Postol said would so upset the strategic balance. And when other technical experts challenged his conclusions, Mr. Postol adopted the tactics of questioning the competence and integrity of his critics. A technical team under contract to the Defense Department reviewed Mr. Postol's THAAD findings and found they contained errors. Mr. Postol's response was to write a series of letters to government officials, accusing the technical team whose findings differed from his of ''spreading false and misleading information'' that ''impugns the scholarly reputation of myself and my colleagues.'' He accused the general officer heading the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization of mismanagement and of ''providing false information to members of the Russian Duma'' in an attempt to—in his words—''influence the Russian debate through subterfuge.'' Mr. Postol demanded that the Defense Department retract its study and issue a letter acknowledging its errors. DoD did none of this because they were right all along and it was Postol and his MIT colleagues who were wrong again.

Two years later, in 1996, Mr. Postol's campaign against missile defenses had taken a new approach. In addition to arguing that systems like THAAD would undermine the Russian strategic deterrent, Mr. Postol argued that they would be easily defeated by countermeasures. He said in effect that U.S. TMD systems were so good that they would threaten the Russian strategic force and at the same time so bad that they could be easily defeated by even the simplest of countermeasures. Both those claims could not be true.

Nonetheless, Mr. Postol continued to promote this argument, and created detailed drawings illustrating how an aspiring missile power might go about deploying countermeasures to U.S. defensive systems. These ideas were elaborated in an 80 page document which Mr. Postol distributed widely and which was eventually made available on the internet, so that anyone—including those who would benefit most from measures that could defeat U.S. weapon systems—could obtain it.

The claims that Theater Missile Defenses would both threaten deterrence and at the same time be overwhelmed by simple countermeasures is now being made by Postol and his co-authors for National Missile Defense. He is arguing that any nation which can build a long-range ballistic missile can necessarily build in measures that will allow it to penetrate missile defenses.

At the same time, these scientists believe, or say they believe, that deployment of a limited NMB system—even though they believe they can scientifically prove it will not work—will cause Russia to maintain higher force levels and China to construct a strategic buildup. All of this is contained in an elaborate, glossy, 175-page document which Mr. Postol and his colleagues have distributed widely.

It is relatively easy to conceive of devices that are theoretically possible using scientific principles. The best science fiction employs just such an approach. But it is another thing altogether to transform those concepts from the realm of ideas into hardware. Actually engineering a complex device like a weapon system is far different from merely imagining it. For every idea that is transformed into hardware and subjected to the real world's trials, many others, thought up by smart people with Ph.D.s from the best universities, are discarded as impractical. Countermeasures are no less subject to this reality than are the weapon systems they are intended to frustrate. Imagining is one thing; designing, building and testing is quite another.

Countermeasures aren't free. Every countermeasures which someone attempts to put on a ballistic missile costs real money. Countermeasures also consume weight and space, which mean lowered performance or less payload. Countermeasures introduce complexity, which means more things can go wrong and engineers must spend more time trying to ensure they go right. Engineers trying to perfect countermeasures are diverted from other activities they could be working on, such as extending a missile's range or improving its reliability. In short, successful pursuit of countermeasures means sacrificing something else, and some may not choose to make that sacrifice.

Countermeasures are an issue that must be taken seriously by the designers of our missile defense systems. And, fortunately, they are. Whether the weapon is an artillery piece or a ballistic missile, it will have to confront efforts to counter it. In fact, missile defense is itself a countermeasure to the ballistic missile. Missile defense should not be abandoned because of the probability that someone will attempt to develop a countermeasure. The talented men and women of our National Missile Defense program—who are operating in the real world in which ideas must be translated into hardware that works—are anticipating and preparing for countermeasures. This is a point that has apparently been lost on Mr. Postol and his concerned colleagues, who would have us believe that new capabilities materialize because they can imagine them.

I believe we are going to see more not less criticism as we move forward to implement the provisions of Public Law 106–38 and deploy our national missile defense system. Some of the critics have impressive academic credentials. Fortunately, however, people who are impressive experts in the design and construction of our modern weapons are working hard to carry out the mandates of our government to build missile defense systems that will protect our country and all our American citizens.

An interesting article was published this week in the June 5 issue of National Review, written by John O'Sullivan, entitled ''By Winding Stair,'' which discusses missile defenses and its antagonists. This is an interesting article and is relevant to the subject I have discussed. I ask unanimous consent a copy of that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BY WINDING STAIR

(By John O'Sullivan)

Although at a glacial speed, and obstructed at every stage by the Clinton administration, America is moving steadily toward the deployment of a national system of missile defense. Public opinion has always been in favor of a commonsense protection against missile attacks from rogue states or accidental launches. Most Americans believe, indeed, that they already enjoy such a defense and are shocked when pollsters inform them otherwise. It was the politicians who needed convincing.

A growing sense of U.S. vulnerability led Congress to pass legislation in May 1999 mandating the deployment of a limited national missile-defense system as soon as technically possible. President Clinton signed the legislation, though he continues to drag his feet, insisting that a final decision to deploy will not be made until later this year on the basis of interceptor tests. Given that 2000 is an election year, however, and that there is growing bipartisan support for a decision to deploy, it looks a foregone conclusion.

If this progress is a reminder of Bacon's dictum that ''all rising to a great place is by winding stair,'' it is at least spiraling in the right direction. But among America's NATO allies, a very different mood prevails. Europe as a whole has not fundamentally rethought its view of missile defense since the morning after Ronald Reagan's ''Star Wars'' speech, when it collectively decided that such schemes were technically impractical, strategically destabilizing, and a threat to arms control. To these earlier criticisms it now adds the post-Cold War complaint that an American decision to build missile defenses would alienate the Russians. Thus, Europeans on the NATO conference circuit regularly snipe at the proposed U.S. missile defense.

What is curious about this frozen attitude is not so much that it neglects the new risks from rogue states as that it ignores the fact that they especially threaten Europe. As seasoned defense expert William Schneider Jr. points out: ''Current developments will enable proliferators in the Middle East and Asia to place all of Europe within range of ballistic missiles [possibly armed with mass-destruction warheads] within five years.'' And this threat is growing—with 36 nations possessing ballistic missiles, 17 nations thought to have chemical- and/or biological-warfare programs, 8 nations certainly owning nuclear weapons, and 4 nations believed to be ''of nuclear-proliferation concern.'' Unfortunately for Europe, three of these last four are Iran, Iraq, and Libya, all on the periphery of the continent.

When such inconvenient facts are pointed out—and they seldom are—Europeans take refuge in the argument that deterrence will protect them against minor rogue states even more securely than it did against the mighty Soviet Union. Now, deterrence may well work for the major powers like Russia and China, which have relatively stable political establishments and a great deal to lose—though it has to fail only once for disaster to occur. But there are a number of reasons for doubting this assurance in other regards. In the first place, deterrence cannot protect against accidental launches, the danger of which increases with proliferation among states that currently operate unsafe airlines. Nor can it protect against a missile launched by a terrorist group with no return address. Nor can it provide a cast-iron defense against the miscalculation of a megalomaniac warlord.

And there is a more subtle danger. Will European nations be prepared to intervene to prevent the spread of Third World conflicts if their intervention provokes threats to retaliate with ballistic missiles? This danger is discussed in ''Coming into Range,'' a report by the all-party Missile Proliferation Study Group in London. As it points out, Britain's defense planners have rightly been praised for their proposed creation of a Joint Rapid Reaction Force, built around two new aircraft carriers. The JRFF is intended to enable Britain to intervene swiftly and in force around the globe, and it is doubtless especially welcome to the Pentagon and the State Department as both potential military assistance and political cover. But the absence of a missile-defense system covering Britain may render the force largely useless. ''The reality,'' says the study group's report, ''is that in the absence of protection the crisis might literally come to us as the result of dispatching our forces to the crisis and, that being so, no decision to deploy those forces could be made.'' And if that is true for Britain, which, like France, still retains a culture of military patriotism, how much more likely it is that largely debellicized nations like Germany and Belgium will shrink from military actions that entail such heavy risks. If Saddam Hussein had had long-range ballistic missiles capable of hitting Berlin, Paris, and London in 1990, how many European nations would have taken part in the Gulf War?

The implications of this for Europe are very serious. If no Western power deploys missile defense, which is what the Europeans now seem to want, then within a short time every NATO member will be a potential target of nuclear, chemical, or biological attack. Yet if only the U.S. has such a system, that might lead to rogue states' threatening to strike at European targets in retaliation for purely American military interventions. In either event, Europeans would be hostages—and the present system of international relations that rests ultimately on the West's willingness to use force would gradually unravel. The logical solution would seem to be an American-led worldwide system of missile defense organized and deployed, at least in part, through NATO.

Why do the Europeans not agitate for this? In part, no doubt, the explanation is intellectual inflexibility. They have been assuring the Americans for so long now, that ''Star Wars'' is a pipe dream that they cannot easily bring themselves to see that it has become a strategic necessity. And since one thread of French foreign policy in recent years has been to restrain what it sees as the overwhelming ''hyper-power'' of the U.S., Paris instinctively opposes anything that buttresses it. The unspoken objection to a missile-defense system is that it would work.

The Europeans' spoken, or admitted, objections are another matter. One is that the continent's governments, especially the Germans, have made arms control an unquestionable desideratum of foreign policy. They are accordingly very reluctant to endorse a policy that requires the rewriting or abandonment of the ABM treaty. It would ease their consciences if the Russians could be induced to go along with any such renegotiation. But the Clinton administration called off negotiations with Moscow on missile-defense cooperation in its first term, and at present it seems to see Mr. Putin as its ally against Congress on the issue. Both the Russians and (therefore) the Germans can probably be won over by a sufficiently determined president and a few sweeteners. But that probably requires a new man in the White House.

The other big problem is the nexus of money and the European Security and Defense Policy. The ESDP is a non-solution to a non-existent problem. It has no military value, but has the potential to divide the NATO alliance. In their zeal for Euro-integration, the Europeans have committed themselves to it, and the Americans, not wishing to confirm the French stereotype of a hegemonic Uncle Sam, have grudgingly gone along. Useless though it is, the ESDP will cost money at a time when the Europeans have very little to spare—indeed, the budgetary rules of the Maastricht treaty actually prevent their increasing defense expenditure. So there is great reluctance to consider any other program, in particular anything as costly as a NATO missile defense, even though, unlike the ESDP, it would actually provide Europe with more defense.

Of course, there are hopeful signs. Realization of their vulnerability is finally beginning to dawn on the British—notably on defense secretary Geoff Hoon. Because the U.S. wants to use British facilities such as the Fylingdales Early Warning Station in its own system, London sees the prospect of Anglo-American cooperation in return for military contracts and a share of the anti-missile umbrella. And much would change in NATO, as it did in 1981, if the next president proved to be a determined advocate of missile defense. After all, the Europeans have not been the only skeptics. Missile defense has had to contend with a hostile White House since 1993.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Chairman of the Budget Committee, who is necessarily absent, I submit his budget statement and scoring table on S. 2593, the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

I support S. 2593, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. As scored by the Congressional Budget Office without any further adjustments, the pending bill provides $287.6 billion in total budget authority and $178.9 billion in new outlays for the Department of Defense and related activities. When adjusted for outlays from prior years, the bill totals $277.2 billion in outlays.

The bill, as reported, is consistent with the level of budget authority made available by the 2001 congressional budget resolution. It is also within the allocation of budget authority and outlays made available pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

S. 2593 provides a 2.4 percent increase in overall procurement spending, a 4.5 percent increase in research and development, and a 0.4 percent increase in Operations and Maintenance.

I support this bill, and I urge its adoption. I want to complement the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his work on this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Senate Budget Committee table displaying the budget impact of this bill be placed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2593, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2001, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority	287,415	216	287,631
Outlays	276,959	216	277,175
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	287,415	216	287,631
Outlays	279,578	216	279,794
2000 level:			
Budget authority	268,605	209	268,814
Outlays	261,933	209	262,142
President's request:			
Budget authority	284,305	216	284,521
Outlays	275,871	216	276,087
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	−2,619	.....	−2,619
2000 level:			
Budget authority	18,810	7	18,817
Outlays	15,026	7	15,033
President's request:			
Budget authority	3,110	.....	3,110
Outlays	1,088	.....	1,088

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous

consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

GRADUATING PAGES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the spring 2000 graduating Page class. They have been an integral part of the everyday proceedings of the U.S. Senate and without their hard work and dedication this deliberative body would not be able to complete our work in a timely manner. Throughout the year young men and women come to Washington, D.C. from all parts of the nation to serve a vital role as Pages in the U.S. Senate. During the spring and fall these high school students attend the Page School in the early mornings and continue their day as U.S. Senate Pages often working long days and into the night. I must say, this group of Pages was of the highest caliber and are among the best youth our Nation has to offer. At this time, I would like to commend them for their service and enter their names in the RECORD.

Shannon Coe, Ashley Burnett, Kelly Morgan, Shannon Montague, Emily Schlect, Loki Gale Tobin, Kyle Brown, Misty Lebatard, Clinton Lee Johnson Jr., Chase Dubay, Benton Keatley, Anjel Jefferson, Nicole Tailleart, Rebecca Manning, Jean-Paul Isabelle, Andriea Aden, Seema Mittal, James Dolan, Nathaniel Haefs, Hannah Pierson-Compeau, Jay Oliphant, Allison Conley, Megan Gilbert.

MANDATING DISCLOSURE BY SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, I commend Senators LIEBERMAN, MCCAIN, FEINGOLD, DASCHLE and LEVIN for all of their hard work on the issue of Section 527 organizations. This latest mutation in fundraising is just another example of the failure of our existing campaign finance laws.

Hopefully, the passage of our amendment yesterday, which mandates disclosure by Section 527 organizations, will close yet another legal loophole being exploited by clever campaign fundraisers. This amendment should make unregulated and unlimited contributions to these so-called Section 527 committees much less attractive. Although donors will be able to continue to make as many tax-deductible contributions as they want, they will no longer be able to do so in absolute secrecy.

These Section 527 organizations, named after a section of the tax code, skirt existing campaign finance laws by carefully avoiding the endorsement of any particular candidate. This convoluted reasoning proceeds as follows: if a Section 527 committee does not endorse a particular candidate, then it is not engaged in political activity; if it is not engaged in political activity, then there is no requirement for it to disclose who has contributed money to the committee; since it is not engaged in political activity, it can run unlimited issue ads without obeying existing campaign finance laws regarding disclosure.

We all know from past experience that it is just a matter of time before enormous amounts of campaign cash are funneled through more and more of these secret organizations. The amendment which passed yesterday, which I was pleased to cosponsor, will force Section 527 organizations to emerge from the shadows. They will be required to disclose their existence to the IRS, file publicly available tax returns, make public reports specifying annual expenditures over $500, and identify those making contributions of $200 or more a year to the organization.

Although disclosure is only part of the solution, the passage of this amendment ensures that the public understands who these committees are, who gives them their money, and how they spend that money. I was pleased to give it my support.

ACCESS TO INNOVATION FOR MEDICARE PATIENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I think we all recognize that the Medicare Program is outdated. The bill introduced by the Senator from Washington would modernize Medicare's coverage to include new biotechnology innovations. Currently, the Medicare program covers physician-administered therapies that are given in an office by infusion or injection, but not those that are injected by a patient or a caregiver at home. Biotechnology has brought us new innovative biologics that are made with large proteins that are so unlike other drugs that they must be formulated as injectables. Science has allowed us to make many of these new products in the form of simple injections that do not have to be given by a health care professional in a clinical setting.

The bill I have cosponsored today would bring Medicare up to date with these developments by ensuring that new biological therapies are available to Medicare beneficiaries. It just does not make sense to continue Medicare's bias toward treatments that are more expensive and less convenient for patients.

I would like to add one point about the bill's cost. We do not know yet what the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] will determine the estimated cost of this change in Medicare policy will be. I understand the cosponsors of this legislation have requested an estimate from CBO. An analysis by the Lewin Group found that this legislation would not result in increasing the cost to the Medicare program. This finding is not surprising given that the bill would reduce certain costs, such as physician office visits and other expensive services, which would no longer be needed. I am hopeful that the CBO will reach the same conclusion. While it is important to modernize Medicare, it is equally important that we do so in a way that does not weaken the financial strength of the program.

I commend Senator GORTON for his leadership on this legislation. It represents the kind of constructive reform that is needed in the Medicare program; reform that would advance and modernize Medicare without imposing additional costs to the program.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL VALMORO III

• Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of an outstanding American, Mr. Michael Valmoro of Mahwah, New Jersey. Serving his community as a teacher of English, world literature and the works of William Shakespeare at Teaneck High School for the past thirty-eight years, he is one of the longest serving teachers in the history of the New Jersey school system. That tremendous achievement alone is worthy of praise. However, his commitment to his students by opening their young minds to the world's great literature and the genius of William Shakespeare has made him a respected educator and pillar of the community.

Cicero once professed, ''What nobler employment, or more valuable to the state, than that of the man who instructs the rising generation.'' It is clear that Mr. Valmoro has taken Cicero's wisdom to heart during the course of the last four decades, as he has enlightened and inspired the thousands of students fortunate enough to have passed through his classroom.

Whether he was teaching his students to express themselves through creative writing, introducing them to the tragedy of ''Romeo and Juliet'' or reveling in the simple joy found in one of Shakespeare's sonnets, Mr. Valmoro approached each of his lessons with the wisdom and perspective of a scholar and the unbridled enthusiasm of an eager student.

In one of the scenes of ''King Lear,'' the titular monarch asks his audience, ''Who is it who can tell me who I am?'' This question often presents itself to an individual upon the twilight of their career. If the outpouring of accolades, fond reminiscence and affection are any indication, the answer to this probing question for Mr. Valmoro is, an excellent teacher, a trusted mentor, a lover of great literature and an inspiration to his colleagues, students and family.

Throughout his distinguished tenure, Mr. Valmoro has exemplified the ideals which the American people value in their educators. It is with my most sincere congratulations and respect that I recognize him today in the Senate.●

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGE ABRAHAM THAMPY

● Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of George Abraham Thampy, of Maryland Heights, Missouri. George correctly spelled ''demarche'' to win the National Spelling Bee held last week in Washington, D.C. The week prior, George placed second in the National Geography Bee, also held in Washington, D.C.

I would like to offer my congratulations to this young scholar who has worked diligently to not only reach, but also win, the National Spelling Bee. George's performance has been exemplary and I'm confident it will serve to promote a heightened interest in academic achievement. George also tied for fourth place in 1998 and finished in a third place tie last year.

I look forward to the continued success of Missouri home school families such as George's, and hope to continue promoting the kind of freedom that encourages parents to take an active role in guiding the course of their children's education. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, delivered during the adjournment of the Senate, announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. RODRIGUEZ of Texas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 291. An act to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District.

S. 356. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–9179. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9180. A communication from the Director for Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of agreements and transactions relative to acquisition and cross-serving agreements with non-NATO countries for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–9181. A communication from the Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–9182. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the status of activities that respond to the National Transportation Safety Board's recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–9183. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on progress on Superfund implementation in fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9184. A communication from the Administration of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Status of the State Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Programs'' for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9185. A communication from the Chair of the State Energy Advisory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy: A Clean Energy Agenda for the 21st Century''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–9186. A communication from the Chair of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–9187. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the financial audit and financial statement for calendar years 1998 and 1999 for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–9188. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–9189. A communication from the Director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of consolidated financial statements for calendar years 1998 and 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–9190. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to the Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9191. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs for U.S. Agency For International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the accountability report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9192. A communication from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''Auditor's Review of Unauthorized Disbursements From ANC 8B's Checking Account''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9193. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9194. A communication from the Chairman and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting jointly, pursuant to law, the report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9195. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–9196. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment For the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. FRIST):

S. 2710. A bill to recognize the rights of grandparents in cases involving international parental kidnapping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 319. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the

United States, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 320. A resolution to authorize testimony by Senate employee in state administration proceeding; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. Con. Res. 121. A concurrent resolution congratulating Representative Stephen S.F. Chen on the occasion of his retirement from the diplomatic service of Taiwan, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the ''Made in the USA'' label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to expand homeownership in the United States.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1988, a bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

S. 2107

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2107, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 2241

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2241, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust wages and wage-related costs for certain items and services furnished in geographically reclassified hospitals.

S. 2366

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend provisions relating to the Organ Procurement Transplantation Network.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2589

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2589, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require periodic cost of living adjustments to the maximum amount of deposit insurance available under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121—CONGRATULATING REPRESENTATIVE STEPHEN S. F. CHEN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF TAIWAN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 121

Whereas Representative Stephen S. F. Chen has been a member of Taiwan's diplomatic service for forty-seven years;

Whereas Representative Chen has represented Taiwan's interests in such countries as the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, and the United States;

Whereas Representative Chen has held a number of important positions in his government at home, including those of Vice Foreign Minister and Deputy Secretary-General to President Lee Teng-hui;

Whereas Representative Chen's many years of service in the United States include appointments as Taiwan's Consul-General in Atlanta from 1973 to 1979 and as Director of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs in Chicago from 1980 to 1982 and Los Angeles from 1988 to 1989;

Whereas Representative Chen has served with distinction as Taiwan's senior diplomat in the United States since 1997, when he became the Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas Representative Chen has been a friend of the United States and earned the respect and genuine affection of many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Representative Stephen Chen is to be congratulated for his many years of distinguished service to Taiwan and for his friendship to the United States; and

(2) the best wishes of Congress are to be extended to Representative Chen and his family on the occasion of his retirement.

SENATE RESOLUTION 319—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SENATE SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 319

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families, ⅓ of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1544 local affiliates and its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporate status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity will build its 100,000th house worldwide in September 2000 and endeavors to complete another 100,000 homes during the next 5 years.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the first week of June 2000 has been designated as ''National Homeownership Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) the Members of the Senate should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the year between National Homeownership Week 2000 and National Homeownership Week 2001, the Members of the Senate, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the District of Columbia each of which should be known as a ''House That the Senate Built'';

(4) each ''House That the Senate Built'' should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each ''House That the Senate Built'' should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, the Members of the Senate and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 320—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE IN STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 320

Whereas, in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, pending before the Department of Labor, in the County of Sussex, State of Delaware, a subpoena for testimony has been issued to Elinor Hughes, an employee of the Senate on the staff of Senator William V. Roth, Jr.;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that Elinor Hughes is authorized to testify in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED—JUNE 8, 2000

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

SMITH OF OREGON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3247

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BRYAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2549, supra; as follows:

On page 155, line 4, strike ''(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This'' and insert the following:

''(g) VICE CHIEF OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of the advisability of increasing the grade authorized for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau to Lieutenant General.

''(2) As part of the study, the chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an analysis of the functions and responsibilities of the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Chief's recommendation as to whether the grade authorized for the Vice Chief should be increased.

''(3) Not later than February, 1, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the study. The report shall include the following:

''(A) The recommendation of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and any other information provided by the Chief to the Secretary of Defense pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(B) The conclusions resulting from the study.

(C) The Secretary's recommendation regarding whether the grade authorized for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau should be increased to Lieutenant General.

''(h) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Subsection (g) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the Act. Except for that subsection, this''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED—JUNE 9, 2000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2000

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 3280

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BRINGING PEACE TO CHECHNYA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Senate of the United States unanimously passed Senate Resolution 262 on February 24th, 2000, which condemned the indiscriminate use of force by the Government of the Russian Federation against the people of Chechnya and called for peace negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected Government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate received credible evidence reporting that Russian forces in Chechnya caused the deaths of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 other residents of Chechnya and committed widespread atrocities, including summary executions, torture, and rape;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation continues its military campaign in Chechnya, including using indiscriminate force, causing further dislocation of people from their homes, the deaths of noncombatants, and widespread suffering;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to participate in peace negotiations with the democratically elected government of Chechnya;

(5) the war in Chechnya contributes to ethnic hatred and religious intolerance within the Russian Federation, jeopardizes prospects for the establishment of democracy in the Russian Federation, and is a threat to the peace in the region; and

(6) it is in the interests of the United States to promote a cease-fire in Chechnya and negotiations between the Government of

the Russian Federation and the democratically elected government of Chechnya that result in a just and lasting peace;

(7) representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya, including his foreign minister, have traveled to the United States to facilitate an immediate cease-fire to the conflict in Chechnya and the initiation of peace negotiations between Russian and Chechen forces;

(8) the Secretary of State and other senior United States Government officials have refused to meet with representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya to discuss proposals for an immediate cease-fire between Chechen and Russian forces and for peace negotiations; and

(9) the Senate expresses its concern over the war and the humanitarian tragedy in Chechnya and its desire for a peaceful and durable settlement to the conflict.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation should immediately—

(A) cease its military operations in Chechnya and participate in negotiations toward a just peace with the leadership of the Chechen Government led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(B) allow into and around Chechnya international missions to monitor and report on the situation there and to investigate alleged atrocities and war crimes; and

(C) grant international humanitarian agencies full and unimpeded access to Chechen civilians, including those in refugee, detention, and so-called ''filtration camps'', or any other facility where citizens of Chechnya are detained;

(2) the Secretary of State should meet with representatives of the government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov to discuss its proposals to initiate a cease-fire in the war in Chechnya and to facilitate the provision of humanitarian assistance to the victims of this tragic conflict; and

(3) the President of the United States, in structuring United States policy toward the Russian Federation, should take into consideration the refusal of the Government of the Russian Federation to cease its military operations in Chechnya and to participate in peace negotiations with the government of Chechnya.

INTERNET NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2000

JOHNSON AMENDMENT NO. 3281

Mr. JOHNSON proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 3709) to extend for 5 years the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

TITLE XX—LOAN GUARANTEES FOR RURAL TELEVISION

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Launching Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000''.

SEC. ___02. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to facilitate access, on a technologically neutral basis and by December 31, 2006, to signals of local television stations, and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings), for households located in unserved areas and underserved areas.

SEC. ___03. LOCAL TELEVISION LOAN GUARANTEE BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the LOCAL Television Loan Guarantee Board (in this title referred to as the ''Board'').

(b) MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Board shall consist of the following members:

(A) The Secretary of the Treasury, or the designee of the Secretary.

(B) The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the designee of the Chairman.

(C) The Secretary of Agriculture, or the designee of the Secretary.

(2) REQUIREMENT AS TO DESIGNEES.—An individual may not be designated a member of the Board under paragraph (1) unless the individual is an officer of the United States pursuant to an appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall determine whether or not to approve loan guarantees under this title. The Board shall make such determinations consistent with the purpose of this title and in accordance with this subsection and section ___04.

(2) CONSULTATION AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out its functions under this title, the Board shall consult with such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as the Board considers appropriate, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(B) RESPONSE.—A department or agency consulted by the Board under subparagraph (A) shall provide the Board such expertise and assistance as the Board requires to carry out its functions under this title.

(3) APPROVAL BY MAJORITY VOTE.—The determination of the Board to approve a loan guarantee under this title shall be by a vote of a majority of the Board.

SEC. ___04. APPROVAL OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO APPROVE LOAN GUARANTEES.—Subject to the provisions of this section and consistent with the purpose of this title, the Board may approve loan guarantees under this title.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator (as defined in section ___05), under the direction of and for approval by the Board, shall prescribe regulations to implement the provisions of this title and shall do so not later than 120 days after funds authorized to be appropriated under section ___09 have been appropriated in a bill signed into law.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) set forth the form of any application to be submitted to the Board under this title;

(B) set forth time periods for the review and consideration by the Board of applications to be submitted to the Board under this title, and for any other action to be taken by the Board with respect to such applications;

(C) provide appropriate safeguards against the evasion of the provisions of this title;

(D) set forth the circumstances in which an applicant, together with any affiliate of an applicant, shall be treated as an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title;

(E) include requirements that appropriate parties submit to the Board any documents and assurances that are required for the administration of the provisions of this title; and

(F) include such other provisions consistent with the purpose of this title as the Board considers appropriate.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—(A) Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit the Board from requiring, to the extent and under circumstances considered appropriate by the Board, that affiliates of an applicant be subject to certain obligations of the applicant as a condition to the approval or maintenance of a loan guarantee under this title.

(B) If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or entity or circumstance is held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this title, or the application of such provision to such person or entity or circumstance other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

(c) AUTHORITY LIMITED BY APPROPRIATIONS ACTS.—The Board may approve loan guarantees under this title only to the extent provided for in advance in appropriations Acts. The Board may delegate to the Administrator (as defined in section ___05) the authority to approve loan guarantees of up to $20,000,000. To the extent the Administrator is delegated such authority, the Administrator shall comply with the terms of this title applicable to the Board.

(d) REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall utilize the underwriting criteria developed under subsection (g), and any relevant information provided by the departments and agencies with which the Board consults under section ___03, to determine which loans may be eligible for a loan guarantee under this title.

(2) PREREQUISITES.—In addition to meeting the underwriting criteria under paragraph (1), a loan may not be guaranteed under this title unless—

(A) the loan is made to finance the acquisition, improvement, enhancement, construction, deployment, launch, or rehabilitation of the means by which local television broadcast signals, and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings), will be delivered to an unserved area or underserved area;

(B) the proceeds of the loan will not be used for operating expenses;

(C) the proposed project, as determined by the Board in consultation with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, is not likely to have a substantial adverse impact on competition that outweighs the benefits of improving access to the signals of a local television station in an unserved area or underserved area;

(D)(i) the loan (including Other Debt, as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B))—

(I) is provided by any entity engaged in the business of commercial lending—

(aa) if the loan is made in accordance with loan-to-one-borrower and affiliate transaction restrictions to which the entity is subject under applicable law; or

(bb) if item (aa) does not apply, the loan is made only to a borrower that is not an affiliate of the entity and only if the amount of the loan and all outstanding loans by that entity to that borrower and any of its affiliates does not exceed 10 percent of the net equity of the entity; or

(II) is provided by a nonprofit corporation, including the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation, engaged primarily in commercial lending, if the Board determines that such nonprofit corporation has one or more issues of outstanding long-term debt that is rated within the highest 3 rating categories of a nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and, if the Board determines that the making of the loan by such nonprofit corporation will cause a decline in the debt rating mentioned above, the Board at its discretion may disapprove the loan guarantee on this basis;

(ii)(I) no loan (including Other Debt as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B)) may be made for purposes of this Act by a governmental entity or affiliate thereof, or by the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, or any institution supervised by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, the Federal Housing Finance Board, or any affiliate of such entities;

(II) any loan (including Other Debt as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B)) must have terms, in the judgment of the Board, that are consistent in material respects with the terms of similar obligations in the private capital market;

(III) for purposes of clause (i)(I)(bb), the term ''net equity'' means the value of the total assets of the entity, less the total liabilities of the entity, as recorded under generally accepted accounting principles for the fiscal quarter ended immediately prior to the date on which the subject loan is approved;

(E) repayment of the loan is required to be made within a term of the lesser of—

(i) 25 years from the date of the execution of the loan; or

(ii) the economically useful life, as determined by the Board or in consultation with persons or entities deemed appropriate by the Board, of the primary assets to be used in the delivery of the signals concerned; and

(F) the loan meets any additional criteria developed under subsection (g).

(3) PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INTERESTS.—The Board may not approve the guarantee of a loan under this title unless—

(A) the Board has been given documentation, assurances, and access to information, persons, and entities necessary, as determined by the Board, to address issues relevant to the review of the loan by the Board for purposes of this title; and

(B) the Board makes a determination in writing that—

(i) to the best of its knowledge upon due inquiry, the assets, facilities, or equipment covered by the loan will be utilized economically and efficiently;

(ii) the terms, conditions, security, and schedule and amount of repayments of principal and the payment of interest with respect to the loan protect the financial interests of the United States and are reasonable;

(iii) to the extent possible, the value of collateral provided by an applicant is at least equal to the unpaid balance of the loan amount covered by the loan guarantee (the ''Amount'' for purposes of this clause); and if the value of collateral provided by an applicant is less than the Amount, the additional required collateral is provided by any affiliate of the applicant; and if the combined value of collateral provided by an applicant and any affiliate is not at least equal to the Amount, the collateral from such affiliate represents all of such affiliate's assets;

(iv) all necessary and required regulatory and other approvals, spectrum rights, and delivery permissions have been received for the loan, the project under the loan, and the Other Debt, if any, under subsection (f)(2)(B);

(v) the loan would not be available on reasonable terms and conditions without a loan guarantee under this title; and

(vi) repayment of the loan can reasonably be expected.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) TYPE OF MARKET.—

(A) PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Board shall give priority in the approval of loan guarantees under this title in the following order: First, to projects that will serve the greatest number of households in unserved areas and the number of States (including noncontiguous States); and second, to projects that will serve the greatest number of households in underserved areas. In each instance, the Board shall consider the project's efficiency in providing service given the area to be served.

(B) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Board should give additional consideration to projects which also provide related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings).

(C) PROHIBITION.—The Board may not approve a loan guarantee under this title for a project that is designed primarily to serve 1 or more of the 40 most populated designated market areas (as that term is defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code).

(2) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—The Board shall consider other factors, which shall include projects that would—

(A) offer a separate tier of local broadcast signals, but for applicable Federal, State, or local laws or regulations;

(B) provide lower projected costs to consumers of such separate tier; and

(C) enable the delivery of local broadcast signals consistent with the purpose of this title by a means reasonably compatible with existing systems or devices predominantly in use.

(f) GUARANTEE LIMITS.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE VALUE OF LOANS.—The aggregate value of all loans for which loan guarantees are issued under this title (including the unguaranteed portion of loans issued under paragraph (2)(A)) and Other Debt under paragraph (2)(B) may not exceed $1,250,000,000.

(2) GUARANTEE LEVEL.—A loan guarantee issued under this title—

(A) may not exceed an amount equal to 80 percent of a loan meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A). If only a portion of a loan meets the requirements of that subsection, the Board shall determine that percentage of the loan meeting such requirements (the ''applicable portion'') and may issue a loan guarantee in an amount not exceeding 80 percent of the applicable portion; or

(B) may, as to a loan meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A), cover the amount of such loan only if that loan is for an amount not exceeding 80 percent of the total debt financing for the project, and other debt financing (also meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A)) from the same source for a total amount not less than 20 percent of the total debt financing for the project (''Other Debt'') has been approved.

(g) UNDERWRITING CRITERIA.—Within the period provided for under subsection (b)(1), the Board shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and an independent public accounting firm, develop underwriting criteria relating to the guarantee of loans that are consistent with the purpose of this title, including appropriate collateral and cash flow levels for loans guaranteed under this Act, and such other matters as the Board considers appropriate.

(h) CREDIT RISK PREMIUMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Board may establish and approve the acceptance of credit risk premiums with respect to a loan guarantee under this title in order to cover the cost, as determined under section 504(b)(1) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of the loan guarantee. To the extent that appropriations of budget authority are insufficient to cover the cost, as so determined, of a loan guarantee under this title, credit risk premiums shall be accepted from a non-Federal source under this subsection on behalf of the applicant for the loan guarantee.

(2) CREDIT RISK PREMIUM AMOUNT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall determine the amount of any credit risk premium to be accepted with respect to a loan guarantee under this title on the basis of—

(i) the financial and economic circumstances of the applicant for the loan guarantee, including the amount of collateral offered;

(ii) the proposed schedule of loan disbursements;

(iii) the business plans of the applicant for providing service;

(iv) any financial commitment from a broadcast signal provider; and

(v) the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as to the amount of the credit risk premium.

(B) PROPORTIONALITY.—To the extent that appropriations of budget authority are sufficient to cover the cost, as determined under section 504(b)(1) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loan guarantees under this title, the credit risk premium with respect to each loan guarantee shall be reduced proportionately.

(C) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—Credit risk premiums under this subsection shall be paid to an account (the ''Escrow Account'') established in the Treasury which shall accrue interest and such interest shall be retained by the account, subject to subparagraph (D).

(D) DEDUCTIONS FROM ESCROW ACCOUNT.—If a default occurs with respect to any loan guaranteed under this title and the default is not cured in accordance with the terms of the underlying loan or loan guarantee agreement, the Administrator, in accordance with subsections (h) and (i) of section ___05, shall liquidate, or shall cause to be liquidated, all assets collateralizing such loan as to which it has a lien or security interest. Any shortfall between the proceeds of the liquidation net of costs and expenses relating to the liquidation, and the guarantee amount paid pursuant to this title shall be deducted from funds in the Escrow Account and credited to the Administrator for payment of such shortfall. At such time as determined under subsection (d)(2)(E) when all loans guaranteed under this title have been repaid or otherwise satisfied in accordance with this title and the regulations promulgated hereunder, remaining funds in the Escrow Account, if any, shall be refunded, on a pro rata basis, to applicants whose loans guaranteed under this title were not in default, or where any default was cured in accordance with the terms of the underlying loan or loan guarantee agreement.

(i) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The decision of the Board to approve or disapprove the making of a loan guarantee under this title shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. ___05. ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service (in this Act referred to as the ''Administrator'') shall issue and otherwise administer loan guarantees that have been approved by the Board in accordance with sections ___03 and ___04.

(b) SECURITY FOR PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INTERESTS.—

(1) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An applicant shall agree to such terms and conditions as are satisfactory, in the judgment of the Board, to ensure that, as long as any principal or interest is due and payable on a loan guaranteed under this title, the applicant—

(A) shall maintain assets, equipment, facilities, and operations on a continuing basis;

(B) shall not make any discretionary dividend payments that impair its ability to repay obligations guaranteed under this title; and

(C) shall remain sufficiently capitalized.

(2) COLLATERAL.—

(A) EXISTENCE OF ADEQUATE COLLATERAL.—An applicant shall provide the Board such documentation as is necessary, in the judgment of the Board, to provide satisfactory evidence that appropriate and adequate collateral secures a loan guaranteed under this title.

(B) FORM OF COLLATERAL.—Collateral required by subparagraph (A) shall consist solely of assets of the applicant, any affiliate of the applicant, or both (whichever the Board considers appropriate), including primary assets to be used in the delivery of signals for which the loan is guaranteed.

(C) REVIEW OF VALUATION.—The value of collateral securing a loan guaranteed under this title may be reviewed by the Board, and may be adjusted downward by the Board if the Board reasonably believes such adjustment is appropriate.

(3) LIEN ON INTERESTS IN ASSETS.—Upon the Board's approval of a loan guarantee under this title, the Administrator shall have liens on assets securing the loan, which shall be superior to all other liens on such assets, and the value of the assets (based on a determination satisfactory to the Board) subject to the liens shall be at least equal to the unpaid balance of the loan amount covered by the loan guarantee, or that value approved by the Board under section ___04(d)(3)(B)(iii).

(4) PERFECTED SECURITY INTEREST.—With respect to a loan guaranteed under this title, the Administrator and the lender shall have a perfected security interest in assets securing the loan that are fully sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and the lender.

(5) INSURANCE.—In accordance with practices in the private capital market, as determined by the Board, the applicant for a loan guarantee under this title shall obtain, at its expense, insurance sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States, as determined by the Board.

(c) ASSIGNMENT OF LOAN GUARANTEES.—The holder of a loan guarantee under this title may assign the loan guaranteed under this title in whole or in part, subject to such requirements as the Board may prescribe.

(d) MODIFICATION.—The Board may approve the modification of any term or condition of a loan guarantee or a loan guaranteed under this title, including the rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest, or security requirements only if—

(1) the modification is consistent with the financial interests of the United States;

(2) consent has been obtained from the parties to the loan agreement;

(3) the modification is consistent with the underwriting criteria developed under section ___04(g);

(4) the modification does not adversely affect the interest of the Federal Government in the assets or collateral of the applicant;

(5) the modification does not adversely affect the ability of the applicant to repay the loan; and

(6) the National Telecommunications and Information Administration has been consulted by the Board regarding the modification.

(e) PERFORMANCE SCHEDULES.—

(1) PERFORMANCE SCHEDULES.—An applicant for a loan guarantee under this title for a project covered by section ___04(e)(1) shall enter into stipulated performance schedules with the Administrator with respect to the signals to be provided through the project.

(2) PENALTY.—The Administrator may assess against and collect from an applicant described in paragraph (1) a penalty not to exceed 3 times the interest due on the guaranteed loan of the applicant under this title if the applicant fails to meet its stipulated performance schedule under that paragraph.

(f) COMPLIANCE.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Board and as the regulations of the Board may provide, shall enforce compliance by an applicant, and any other party to a loan guarantee for whose benefit assistance under this title is intended, with the provisions of this title, any regulations under this title, and the terms and conditions of the loan guarantee, including through the submittal of such reports and documents as the Board may require in regulations prescribed by the Board and through regular periodic inspections and audits.

(g) COMMERCIAL VALIDITY.—A loan guarantee under this title shall be incontestable—

(1) in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf the loan guarantee is made, unless the applicant engaged in fraud or misrepresentation in securing the loan guarantee; and

(2) as to any person or entity (or their respective successor in interest) who makes or contracts to make a loan to the applicant for the loan guarantee in reliance thereon, unless such person or entity (or respective successor in interest) engaged in fraud or misrepresentation in making or contracting to make such loan.

(h) DEFAULTS.—The Board shall prescribe regulations governing defaults on loans guaranteed under this title, including the administration of the payment of guaranteed amounts upon default.

(i) RECOVERY OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall be entitled to recover from an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title the amount of any payment made to the holder of the guarantee with respect to the loan.

(2) SUBROGATION.—Upon making a payment described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall be subrogated to all rights of the party to whom the payment is made with respect to the guarantee which was the basis for the payment.

(3) DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—

(A) SALE OR DISPOSAL.—The Administrator shall, in an orderly and efficient manner, sell or otherwise dispose of any property or other interests obtained under this title in a manner that maximizes taxpayer return and is consistent with the financial interests of the United States.

(B) MAINTENANCE.—The Administrator shall maintain in a cost-effective and reasonable manner any property or other interests pending sale or disposal of such property or other interests under subparagraph (A).

(j) ACTION AGAINST OBLIGOR.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO BRING CIVIL ACTION.—The Administrator may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States in the name of the United States or of the holder of the obligation in the event of a default on a loan guaranteed under this title. The holder of a loan guarantee shall make available to the Administrator all records and evidence necessary to prosecute the civil action.

(2) FULLY SATISFYING OBLIGATIONS OWED THE UNITED STATES.—The Administrator may accept property in satisfaction of any sums owed the United States as a result of a default on a loan guaranteed under this title, but only to the extent that any cash accepted by the Administrator is not sufficient to satisfy fully the sums owed as a result of the default.

(k) BREACH OF CONDITIONS.—The Administrator shall commence a civil action in a court of appropriate jurisdiction to enjoin any activity which the Board finds is in violation of this title, the regulations under this title, or any conditions which were duly agreed to, and to secure any other appropriate relief, including relief against any affiliate of the applicant.

(l) ATTACHMENT.—No attachment or execution may be issued against the Administrator or any property in the control of the Administrator pursuant to this title before the entry of a final judgment (as to which all rights of appeal have expired) by a Federal, State, or other court of competent jurisdiction against the Administrator in a proceeding for such action.

(m) FEES.—

(1) APPLICATION FEE.—The Board may charge and collect from an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title a fee to cover the cost of the Board in making necessary determinations and findings with respect to the loan guarantee application under this title. The amount of the fee shall be reasonable.

(2) LOAN GUARANTEE ORIGINATION FEE.—The Board may charge, and the Administrator may collect, a loan guarantee origination fee with respect to the issuance of a loan guarantee under this title.

(3) USE OF FEES COLLECTED.—Any fee collected under this subsection shall be used to offset administrative costs under this title, including costs of the Board and of the Administrator.

(n) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO AFFILIATES.—

(1) INDEMNIFICATION.—The United States shall be indemnified by any affiliate (acceptable to the Board) of an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title for any losses that the United States incurs as a result of—

(A) a judgment against the applicant or any of its affiliates;

(B) any breach by the applicant or any of its affiliates of their obligations under the loan guarantee agreement;

(C) any violation of the provisions of this title, and the regulations prescribed under this title, by the applicant or any of its affiliates;

(D) any penalties incurred by the applicant or any of its affiliates for any reason, including violation of a stipulated performance schedule under subsection (e); and

(E) any other circumstances that the Board considers appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF LOAN PROCEEDS.—An applicant for a loan guarantee

under this title may not transfer any part of the proceeds of the loan to an affiliate.

(o) EFFECT OF BANKRUPTCY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever any person or entity is indebted to the United States as a result of any loan guarantee issued under this title and such person or entity is insolvent or is a debtor in a case under title 11, United States Code, the debts due to the United States shall be satisfied first.

(2) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, shall not release a person or entity from an obligation to the United States in connection with a loan guarantee under this title.

SEC. ___06. ANNUAL AUDIT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct on an annual basis an audit of the administration of the provisions of this title.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on each audit conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. ___07. SUNSET.

No loan guarantee may be approved under this title after December 31, 2006.

SEC. ___08. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term ''affiliate''—

(A) means any person or entity that controls, or is controlled by, or is under common control with, another person or entity; and

(B) may include any individual who is a director or senior management officer of an affiliate, a shareholder controlling more than 25 percent of the voting securities of an affiliate, or more than 25 percent of the ownership interest in an affiliate not organized in stock form.

(2) UNSERVED AREA.—The term ''unserved area'' means any area that—

(A) is outside the grade B contour (as determined using standards employed by the Federal Communications Commission) of the local television broadcast signals serving a particular designated market area; and

(B) does not have access to such signals by other widely marketed means.

(3) UNDERSERVED AREA.—The term ''underserved area'' means any area that—

(A) is outside the grade A contour (as determined using standards employed by the Federal Communications Commission) of the local television broadcast signals serving a particular designated market area; and

(B) has access to local television broadcast signals from not more than one commercial, for-profit multichannel video provider.

(4) COMMON TERMS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) through (3), any term used in this Act that is defined in the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) has the meaning given that term in the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. ___09. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) COST OF LOAN GUARANTEES.—For the cost of the loans guaranteed under this title, including the cost of modifying the loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661(a)), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2001 through 2006, such amounts as may be necessary.

(b) COST OF ADMINISTRATION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, other than to cover costs under subsection (a).

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations in subsections (a) and (b) shall remain available until expended.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to two members of my staff, Justin Walker and Kristin Hedger, today.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bob Herbert, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Daly of Senator ABRAHAM's office be granted floor privileges during the consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Hodges from my staff be allowed floor privileges.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2000

Mr. STEVENS. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, June 12. I further ask that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators speaking therein for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN, or his designee, from 12 to 1 p.m., Senator THOMAS, or his designee, from 1 to 2 p.m.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 12 noon on Monday and be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Defense appropriations bill. Amendments will be offered, and it is expected the two managers will agree to exchange a list of amendments at 2 p.m. Monday.

ORDER FOR FILING OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. STEVENS. With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to this bill must be filed by 3 p.m. on Monday.

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

VITIATION OF ORDER

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to rule XVI regarding the Defense appropriations bill be vitiated.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in addition, any votes regarding those amendments will be scheduled to occur on Tuesday morning, June 13. As a reminder, Senators should inform the bill managers, Senator INOUYE and myself, if they have amendments to the Defense appropriations bill. It is my hope we will have an announcement on Monday that any amendments that are stacked on Tuesday will commence very early in the day.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senators DASCHLE, ENZI, DORGAN, and BROWNBACK.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRATULATING NOFAS ON 10 YEARS OF PROGRESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 10 years ago, I met with an extraordinary group of people in the basement of a home in suburban Maryland, just outside Washington, DC. They came from all kinds of backgrounds and fields, but they were united by one common desire, and that was to try to prevent fetal alcohol syndrome and help children and families who are living with its consequences.

The other night, I saw some of those same people again at a reception celebrating the 10th anniversary of NOFAS, the National Organization for Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

Born in that suburban Maryland basement 10 years ago, NOFAS is now the world's leading clearinghouse for information on fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects. I am proud to say that my wife and I serve on its board of directors.

At the reception the other night, I was asked to say a few words about why I support NOFAS. I could have cited its pivotal role in the significant advances in our understanding of fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effect. Ten years ago, we knew very little about fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effects, its only slightly milder version. Today, we know that as many as 40,000 children are born each year in this country with FAS and other alcohol-related conditions, costing Americans more than $3 billion a year in direct health care expenses.

We know that fetal alcohol syndrome is the leading known cause of mental retardation among children. We know that FAS and FAE are both 100 percent preventable when pregnant women abstain from alcohol. And we know now that there is no safe level of alcohol use during pregnancy. That is progress, and it is possible we still would not know these things today were it not for 10 years of diligent and dedicated work by the National Organization for Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. Instead, I talked about two other reasons that I support NOFAS. Those reasons are Karli Schrider and Lucy Klene. If you ever drop by the NOFAS office in Washington on a Friday afternoon, there is a good chance you will run into Karli. She volunteers at NOFAS every Friday stuffing information packets. It is one of her many volunteer jobs.

Twenty-eight years ago, when Karli's mother, Kathy, was pregnant with Karli, it was not uncommon for expectant mothers to be told to ''drink a beer a day for a fat, healthy baby.'' Women who were in danger of miscarrying were sometimes hospitalized and given alcohol intravenously for 5 or 6 hours in the mistaken belief it would prevent miscarriage. Back then, it never crossed Kathy's mind that her occasional glasses of wine might be harming her unborn child. Besides, just the year before, Kathy had had another baby who was perfectly healthy, and she drank during that pregnancy, too. The first time Karli was misdiagnosed, she was an infant. A doctor attributed her developmental delays to chronic ear infections.

When he was 4 years old, a psychologist offered another explanation for Karli's difficulties. He said she was being ''willfully disobedient.'' When Karli was 8, a team of specialists misdiagnosed her again with cerebral palsy. Eight years later, when Karli was 16, Kathy was training to be a substance abuse counselor. As part of her training, she attended a conference on crack babies. Sitting in the audience, she was stunned. Every characteristic of crack babies the lecturer described, Karli had. But Kathy had never used crack. She tracked down the few studies that had been done at that time on the effects of alcohol on fetuses. Again, she saw the same list of symptoms.

Years later, researchers would announce that most of the symptoms they originally thought were the result of fetal exposure to crack were actually the result of fetal alcohol exposure, and that alcohol is much more devastating to fetuses than crack or any other drug. That was 11 years ago, before NOFAS was born. Learning the real cause of Karli's special challenges has not erased those challenges. FAS and FAE are lifelong conditions.

But knowing the truth has enabled Kathy—and others in Karli's life to focus less on Karli's deficits, and more on her strengths. One of those strengths is Karli's extraordinary kindness and empathy. In addition to her volunteer work at NOFAS, Karli also volunteers to help people with cerebral palsy and the elderly. Two years ago, she was named one of America's ''Thousand Points of Life'' by former President Bush. She is an inspiration to everyone who meets her, and one of the reasons I believe so deeply in the work NOFAS does.

Another reason I believe in NOFAS is because of a pint-sized little girl named Lucy Klene. Lucy is 4 years old. She spent the first two years of her life in an orphanage in Russia. When she was 2, she was adopted by Stephan and Lydia Klene, of Herndon, VA. The Klenes also adopted a son from Russia, Paul, who is 3 years old and has no apparent fetal alcohol effects. Within a month after bringing Lucy and Paul home, Stephan and Lydia began to suspect that Lucy had special challenges. Over the next 16 months, Lucy was evaluated eight times by pediatricians and other specialists. Not one of them recognized the symptoms of Lucy's fetal alcohol effects. Finally, scouring the Internet, Stephan stumbled on the truth. He and Lydia took their research to Lucy's pediatrician, who read it and confirmed their hunch.

Today, Lucy is a talented little gymnast who attends special education preschool. While it is still too early to know for sure, her doctor and parents think there is a good chance she will be able to live an independent and productive life when she grows up. Together, Karli and Lucy illustrate some of the progress that has been made in the 10 years since NOFAS was born. We still have a long way to go. Today children with FAS and FAE are being diagnosed earlier. That means they are getting help earlier, which means they have a better chance at full and productive lives.

It took Karli's family 16 years to get a correct diagnosis. It took Lucy's family 16 months. That is progress. Eleven years ago, when Karli was diagnosed, there was very little research on the effects of alcohol on fetuses. Ten years later, Lucy's father was able to find an enormous amount of information on the Internet. Slowly but surely, the studies are being done and the information is reaching the people who need it. That is real progress. When Karli was diagnosed, there were few, if any, people Kathy could turn to for support and advice. Today, Stephan and Lydia attend a NOFAS support group for parents of children with FAS and FAE, and they know they are not alone. That, too, is progress.

At the reception the other night, we celebrated an incredible milestone, the 10th anniversary of NOFAS. But next Thursday, June 15, will mark another milestone. At the urging of Stephan and Lydia, in Fairfax, VA, the school district will hold its first ever meeting to help preschool teachers recognize FAS and FAE and help children and families living with this challenge each and every day. And NOFAS will conduct the training. That is real progress.

I hope everyone today will recognize how fortunate we are—those of us lucky enough to be born healthy, those of us lucky enough to be born without fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effect.

I hope everyone will congratulate those who have worked so diligently over the course of the last 10 years to make NOFAS what it is today, and to recognize NOFAS for the difference they are making in the lives of Karli and Lucy and hundreds of thousands of others who live with the challenges of FAS and FAE, and for millions of babies who have been born healthy these last 10 years because of NOFAS. May their next 10 years be even more remarkable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

THE HOUSE THE SENATE BUILT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, today the Senate has resolved to embark upon a unique partnership with Habitat for Humanity International. That is what I want to speak about this morning. In honor of National Homeownership Week, which concludes tomorrow, the Senate will resolve today to lend its support and its elbow grease to a project we call ''The House the Senate Built.''

The idea of this project is to bring Members of the Senate, their staffs, local Habitat affiliates, volunteers, and sponsors together to build simple and decent, affordable housing for low-income families in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, and to do this by the end of 2001.

The project will begin with a ''model build'' right here in Washington, DC,

slated to begin before National Homeownership Week in 2001. Following this event, Habitat for Humanity International will link Senators with local Habitat affiliates in their respective States. The Senators will then work with these local affiliates to build at least one Habitat house in their States during 2001.

So we are going to have 51 houses built by the Senate before the end of 2001.

For over 24 years, Habitat for Humanity International has been at the forefront of turning the American dream of owning a home into a reality. Founded by Millard Fuller in 1976, Habitat for Humanity is an ecumenical Christian housing organization to eliminate poverty housing, end homelessness worldwide, and make a decent shelter a matter of conscience and action.

Since its inception, Habitat has built over 80,000 homes that have housed over 400,000 people worldwide. This September, Habitat will build its 100,000th home, and they seek to build another 100,000 by 2005. So they started 24 years ago. By September they will have built their first 100,000. In the next 5 years, they hope and anticipate building their next 100,000 homes.

I have talked personally and visited a number of times with Millard Fuller. I have had him out to Kansas and hosted him there. He is quite a dynamic individual. He has a great heart and wants to see people around the world living in good housing. And he is getting there, one home at a time, but they are building up fast.

Habitat for Humanity relies solely on volunteer labor to build their homes. The remarkable success of Habitat is in large part attributed to the tireless efforts of its founder, Millard Fuller, to continually bring new building partners on board.

Over the years, Millard has enlisted the services of foreign Ambassadors, former Presidents—President Carter probably being the most noteworthy and most frequent builder—and even the House of Representatives has helped to aid in building homes at various sites across the country. This year, Millard Fuller has turned to the Senate to build some houses.

I ran into Millard as I was waiting to catch my flight back home at the airport in Kathmandu, Nepal, this past January. Sitting there in a small waiting room, thousands of miles away from home, Millard shared with me the vision he had for bringing the Senate together with Habitat for Humanity International.

He was in Nepal, building houses and announcing a program there, but at the same time he was also thinking, what could he do to build some through the Senate? That is where we discussed this program.

The ''House the Senate Built'' project that was born out of this vision will undoubtedly be a successful one. We will build the houses. I think we will build a lot more than 51 houses. That is our target. Benjamin Franklin once wrote: ''Well done is better than well said.'' I think that may particularly apply to the Senate. We talk frequently about things. Here is a chance for us to do something about homeownership.

I think it is going to be a great project for us to be able to put people in homes. I can come to the floor today in the middle of National Homeownership Week and tell you that we should be committed to end homelessness across the country and eliminate poverty housing, but instead of telling you that, I would rather show you. I would rather pick up a hammer and demonstrate my commitment to affordable housing, nail by nail.

I am proud to come to the floor today and discuss this important initiative. This Senate is saying that words of support are not enough. Nothing less than the sweat of our brows will do in expressing how committed the Senate is in making the American dream of homeownership a true reality.

I thank the Chair and hope we are going to be able to adopt this resolution yet today. I believe it has been cleared.

PARTICIPATION IN AND SUPPORT OF ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 319, submitted by myself and others. I believe it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 319) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we have 55 cosponsors in the Senate on this bill. My understanding is it has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, that there is no objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and, finally, any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 319

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families, ⅓ of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1544 local affiliates and its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporate status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity will build its 100,000th house worldwide in September 2000 and endeavors to complete another 100,000 homes during the next 5 years.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the first week of June 2000 has been designated as ''National Homeownership Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) the Members of the Senate should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the year between National Homeownership Week 2000 and National Homeownership Week 2001, the Members of the Senate, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the District of Columbia each of which should be known as a ''House That the Senate Built'';

(4) each ''House That the Senate Built'' should be constructed primarily by Members

of the Senate, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each ''House That the Senate Built'' should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, the Members of the Senate and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I am delighted we were able to pass S. Res. 319. We are going to build some houses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Kansas. I believe I am a cosponsor of his resolution. If not, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I think the Senator from Kansas has described it well. I am proud that the Senate has adopted the resolution. I think what Habitat for Humanity has done is really quite remarkable. I am glad he calls attention to it on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAGGIE MILLER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to let my colleagues know about a woman who, this morning, is working at the post office in Knox, ND. Knox, ND, is a little town of 42 people, but it is big enough to have a post office.

Just recently, the postmaster of the Knox, ND, post office, a woman named Vivian Seter, retired. Upon Vivian's retirement at age 73, Maggie Miller took over the job.

Now maybe my colleagues are thinking there is nothing unusual in that. But Maggie is 83 years old, and she just took over the running of the post office in Knox from her 73-year-old friend Vivian.

The post office has cut its hours a bit since Maggie took over, so it is open now from 8:30 until 10:30 a.m. In fact, in about 10 minutes from now, central time in Knox, ND, Maggie will be hanging it up for the day. But for now, at age 83, after working 62 years in the postal system, Maggie has assumed the reins of the Knox Post Office.

The reason I mention this today is that I have talked a lot over the years about rural values. There is something quite remarkable and unique about life in the small towns of rural America. I represent a wonderful State, North Dakota, with a lot of small communities. Knox, ND, is one of them.

There are also a lot of hard-working, remarkable people in these small towns, and Maggie Miller is one of them. Again, she has been working for the postal system for 62 years, and I read in the newspaper that the postmaster from Rolla, ND, had to come train her for her new position. Vivian, the retiring postmaster, joked: She has only been doing this 62 years, so she needs a little training.

The article I read about her said that last year Maggie, who was age 82 at the time, bowled a 204. Then she broke her wrist and has had to take the summer off. But Maggie being Maggie, she vows to make a comeback to her bowling league.

When I saw this story in the paper, I just had to call Maggie. When she answered the phone, I said: Maggie, this is BYRON DORGAN calling from Washington, DC. I wanted to tell you that it is wonderful that you are stepping in as postmaster at age 83. Maggie said: Tell me another one. I said: No, Maggie, it really is BYRON DORGAN. And she said: I bet it is.

So Maggie, if you happen to be watching this debate in Congress, I really did call you. I say congratulations. You have a lot of spunk. I am proud of all the things you have done and of the values that you represent of folks in small towns helping each other and working together. I know the post office in many small towns is the hub of the community, and I am confident you will serve Knox well.

Congratulations to Maggie and to the town of Knox.

SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will speak for a few moments about the issue of the sanctions on food and medicine that exist in this country with respect to other countries.

I have a chart that describes what has happened to our family farmers. I represent a State with a lot of wheat growers. This chart shows what has happened to the price of wheat. As my colleagues can see, it has collapsed. Over a period of a few years, the price of wheat has just flat collapsed. I guess it is because the grain markets have determined that the food our family farmers produce does not have much value.

So our farmers, at a time when their prices have collapsed, are struggling mightily. They have a very difficult time trying to deal with collapsed prices. Yet all their expenses continue to increase. They have a difficult time understanding what is happening in the world relative to their prices and to people around the world who need what they produce.

This is a picture that is in stark contrast to the graph that shows a collapse in the price of wheat. This is a picture of hunger. This picture is all too typical in some parts of the world. Starvation, deprivation, desperate hunger, hundreds of millions of people go to bed with an ache in their belly because they didn't have enough to eat. Millions and millions of children don't have enough to eat. Every eight seconds, one child dies because of hunger and hunger-related causes. Yet a family farmer who plows the ground in the spring and tends to the crop, and is lucky enough to get a crop off in the fall, takes that load of wheat to the elevator only to be told by the grain trade: The food you have produced doesn't have value.

Farmers wonder if so many people in the world are so hungry, if so many live in starvation, and suffer from deprivation, and go to bed hungry, why is it that the food we produce in such abundant quantity in this country has no value?

As we talk about this disconnection—indeed, it is a disconnection of what we produce and what the world so desperately needs and the hunger that exists around the rest of the world, and then for our producers to be told that what they have produced doesn't have value—we have a policy in the United States that says: There are certain countries in this world whose behavior is such that we want to impose an economic embargo. Included in that embargo, we, as a country, want to prohibit the sale of food and medicine to those other countries. That is current policy. In fact, almost 11 percent of the wheat export market in the world has been off limits to our family farmers because of sanctions that we have applied against other countries.

North Korea, Iran, Cuba, and others have been told, the United States of America will not move grain and medicine to these countries because they are behaving outside the norm of international behavior and therefore, we impose sanctions. Those sanctions include food and medicine. That is wrong-headed public policy, and it should never have happened in the first place. It is a bipartisan mistake by administrations over the years that have included food and medicine in the economic sanctions. We should never include food and medicine in sanctions we impose against other governments. We should never use food as a weapon. We should never include medicine as a part of a sanction—to use medicine as a weapon. We ought to decide now that we are going to change that policy.

A bipartisan group of us, myself in the Appropriations Committee, joined by Senator SLADE GORTON from the State of Washington, with the support of Senator ASHCROFT, Senator DODD, and a group of others, have offered an amendment in the Appropriations

Committee to say: No more; let us abolish all sanctions on food and medicine shipments everywhere in the world. It passed. It is in the Agriculture appropriations bill that will come to the floor of the Senate.

That is not new. We passed it last year as well, by 70 votes in the Senate. Because of one issue, it got hijacked by some legislative leaders and did not become law. They are planning to hijack it again.

The issue is Cuba. We have legislative leaders who say Cuba is a different story. We must maintain sanctions against the shipment of food and medicine to Cuba. They want to retain the entire embargo with Cuba. But the 40 years of embargo has failed.

The question is—when you have an experiment, a laboratory experiment, and this is a real experiment, a real laboratory, for 40 years you have an embargo against Cuba and it doesn't work—who will be the first to stand up and say: This does not work; maybe we ought to do something else?

We are not talking about the entire embargo with respect to Cuba. We are just talking about the issue of food and medicine and the sanctions that now apply to shipments of food and medicine to Cuba. The legislative leaders are intending to hijack this position once again. Our intent to repeal that sanction is going to be hijacked once again, unless we find a way to stop it.

The Washington Post today wrote an editorial, ''Food for Cuba.'' They make the point that there is no justification for having sanctions on food and medicine for Cuba, and there is no justification. It is interesting that the debate over normal trade relations with China produces all these folks who come to the floor of the House and Senate and say: We must engage with China. Engaging with a Communist nation will inevitably move that nation in a more constructive direction. More trade and more direction towards open markets will inevitably improve things in a country such as China.

If that is the case, why is it not the case with Cuba, also a Communist country? Why is it the case that engagement with China is productive in moving them towards better human rights and towards a more constructive direction, but it is not the case in Cuba? The answer is the current embargo that exists with Cuba makes no sense at all. Sanctions against the shipments of food and medicine, not only to Cuba but to the other sanctioned countries in the world, is not moral policy. It is not moral for this country, in my judgment, to use food and medicine as part of sanctions. It is wrong.

I started by talking about farmers. Yes. I have an interest to try to make sure farmers have the opportunity to serve markets. Those who support Freedom to Farm. I don't; I don't think it has worked. We need to ask the same question with respect to markets. If you say the Freedom to Farm approach is something that is important for farmers, what about the freedom to sell? Freedom to Farm—what about the freedom to sell? Farmers are told they have the freedom to farm. What about the freedom to sell their products to Cuba, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Iran, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Libya?

If we have in the coming weeks the kind of chicanery that went on last year to hijack this policy, to hijack those Republicans and Democrats who say we must end these sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to all countries—and, yes, including Cuba—if they intend to hijack that again through legislative chicanery, they are going to have a whole load on their hands, because they did it last year and they were successful, but they are not going to do it twice.

If there is an up-or-down vote on this to eliminate the sanctions on food and medicine with respect to all of these countries, including Cuba—there were 70 votes in the Senate last year, and there was a majority in the House. By an overwhelming margin Republicans and Democrats in the Congress believed that we ought to eliminate sanctions on food and medicine shipments. The only conceivable way they can detour our effort is to prevent a vote in the House and to try to strip out the provision that the Senate Appropriations Committee put in when that bill comes to the floor of the Senate.

I serve notice to all who think about these issues that it is not going to happen the way it happened last year. You might have the muscle and you might have the cards up your sleeve to try to derail this once again. But it is going to cost in terms of the way this place works.

We have a clear, large majority in the House and the Senate on the side of the American farmer, who believe they ought to have the freedom to sell in these markets; on the side of those who say this policy of using food as a weapon is fundamentally immoral; on the side of doing the right thing with Cuba and yes, other countries; consistent with what we described and talked about with respect to China. We have a large majority in the House and the Senate to do the sensible thing this year.

I am not prepared to step aside and quietly go away on this issue. If leaders do to us what they are suggesting in the papers, they will try to do to us what they did last year successfully through legislative slight of hand.

Our farmers deserve better than that. Hungry people around the world deserve to look at this country and understand that this country will never, never ever impose sanctions on food and medicine.

This country in its zeal and desire to take aim at a dictator hits hungry people, hits poor people, and hits sick people. We are not hurting dictators. Does anybody here believe that Fidel Castro has ever missed a meal because we have an embargo or sanction on food and medicine? Does anybody here ever think that Saddam Hussein has missed dinner because we have not sent food to Iraq? We haven't hurt dictators. All we have done is hurt sick people, poor people, and hungry people around the world with this foolish policy. And, at the same time, we have hurt our farmers here at home.

This must stop. It must stop this year. And it must not be a halfhearted notion of putting on the brakes halfway and saying we will eliminate the sanctions with respect to these couple of countries but we can't do it with respect to Cuba. Nonsense. It must be done across the board, and it must be done this year.

Those, as I have said, who think they are going to hijack this policy are in for a long, hot summer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: No. 451, and Nos. 528 through 543, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service. I ask the clerk to report Calendar No. 536.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Douglas A. Dworkin, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Edward E. Kaufman, of Delaware, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2000.

Alberto J. Mora, of Florida, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David N. Greenlee, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

Susan S. Jacobs, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Solomon Islands, and as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vanuatu.

John F. Tefft, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lithuania.

John R. Dinger, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mongolia.

Donna Jean Hrinak, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Venezuela.

John Martin O'Keefe, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kyrgyz Republic.

Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Daniel A. Johnson, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname.

V. Manuel Rocha, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Bolivia.

Rose M. Likins, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador.

W. Robert Pearson, of Tennessee, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

Marc Grossman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

Anne Woods Patterson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia.

James Donald Walsh, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Foreign Service nominations beginning Craig B. Allen, and ending Daniel E. Harris, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 2000.

Foreign Service nominations beginning C. Franklin Foster, Jr., and ending Michael Patrick Glover, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 2000.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Leslie O'Connor, and ending David P. Lambert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 2000.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the legislative session.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD GNEHM, JR.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues for the action that was just taken.

This is truly one of the highlights of my Senate career. The nomination that was read individually was my college roommate. I roomed with him for 3 years at George Washington University where he was striving to become a career Ambassador for the United States of America. I watched him work and struggle and exceed all expectations. He is extremely brilliant and has been able to get the kind of career that he wanted.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming, who is presiding, for the rapid action that he took to have the hearing held on this nomination.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, for the expeditious work that he did with the full committee to get this name brought before the Senate.

We have a truly dedicated career officer who will be serving us in Australia. I know him very well. I canoed with him in the swamps of Georgia.

I watched his career and his travels. Most of my travels around the world have been through his eyes, as he has been located in different positions beginning with Katmandu, Nepal.

I think we owe a lot of thanks not only to him but to his family, and his wife Peggy, who has gone with him on these travels. They served well as ambassadors for our country.

When he had a break, he came back to the United States and served in the State Department. I was often able to see him in Washington. I watched him as he was liaison for the Defense Department, liaison for the State Department with Senator KENNEDY, and in a number of other positions.

He and I have daughters who are the same age. We have sons who are the same age. His son, Ed, is married to the daughter of the couple who introduced my wife and I. How did a Wyoming girl meet somebody out here? They met at my swearing-in ceremony. The two dads were part of my wedding. And I was there to see their children's marriages in Wyoming.

Skip is a fraternity brother of mine and is actually the only brother that I have.

With this action taken today, the United States will be well served in Australia. This is the correct action, the best action, and this is the best representation we can get.

I thank all of my colleagues for their support in getting this important nomination approved.

AUTHORIZATION OF TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 320, submitted earlier by Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize testimony by a Senate employee in a State administrative proceeding.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, a caseworker employed in the state office of Senator WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr. has been subpoenaed to testify at an unemployment compensation benefits hearing before the Delaware Department of Labor.

The testimony concerns contacts that the caseworker had with the claimant in the course of assisting the claimant's employing business with casework matters.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, this resolution would enable the caseworker to testify in response to the subpoena.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 320) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 320

Whereas, in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, pending before the Department of Labor, in the County of Sussex, State of Delaware, a subpoena for testimony has been issued to Elinor Hughes, an employee of the Senate on the staff of Senator William V. Roth, Jr;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under

the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Elinor Hughes is authorized to testify in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

CONGRATULATING REPRESENTATIVE STEPHEN S.F. CHEN

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 121, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, a motion to consider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 121) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 121

Whereas Representative Stephen S. F. Chen has been a member of Taiwan's diplomatic service for forty-seven years;

Whereas Representative Chen has represented Taiwan's interests in such countries as the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, and the United States;

Whereas Representative Chen has held a number of important positions in his government at home, including those of Vice Foreign Minister and Deputy Secretary-General to President Lee Teng-hui;

Whereas Representative Chen's many years of service in the United States include appointments as Taiwan's Consul-General in Atlanta from 1973 to 1979 and as Director of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs in Chicago from 1980 to 1982 and Los Angeles from 1988 to 1989;

Whereas Representative Chen has served with distinction as Taiwan's senior diplomat in the United States since 1997, when he became the Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas Representative Chen has been a friend of the United States and earned the respect and genuine affection of many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Representative Stephen Chen is to be congratulated for his many years of distinguished service to Taiwan and for his friendship to the United States; and

(2) the best wishes of Congress are to be extended to Representative Chen and his family on the occasion of his retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

40 YEARS TOO LONG—THE CUBAN EMBARGO

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, when President Kennedy announced a trade embargo on Cuba in 1961, the consensus in Washington was that stifling the Cuban economy would lead to internal unrest and ultimately depose the anti-American president, Fidel Castro. Since that time, Congress has tightened the screws on Cuba to include food and medicine in the embargo and to put pressure on other countries not to trade with Cuba. We have made it more difficult to lift the embargo by requiring a two-thirds vote by Congress and we have passed a law that says no government involving Fidel Castro or his brother will be acceptable to the U.S., even if they were chosen in Democratic elections. Through it all, our main nemesis, Fidel Castro, has survived. In fact, he is strong as ever. To gain a better understanding of this issue, I recently led a group of Arkansas farmers to Havana to see firsthand the impact of our policy and the potential opportunities that exist should this policy be changed. I entered Havana focused on Cuba's potential as a new trade market for Arkansas agriculture producers. I left Havana with a new understanding of the embargo's effects on the people of Cuba. I returned from Cuba more confident than ever that the U.S. embargo on Cuba must be lifted. The three most compelling reasons for my stance on this issue are: (1) the fact that we should engage countries, not isolate them in order to move them forward and help them to gain potential; (2) the overall effect on the American economy that losing the trade with Cuba has had; and (3) the humanitarian impact on the Cuban people.

This was my first trip to Cuba and it was extremely worthwhile. I found the country and its people impressive and possessing great potential. The architecture in downtown Havana was charming, however, it struck me that someone had turned the lights out 40 years ago and no one has thought to flip the switch back on. The gorgeous architecture was crumbling along with the people. The physical decay of the cities, buildings, and infrastructure is readily apparent. This obvious economic and physical decline has not, however, led to an uprising of Cuban citizens demanding for a more democratic government based on capitalistic principles. It has been four decades since the embargo was enforced for political reasons. Times have clearly changed. The Soviet Union no longer aids Cuban efforts to challenge U.S. interests in Central America and elsewhere. The Soviet Union does not even exist.

The Cold War has been over for 10 years and the U.S. has normal trade relations with all of the countries of the former Eastern bloc. Yet we continue to ostracize Cuba. U.S. defense analysts even maintain that Cuba does not pose a security threat to our country at the turn of the century. Is Cuba an ideal nation? Absolutely not. But there are other countries that we trade with and maintain normal diplomatic relations with whose governments are not democratically elected; where full respect for internationally recognized human rights is lacking; where there is little or no tolerance for political dissent; or where private enterprise is largely illegal.

The first of these countries that comes to mind is China. Prior to the Memorial Day recess the House of Representatives voted to grant Permanent Normal Relations (PNTR) status to the Republic of China. The Senate will likely vote on this matter soon. On this separate but related issue let me be clear. I look forward to the China PNTR debate and urge my colleagues to join me in support of expanding our trading opportunities. I hope that we can pass PNTR with China as quickly as possible with no amendments so that President Clinton can sign this landmark legislation into law. As I have watched the China PNTR debate rage in Washington during recent weeks, I am struck by the common theme that we, as a nation, can influence a country's actions much more by engaging them in trade and communication than we ever could by ignoring and isolating them.

I've held to this belief for quite some time in regard to China as well as Cuba. China is the largest Communist country in the world. The U.S. has annually granted China its most-favored-nation status and will likely approve Permanent Normal Trade Relations in the coming months. Our treatment of Cuba should be no different. It is true that China has made various overtures and taken some positive steps as their acceptance into the WTO is being considered. China has allowed for a limited amount of private enterprise to exist. And recently, China purchased goods from the U.S. as a good faith gesture that they will live up to the commitments negotiated in the WTO accession agreement. Many who oppose trade with Cuba ask, ''Why are we not holding Cuba to the same standard? Why don't we require them to privatize certain business entities or purchase some commodities as a good faith gesture?''

The option to purchase U.S. goods is not available to Cuba, as it is to China, due to laws that we have passed in this very institution. Their hands are tied.

Yet Cuba is taking steps on its own regarding private industry. Recent progress has been made in the form of joint ventures to facilitate the tourism industry in Cuba. For instance, the hotel we stayed in was a joint venture with the Dutch. Of course the government is still participating, but it is an example of private capital coming in from another source and affecting the people's way of life. The people working at those hotels receive tips from tourists that put them way above the daily wage of average Cubans. Steps made in these directions can only foster and plant positive seeds for change. We can also expect the rapidly and advancing technology of the Internet to help open doors to Cuba. Just as Chinese dissidents communicate today over the Internet in spite of attempts by the Communists to stop them, I can anticipate a day when the Cuban people do the same thing.

The farmers of Cuba are incapable of producing enough to sustain the 11 million inhabitants of the Caribbean island. Therefore, food must be imported. Our allies are already meeting that need and trading with Cuba. Rice is coming into Cuba from Asia, soybeans from Brazil, while our farmers endure some of the worst prices they have seen in decades.

We have put ourselves in a position where we are hurting our own economy and the backbone of our nation, the America farmer. By denying our farmers access to additional markets, like Cuba, we are ignoring a pledge that was made with the passage of the 1996 Farm Bill to open markets, the necessary markets our farmers need. Promises regarding enhanced trading opportunities and the free market abounded with passage of the so-called Freedom to Farm Act. Yet, the recently passed Caribbean/Africa Trade bill was the first trade bill Congress has passed in six years. We have failed to grant the President Fast Track Authority and essentially guaranteed the failure of our nation's farmers by granting them the ability to produce as much as they are capable while denying them access to sufficient markets to move their goods. For the American farmer the combination of this nation's Ag and foreign trade policies is a no-win situation.

For soybeans alone, opening up trade with Cuba could mean a $60 million market. In Arkansas, we could ship 400,000 tons of rice right down the Mississippi River, through the Gulf of Mexico to the Cuban people. Food products would be a phone call and a couple of days away. Instead, the Cuban people are left paying higher prices for a lower quality product that takes weeks, sometimes months, to arrive in their ports.

Rice is a staple of the Cuban diet and we know how to grow it in Arkansas. Arkansas is consistently the top U.S. producer of rice. Exports are extremely important to the rice industry. Last year, the rice industry exported to more than 100 countries. Trade and trade policy, therefore, are critical to the continued success of the industry.

At the time that the U.S. Government imposed sanctions on trade with Cuba, it was not only our largest export market for rice, but it took more than one-half of our total rice exports. Cubans know good American rice, and they want it. The embargo dealt a major blow to the rice industry, particularly growers in the South who grow long grain rice, which is the rice of preference in Cuba. The only impact the embargo has had on Cuba is on its middle- to low-income citizens. We are hurting the Cuban people much more than the Cuban government or Cuban elite. Due to the high prices the government is forced to pay, less food is available for distribution. U.S. humanitarian organizations are prevented from providing food to starving children due solely to the existence of the embargo.

While in Cuba, I met with opponents of the Castro regime who have been persecuted for attempting to highlight the disparate human rights treatment in Cuba. These dissidents believe that the embargo gives the Cuban government an excuse for what is wrong with the country. Our embargo provides Cuban officials with an excuse for the sorry state of the economy and the challenges the country faces. If we lift the embargo, we expose the Cuban people to many of the problems of their own government. Right now the Cuban people are only getting one side of the story, and they are not blaming their government or Fidel Castro for their troubles, because Fidel Castro is using the U.S. Government as the excuse for those problems.

I understand there are colleagues in this body whom I deeply respect who also disagree with me on this issue. I agree that should the U.S. lift its embargo on Cuba, Fidel Castro will probably declare victory over what he calls his imperialist oppressor to his north. But the real truth which is undeniably is that under current policy absolutely no one wins.

As a farmer's daughter, I am not so concerned about the short-term implications of who can claim victory after 40 years of economic isolation. I believe that the long-term benefits of engagement with Cuba offer economic benefit to Americans; opportunities for democratic influences inside Cuba and better living conditions for the Cuban people. Each of these goals strike me as fundamental principles of our unique, American democracy. Lifting the 40-year embargo on Cuba is the right thing to do. I hope we do it sooner than later.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, under the previous order, will stand adjourned until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, June 12, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:54 a.m., adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2000, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DOUGLAS A. DWORKIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2000.

ALBERTO J. MORA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID N. GREENLEE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY.

SUSAN S. JACOBS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PAPUA NEW GUINEA, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SOLOMAN ISLANDS, AND AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VANUATU.

JOHN F. TEFFT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA.

JOHN R. DINGER, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONGOLIA.

DONNA JEAN HRINAK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA.

JOHN MARTIN O'KEEFE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

EDWARD WILLIAM GNEHM, JR., OF GEORGIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

DANIEL A. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA, CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME.

V. MANUEL ROCHA, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA.

ROSE M. LIKINS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

W. ROBERT PEARSON, OF TENNESSEE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

MARC GROSSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

ANNE WOODS PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA.

JAMES DONALD WALSH, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF

MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ARGENTINA.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CRAIG B. ALLEN, AND ENDING DANIEL E. HARRIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 7, 2000.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING C. FRANKLIN FOSTER JR., AND ENDING MICHAEL PATRICK GLOVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 7, 2000.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING LESLIE O'CONNOR, AND ENDING DAVID P. LAMBERT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 11, 2000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 9, 2000*

The House met at 9 a.m.

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

Scripture Says:

''Behold I am laying a stone in Zion
a cornerstone, chosen and precious.
Whoever believes in it shall not be put to shame.''

Lord, we believe we have been chosen,
we delight in your touch.
We trust each of us is precious in your sight.
May we never betray your selection of us
for your set purpose and to serve this Nation.
This House, the story is told,
has no cornerstone.
There is no regret or recrimination
we accept its rejection or absence.
This government, its story is bold,
has been fashioned in the hearts of people.
With great pride and remembrance
we accept your providence.
On this day in this millennium year
from the very rocks of virtue
which have made this Nation great.
We choose as our cornerstone
integrity
that we may always stand strong and together
for ages to come.
integrity now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILCHREST led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1953. An act 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. 2484. An act 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 approved by the United States.

H.R. 3639. An act 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''.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes on each side.

ELIMINATE THE DEATH TAX AND RESTORE THE AMERICAN DREAM

(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 discuss a problem that affects too many Americans, the death tax. It seems absurd that our government would tax someone just for dying; yet that is exactly what has been happening in this country for years.

Too many Nevadans are forced to sell acres of their family farms and ranch lands after the death of their parents or grandparents in order to pay their huge estate tax bills, all courtesy of the death tax.

Many of these farms and ranches have been in families for years, but now these families must sell part of their family heritage in order to pay the IRS. For many Americans, the American dream is to start a small business and pass it on to their children; yet our government is preventing millions of Americans from realizing this dream. This is wrong; it must end.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will support the Death Tax Elimination Act and restore the American dream and do it today.

EVENTS SURROUNDING ELIAN GONZALEZ RESEMBLE LIFE IN COMMUNIST CHINA

(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, Elian Gonzalez watched his mother drown, he then clinged to a tire at sea to save his life, and after all of that, commandos seized him at gunpoint. If that is not enough to portray a gulag, Americans later gathered right here in the Capitol to pray for Elian and Secret Service agents in full uniforms stormed in and stopped their prayer service.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot even pray in America. Beam me up. Is this Communist China, or is this the United States of America?

Now, I believe Elian should have been sent back with his dad, but do we have a gulag portrayed, or what? I yield back the fact that our founders are literally rolling over in their graves.

DEATH TAX EQUALS DOUBLE TAXATION AND SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, a family that has suffered a loss of a loved one should not have the added grief of losing the family business, ranch, or personal savings; yet that is what is happening under our current Tax Code. Because of an archaic tax law, when a person dies in this country, an outrageous tax of 37 to 55 percent is levied on his or her property, even though the deceased spent his or her entire life paying taxes on that very estate.

The death tax is a form of double taxation that has devastated too many families and businesses. It has been estimated that one-third of small business owners will have to sell outright or liquidate a part of their business to pay death taxes. More than 70 percent of family businesses do not survive the second generation, and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. In my district of Colorado Springs, a well-established family business had to close its doors in the face of an enormous estate tax bill. Small family-run businesses are the backbone of our Nation's strong economy and should not be forced to close down because of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the Death Tax Elimination Act on this very day.

DEATH TAX IS UNAMERICAN

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, William Shakespeare once wrote, ''For in that sleep of death, what dreams may come when we have shuffled off this mortal coil must give us pause.''

Hundreds of years before the death tax was even conceived, Shakespeare captured the worries felt by thousands of Americans, hoping to leave their life's work to their loved ones. Sadly, this dying wish often does not come true for those trying to leave a small business or family farm to their relatives. The death tax thwarts them at every turn, costing surviving relatives up to 60 percent of the business or property's worth.

Mr. Speaker, this is blatantly wrong.

Fortunately, today the House has an opportunity to right this injustice. Before us today is H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. This common sense legislation challenges the IRS's assertion that grief also should be taxed. The death tax is un-American, and it deserves an appropriate burial.

Vote in favor of H.R. 8.

HUMAN INITIATIVE THWARTED BY DEATH TAX

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to vote on a bill that will, in about a decade, eliminate what we have come to know as the death tax or the estate tax.

In this country, we lose about 1 million acres of agricultural land a year, 1 million acres; and it is not slowing down. In my State alone, we lose about 25,000 acres of farmland every single year. There is a lot of reasons for that. One of them is that when a farmer dies, in order to leave that farm or what we may call an estate to his children, they have to pay an enormous tax. To pay that tax, many of these young people, these young farmers that want to stay on the land, must sell a portion, if not all of that land, in order to pay the Federal Government their tax. This is wrong. We need to correct that.

Mr. Speaker, we need to correct the fact that human initiative needs an opportunity to be fulfilled, and that opportunity for farmers is to stay on the land. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that everyone votes for this bill.

POSTAL SERVICE ISSUES ADOPTION AWARENESS STAMP

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that the U.S. Postal Service has recently issued an adoption awareness stamp.

As a proud grandfather of two adopted children, I am particularly aware of the need to call attention to this subject and to encourage more adoptions. We all know that every child needs support, guidance, and understanding of people who care enough to offer love, a home and a family. Far too many children in the U.S. are waiting to be adopted. Most have special needs, they are older, they often have emotional and physical problems; but they still need a home.

In my State, more than 400 children were placed in adoptive homes last year, but there are still 100 or more Nebraska children waiting for families right now.

Although Congress has passed laws to encourage adoption, we need more adoptive families, and if adopting a child is not an option, there are other ways to help: mentoring, contributing to any of the fine organizations that promote adoption, and certainly buying the special U.S. Postal Service adoption stamps will help call attention to this issue.

I encourage everyone to help find every child a loving family.

SLAVERY STILL EXISTS IN NEW MILLENNIUM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, who would ever have thought that we would be talking about the horror of modern-day slavery in this new millennium?

Francis Bok is a 21-year-old native of southern Sudan. At age 7 he was captured and enslaved during an Arab militia raid on his village. Francis saw children and adults brutalized and killed all around him. He was strapped to a donkey and taken north, and for 10 years he lived as a family slave. He was forced to sleep with cattle and endure daily beatings and eat terrible food.

In December of 1996, Francis escaped to a nearby town where local policemen enslaved him again. Again he escaped. Eventually he reached Khartoum, the capital, where he was arrested by security forces and jailed for 7 months. After being released, Mr. Bok was able to make his way to Cairo, Egypt, and finally, in 1999, the U.N. resettled him in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I met Francis yesterday. It is an incredible story. It is incomprehensible that slavery still persists in the world today. It is harder to understand why the Clinton administration has not made stopping slavery and genocide in Sudan a priority.

ALL CHILDREN HAVE STRONG POTENTIAL TO ACHIEVE

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this amendment on the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. I have been involved with education issues for almost 30 years. This experience has strongly reinforced for me that all children, regardless of income level or race, have the same potential for high achievement and healthy development when provided appropriate opportunities.

Thus our goal must be to support the development of quality after-school programs for all children, but especially those in low-income communities. Our goal should also be to see the expanded day programs linked to the core school day.

ISRAEL GRANTED MEMBERSHIP IN WEOG

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 3405, the Equality for Israel at the United Nations Act that pushed for equality at the U.N. for our closest ally, I am pleased that because of U.S. pressure, Israel has finally achieved a long-deserved, although partial, victory.

Israel for years has been refused entry into one of the 5 regional groupings and thus has been denied full membership at the U.N., although it has been a member since 1949. This has undermined and weakened Israel's ability to function effectively within the international community.

Israel has now finally been granted membership in the Western European and Other Group, WEOG; however, with conditions.

□ 0915

Many of us will continue to push for Israel's full membership in the WEOG, as well as its membership in its rightful regional grouping, which is the Asian group. Israel has earned it. Few other countries have been tested in this manner and have given so much to protect the very principles upon which the United Nations was founded.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of the abduction of Nocona Lynn Smith when she was 3 years old. Nocona was abducted by her

mother, River Burton, and her grandmother, Francis Harris, and taken to Honduras on March 10, 1994.

An hour after the abduction, a State District judge ordered emergency custody for her father, Roy Smith. A warrant for the arrest of Nocona's mother was issued, but charges were dropped when she returned to Texas for a trial.

Nocona, however, did not return with her. She is still in Honduras with her grandmother, and her father's attempts to implement the Hague Convention have been in vein.

Mr. Speaker, Roy Smith and his daughter Nocona have missed out on 6 years of memories that are so important to families in the development of healthy and loving relationships. We cannot allow situations like theirs to continue to happen to any other families.

Congress passed a resolution urging signatories of the Hague Convention to uphold that agreement, and we must use that as a starting point for further action.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken a step in the right direction, and it is my hope that this House will continue that work and help bring our children home.

SUDAN

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that today is National Sudan Day. Today there are activities going on in major cities across the United States focusing attention on the ongoing genocide in Sudan.

The Congress needs to make sure that everyone, especially the administration, knows about and acts upon the horrific killings, evictions, and enslaving that is going on, brought about by Sudan's Islamic fundamentalist regime.

The regime is on a deliberate campaign of genocide against the black Christians of southern Sudan. Eyewitnesses have given House and Senate testimony about slavery, torture, rape, mutilation, and killings of Christians.

Mr. Speaker, myself and other House Members have been taking action to bring this genocide into the limelight and to focus our efforts on stopping the brutality. I encourage my colleagues to continue to pressure the White House and the U.S. State Department to take an active part in stopping the genocide in Sudan and bringing the issue to the forefront of American foreign policy.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD BASKIN, AN ORIGINAL AMERICAN ARTIST

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity this morning to pay special tribute to an extraordinary individual from my district who passed away last week in Leeds, Massachusetts, after a lengthy illness.

Leonard Baskin was an acclaimed artist with a unique style and vision whose sculptures, woodcuts, prints, and books are celebrated throughout the world. One can find an original Baskin on display in public collections from New York to Rome.

Here in our Nation's Capitol, his remarkable skills helped recreate both the Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge memorials. Quite simply, he has been called one of the finest sculptors of our time.

Born in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in 1922, Leonard Baskin was educated at Yale University, served in the Navy, taught art at both SMITH and Hampshire Colleges, and received countless medals and awards.

Mr. Speaker, his brilliant work touched and inspired many. As we mourn his passing today, I urge the Members of this House to join me in honoring this truly American original.

DEATH TAX REPEAL

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the repeal of the death tax. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and have been since I came here some 8 years ago.

Under the guise of making the rich pay their fair share, the death tax discourages savings and investment and has a negative impact on the entire economy. Ironically, those that are most affected by the death tax are not the wealthy. They have the resources to shelter assets. But family-owned businesses, which are often asset-rich and cash poor, cannot meet those requirements.

The death tax hits these businesses especially hard when the owner passes away. The result is that many family-owned businesses cannot survive in the family. Even prior to death, the death tax impacts many businesses, forcing the owners to divert money from productive uses, such as capital investment and job creation, to, guess what, estate tax planning.

So for those who are out there who would vote against the death tax repeal, please think again. They are not hurting the wealthy, they are hurting the little guy.

THE MULTI-MILLIONAIRE PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Death Tax Elimination Act should be called the Multi-millionaire Protection Act. It does tell America what Republican priorities really are.

Before anything else, the Republican leadership would give a huge, reckless and dangerous backloaded tax cut to only 2 percent of Americans, and more than half of the tax cut goes to the wealthiest one-tenth of 1 percent. That is right, more than half of it would be available to fewer than 60,000 families out of more than 60 million families.

Do the Republicans really believe that the Bill Gates and Steve Forbes and John Corzines need $25 billion of tax cuts every year? Does anyone listening or watching today believe they need $25 billion of tax cuts?

But the Republican leadership would give that multi-billion dollar tax cut before limiting class sizes to 18 for 3 million children, before establishing a prescription drug benefit as part of Medicare for 13 million American senior citizens who cannot afford the expense of insurance coverage.

It is a stunning revelation to know that the Republicans' highest priority is a huge tax cut that only benefits the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. Vote for the substitute and against this giveaway.

TIME TO REPEAL THE DEATH TAX

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Democrats' not-ending attempt to create class warfare and their obsession of hate and vengeance towards the successful in our society, they forget the small business owner or the family farmer who has to pay as much as 50 percent of their entire value of their assets when they die.

Just think about a small farm in south Georgia where, for generations, it has been passed down from generation to generation, from mom, dad, mom, dad, daughter and everything, and then the owner dies one day, and in order to pay for the farm, in order to pay for the inheritance, the kids have to sell. Then there is one more strip shopping center.

Imagine one of the many new women entrepreneurs who owns a small business and builds it up over 20 years, and then has to plan her estate. She wants to pass it to your daughter, but guess what, the Democrats do not want her to. They want that to go to Uncle Sam. What does she do? Simply dies, but on the day that she dies, the Democrat party wants her to be visited not just by the undertaker but by the IRS.

It is time to repeal the death tax.

LAWMAKERS SHOULD CORRECT POVERTY AND LACK OF MEDICAL CARE BEFORE ENACTING RECKLESS TAX CUTS

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I love my friend's compassion. This is a Chamber that ought to have compassion. We ought to have compassion for 45 million Americans that do not have health care, for the hundreds of thousands of working families that cannot afford to send their kids to college, for senior citizens who do not have a drug benefit.

If we take the Democratic proposal here, I do not know how many family farms are worth more than $4 million, but I would say that when we add the cut in the percentage and the $4 million exemption, that is about as much compassion as we need until we have taken care of the poorest of the poor.

To listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you have two children, one lives in Beverly Hills and the other one lives on the edge of poverty. What we need to do today is rush and give some more help to the folks in Beverly Hills.

The difference between the two proposals is that the Democratic proposal helps small business, helps farmers, helps people with $4 million worth of assets, but leaves a little in the Treasury to make sure that senior citizens have social security and Medicare, that maybe we can help more kids get a college education, and maybe some day people in this country can expect health care coverage.

AUSTRALIAN GUN BAN RESULTS: DEADLY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, according to NewsMax.com, the results from the Australian gun ban are in and they are deadly.

Just over a year ago, Australia followed in the footsteps of mother country Great Britain and made a law that totally banned handguns. The gun ban and the confiscation program cost the Australian government more than $500 million. Sometimes using deadly force, authorities collected 640,381 personal firearms.

Now, the results are in. Since the gun ban, Australia-wide, homicides are up 3.2 percent, assaults are up 8.6 percent, armed robberies are up 44 percent. In the state of Victoria, homicides with firearms are up 300 percent.

Figures over the previous 25 years had shown a steady decrease in armed robberies with firearms, but since the gun ban this has changed for the worse. There has been a dramatic increase in break-ins and assaults on the elderly.

Australian politicians are on the spot and at a loss to explain this, and so are the liberals here in America. They want to avoid the facts that following a gun ban, crimes go up. If we would enforce the laws that we have on the books, it would make America a safer place.

SUPPORTING THE ELIMINATION OF THE DEATH TAX

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of eliminating the death tax. The death tax is one of the most extreme examples of unfair, inefficient taxation in the United States today. It forces children to sell family businesses and farms to pay the taxes, and at the same time costs the government almost as much to collect as it brings in, in revenue.

In fact, the annual death tax revenues are less than 2 percent of the total Federal receipts, but the economic costs are far higher. This tax thwarts savings and investment, decreases wages and job creation, and dissolves thousands of family-run businesses each year.

The death tax is blatant double taxation aimed directly at small business owners, farmers, and ranchers. These people pay taxes throughout their lives. Then when they die, they are taxed an additional tax on the value of their property.

We should be encouraging businesses like these, not creating obstructions for their existence. Uncle Sam should not come knocking at our door when our loved one dies. I ask my colleagues to join with me in burying the death tax once and for all.

AMERICA SHOULD INVEST MORE RESOURCES IN CURING PEDIATRIC CANCER

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the progress that has been made in childhood cancer is a modern medical miracle. Unlike most miracles, I think this one can be explained. It is widely recognized that the progress in cancer survival rates among children is the result of successful clinical trials, where work from our Nation's laboratories is translated into clinical application.

For children, the standard of care today is to be treated in a clinical trial, and more than 70 percent of children with cancer participate. That compares to only about 3 percent of adults and only 1.5 percent of Medicare patients.

In addition, children are normally treated in centers of excellence by a pediatric oncology specialist and a team of multidisciplinary health care providers, and the rapid dissemination of better treatments through a consortium of major teaching hospitals where new therapies can be tested has benefited the children in these trials.

In many ways, care for children with cancer is the model by which adult cancer can hopefully become better.

ENDING THE DEATH TAX

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service burdens the American people with so many taxes it often seems we are taxed on virtually every move we make and every breath we draw.

So it is not surprising to learn that when we stop moving and drawing breath, the IRS taxes us for that, too. Every year, thousands of grieving families are hit unexpectedly with an unfair provision of law called the death tax. This provision of law is so burdensome it prevents more than three out of four small businesses from surviving to the next generation.

Death taxes reduce potential employment opportunities, encourage consumption instead of responsible saving and investing, and undermine the premise of the American dream, which assures that hard, honest work will be rewarded.

Let us show the American people that the American dream is still alive. Let us today vote to repeal the unfair death tax.

A FAILED REPUBLICAN EDUCATION BILL AND IRRESPONSIBLE TAX CUTS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House began debate on a Republican education bill that fails our Nation's schoolchildren.

Today, the Republican leadership is giving an irresponsible tax cut to the 2,400 wealthiest Americans. Some 2,400 people today will benefit from the cut and the repeal of the estate tax, and $50 billion will be taken out of the revenue stream of this country over a 10-year period to benefit 2,400 people.

□ 0930

My friends should do the mathematics. And because of this effort, what we will see is our youngsters shortchanged on their educational opportunities. Our first priority has to be to ensure that our Nation's children

learn to their fullest potential and that their teachers have the tools necessary to be able to teach them.

The Republican bill does nothing to reduce class size, address the modernization of our schools, and it significantly cuts after-school programs because of a tax cut to the 2,400 wealthiest people in this country.

ONE PERCENT OF AMERICANS OWN 40 PERCENT OF AMERICA'S ASSETS

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today my Republican colleagues would like to do away with the estate tax entirely. Democrats propose a way to make sure that 99 percent of Americans do not pay any estate tax.

Who started the estate tax? The Republican, Theodore Roosevelt. Why? Because we did not want two different Americas.

Today in America, 1 percent of the people in America own 40 percent of the assets of America. It is growing bigger and bigger, this gap. Twice as much as it was 20 years ago. What do my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle want to do? They want to make it worse. They want to give the richest 1 percent of America an enormous tax cut costing our country $50 billion a year. With Social Security and Medicare going broke, with the $5.6 trillion national debt, with our public schools falling apart, with needs for a strong defense, our Republican colleagues want to give a huge tax break, unneeded, unnecessary, to the 1 percent richest people in America who already control 40 percent of the Nation's wealth. It is obscene; it is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the modest estate tax relief under the Democrat bill.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 51, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—330

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—51

Aderholt
Bilbray
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Costello
DeFazio
Dickey
Fattah
Filner
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Holt
Hooley
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Latham
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
McNulty
Miller, George
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pickett
Pomeroy
Ramstad
Sabo
Schaffer
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wicker

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Metcalf
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—51

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clement
Conyers
Crane
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Delahunt
DeLay
Dixon
Dooley
Ehrlich
English
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Goss
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Klink
Lazio
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Norwood
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Porter
Radanovich
Rogan
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Towns
Vento
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Young (AK)

□ 0952

Mr. OBEY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

Mrs. WILSON changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 519, I call up the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to phase out the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to House Resolution 519, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 8 is as follows:

H.R. 8

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 ''Death Tax Elimination Act''.

SEC. 2. PHASEOUT OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES.

(a) REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES.—Subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to estate and gift taxes) is repealed effective with respect to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 2009.

(b) PHASEOUT OF TAX.—Subsection (c) of section 2001 of such Code (relating to imposition and rate of tax) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PHASEOUT OF TAX.—In the case of estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, during any calendar year after 1999 and before 2010—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The tentative tax under this subsection shall be determined by using a table prescribed by the Secretary (in lieu of using the table contained in paragraph (1)) which is the same as such table; except that—

''(i) each of the rates of tax shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the number of percentage points determined under subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) the amounts setting forth the tax shall be adjusted to the extent necessary to reflect the adjustments under clause (i).

''(B) PERCENTAGE POINTS OF REDUCTION.—

"For calendar year:	The number of percentage points is:
2000	5
2001	10
2002	15
2003	20
2004	25
2005	30
2006	35
2007	40
2008	45
2009	50.

''(C) COORDINATION WITH PARAGRAPH (2).—Paragraph (2) shall be applied by reducing the 55 percent percentage contained therein by the number of percentage points determined for such calendar year under subparagraph (B).

''(D) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR STATE DEATH TAXES.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (A) shall apply to the table contained in section 2011(b) except that the number of percentage points referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) shall be determined under the following table:

"For calendar year:	The number of percentage points is:
2000	1½
2001	3
2002	4½
2003	6
2004	7½
2005	9
2006	10½
2007	12
2008	13½
2009	15.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of H.R. 8, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 8

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, 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 Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

TITLE I—REPEAL OF ESTATE, GIFT, AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TAXES; REPEAL OF STEP UP IN BASIS AT DEATH

SEC. 101. REPEAL OF ESTATE, GIFT, AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and gifts and generation-skipping transfers made, after December 31, 2009.

SEC. 102. TERMINATION OF STEP UP IN BASIS AT DEATH.

(a) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF SECTION 1014.—Section 1014 (relating to basis of property acquired from a decedent) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) TERMINATION.—In the case of a decedent dying after December 31, 2009, this section shall not apply to property for which basis is provided by section 1022.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 1016 (relating to adjustments to basis) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(28) to the extent provided in section 1022 (relating to basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 2009).''.

SEC. 103. CARRYOVER BASIS AT DEATH.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

''SEC. 1022. CARRYOVER BASIS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT DYING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2009.

''(a) CARRYOVER BASIS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the basis of carryover basis property in the hands of a person acquiring such property from a decedent shall be determined under section 1015.

''(b) CARRYOVER BASIS PROPERTY DEFINED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'carryover basis property' means any property—

''(A) which is acquired from or passed from a decedent who died after December 31, 2009, and

''(B) which is not excluded pursuant to paragraph (2).

The property taken into account under subparagraph (A) shall be determined under section 1014(b) without regard to subparagraph (A) of the last sentence of paragraph (9) thereof.

''(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY NOT CARRYOVER BASIS PROPERTY.—The term 'carryover basis property' does not include—

''(A) any item of gross income in respect of a decedent described in section 691,

''(B) property of the decedent to the extent that the aggregate adjusted fair market value of such property does not exceed $1,300,000, and

''(C) property which was acquired from the decedent by the surviving spouse of the decedent (and which would be carryover basis property without regard to this subparagraph) but only if the value of such property would have been deductible from the value of the taxable estate of the decedent under section 2056, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000.

For purposes of this subsection, the term 'adjusted fair market value' means, with respect to any property, fair market value reduced by any indebtedness secured by such property.

''(3) LIMITATION ON EXCEPTION FOR PROPERTY ACQUIRED BY SURVIVING SPOUSE.—The adjusted fair market value of property which is not carryover basis property by reason of paragraph (2)(C) shall not exceed $3,000,000.

''(4) ALLOCATION OF EXCEPTED AMOUNTS.—The executor shall allocate the limitations under paragraphs (2)(B) and (3).

''(5) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT OF EXCEPTED AMOUNTS.—In the case of decedents dying in a calendar year after 2010, the dollar amounts in paragraphs (2)(B) and (3) shall each be increased by an amount equal to the product of—

''(A) such dollar amount, and

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting '2009' for '1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any increase determined under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $10,000, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.''.

(b) MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS RELATED TO CARRYOVER BASIS.—

(1) CAPITAL GAIN TREATMENT FOR INHERITED ART WORK OR SIMILAR PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 1221(a)(3) (defining capital asset) is amended by inserting ''(other than by reason of section 1022)'' after ''is determined''.

(B) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 170.—Paragraph (1) of section 170(e) (relating to certain contributions of ordinary income and capital gain property) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of this paragraph, the determination of whether property is a capital asset shall be made without regard to the exception contained in section 1221(a)(3)(C) for basis determined under section 1022.''.

(2) DEFINITION OF EXECUTOR.—Section 7701(a) (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(47) EXECUTOR.—The term 'executor' means the executor or administrator of the decedent, or, if there is no executor or administrator appointed, qualified, and acting within the United States, then any person in actual or constructive possession of any property of the decedent.''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 1022. Carryover basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 2009.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 2009.

TITLE II—REDUCTIONS OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAX RATES PRIOR TO REPEAL

SEC. 201. ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAX RATES.

(a) MAXIMUM RATE OF TAX REDUCED TO 50 PERCENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in section 2001(c)(1) is amended by striking the two highest brackets and inserting the following:

''Over $2,500,000	*$1,025,800, plus 50% of the excess over $2,500,000.''.*

(2) PHASE-IN OF REDUCED RATE.—Subsection (c) of section 2001 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PHASE-IN OF REDUCED RATE.—In the case of decedents dying, and gifts made, during 2001, the last item in the table contained in paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting '53%' for '50%'.''.

(b) REPEAL OF PHASEOUT OF GRADUATED RATES.—Subsection (c) of section 2001 is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3), as added by subsection (a), as paragraph (2).

(c) ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS OF RATES OF TAX.—Subsection (c) of section 2001, as so amended, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PHASEDOWN OF TAX.—In the case of estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, during any calendar year after 2002 and before 2010—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the tentative tax under this subsection shall be determined by using a table prescribed by the Secretary (in lieu of using the table contained in paragraph (1)) which is the same as such table; except that—

''(i) each of the rates of tax shall be reduced by the number of percentage points determined under subparagraph (B), and

''(ii) the amounts setting forth the tax shall be adjusted to the extent necessary to reflect the adjustments under clause (i).

''(B) PERCENTAGE POINTS OF REDUCTION.—

"For calendar year:	The number of percentage points is:
2003	1.0
2004	2.0
2005	3.0
2006	4.0
2007	5.5
2008	7.5
2009	9.5.

''(C) COORDINATION WITH INCOME TAX RATES.—The reductions under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall not reduce any rate under paragraph (1) below the lowest rate in section 1(c), and

''(ii) shall not reduce the highest rate under paragraph (1) below the highest rate in section 1(c).

''(D) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR STATE DEATH TAXES.—Rules similar to the rules of subparagraph (A) shall apply to the table contained in section 2011(b) except that the Secretary shall prescribe percentage point reductions which maintain the proportionate relationship (as in effect before any reduction under this paragraph) between the credit under section 2011 and the tax rates under subsection (c).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) SUBSECTIONS (a) AND (b).—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 2000.

(2) SUBSECTION (c).—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 2002.

TITLE III—UNIFIED CREDIT REPLACED WITH UNIFIED EXEMPTION AMOUNT

SEC. 301. UNIFIED CREDIT AGAINST ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES REPLACED WITH UNIFIED EXEMPTION AMOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTATE TAX.—Subsection (b) of section 2001 (relating to computation of tax) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by this section shall be the amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative tax determined under paragraph (2), over

''(B) the aggregate amount of tax which would have been payable under chapter 12 with respect to gifts made by the decedent after December 31, 1976, if the provisions of subsection (c) (as in effect at the decedent's death) had been applicable at the time of such gifts.

''(2) TENTATIVE TAX.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the tentative tax determined under this paragraph is a tax computed under subsection (c) on the excess of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) the amount of the taxable estate, and

''(ii) the amount of the adjusted taxable gifts, over

''(B) the exemption amount for the calendar year in which the decedent died.

''(3) EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'exemption amount' means the amount determined in accordance with the following table:

"In the case of calendar year:	The exemption amount is:
2001	$675,000
2002 and 2003	$700,000
2004	$850,000
2005	$950,000
2006 or thereafter	$1,000,000.

''(4) ADJUSTED TAXABLE GIFTS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'adjusted taxable gifts' means the total amount of the taxable gifts (within the meaning of section 2503) made by the decedent after December 31, 1976, other than gifts which are includible in the gross estate of the decedent.''

(2) GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 (relating to computation of tax) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be the amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative tax determined under paragraph (2), over

''(B) the tax paid under this section for all prior calendar periods.

''(2) TENTATIVE TAX.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the tentative tax determined under this paragraph for a calendar year is a tax computed under section 2001(c) on the excess of—

''(A) the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

''(B) the exemption amount under section 2001(b)(3) for such calendar year.''

(b) REPEAL OF UNIFIED CREDITS.—

(1) Section 2010 (relating to unified credit against estate tax) is hereby repealed.

(2) Section 2505 (relating to unified credit against gift tax) is hereby repealed.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1)(A) Subsection (b) of section 2011 is amended—

(i) by striking ''adjusted'' in the table, and

(ii) by striking the last sentence.

(B) Subsection (f) of section 2011 is amended by striking '', reduced by the amount of the unified credit provided by section 2010''.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 2012 is amended by striking ''and the unified credit provided by section 2010''.

(3) Subparagraph (A) of section 2013(c)(1) is amended by striking ''2010,''.

(4) Paragraph (2) of section 2014(b) is amended by striking ''2010, 2011,'' and inserting ''2011''.

(5) Clause (ii) of section 2056A(b)(12)(C) is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) to treat any reduction in the tax imposed by paragraph (1)(A) by reason of the credit allowable under section 2010 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000) or the exemption amount allowable under section 2001(b) with respect to the decedent as a credit under section 2505 (as so in effect) or exemption under section 2521 (as the case may be) allowable to such surviving spouse for purposes of determining the amount of the exemption allowable under section 2521 with respect to taxable gifts made by the surviving spouse during the year in which the spouse becomes a citizen or any subsequent year,''.

(6) Subsection (a) of section 2057 is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) MAXIMUM DEDUCTION.—The deduction allowed by this section shall not exceed the excess of $1,300,000 over the exemption amount (as defined in section 2001(b)(3)).''

(7)(A) Subsection (b) of section 2101 is amended to read as follows:

''(b) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by this section shall be the amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(A) the tentative tax determined under paragraph (2), over

''(B) a tentative tax computed under section 2001(c) on the amount of the adjusted taxable gifts.

''(2) TENTATIVE TAX.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the tentative tax determined under this paragraph is a tax computed under section 2001(c) on the excess of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) the amount of the taxable estate, and

''(ii) the amount of the adjusted taxable gifts, over

''(B) the exemption amount for the calendar year in which the decedent died.

''(3) EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'exemption amount' means $60,000.

''(B) RESIDENTS OF POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.—In the case of a decedent who is considered to be a nonresident not a citizen of the United States under section 2209, the exemption amount under this paragraph shall be the greater of—

''(i) $60,000, or

''(ii) that proportion of $175,000 which the value of that part of the decedent's gross estate which at the time of his death is situated in the United States bears to the value of his entire gross estate wherever situated.

''(C) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(i) COORDINATION WITH TREATIES.—To the extent required under any treaty obligation of the United States, the exemption amount allowed under this paragraph shall be equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the exemption amount under section 2001(b)(3) (for the calendar year in which the decedent died) as the value of the part of the decedent's gross estate which at the time of his death is situated in the United States bears to the value of his entire gross estate wherever situated. For purposes of the preceding sentence, property shall not be treated as situated in the United States if such property is exempt from the tax imposed by this subchapter under any treaty obligation of the United States.

''(ii) COORDINATION WITH GIFT TAX EXEMPTION AND UNIFIED CREDIT.—If an exemption has been allowed under section 2521 (or a credit has been allowed under section 2505 as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000) with respect to any gift made by the decedent, each dollar amount contained in subparagraph (A) or (B) or the exemption amount applicable under clause (i) of this subparagraph (whichever applies) shall be reduced by the exemption so allowed under section 2521 (or, in the case of such a credit, by the amount of the gift for which the credit was so allowed).''.

(8) Section 2102 is amended by striking subsection (c).

(9)(A) Subsection (a) of section 2107 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) LIMITATION ON EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 2101(b)(3) shall not apply in applying section 2101 for purposes of this section.''.

(B) Subsection (c) of section 2107 is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and

(ii) by striking the second sentence of paragraph (2) (as so redesignated).

(10) Paragraph (1) of section 6018(a) is amended by striking ''the applicable exclusion amount in effect under section 2010(c)'' and inserting ''the exemption amount under section 2001(b)(3)''.

(11) Subparagraph (A) of section 6601(j)(2) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2001(c) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were $1,000,000, or''.

(12) The table of sections for part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2010.

(13) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2505.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) insofar as they relate to the tax imposed by chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 2000, and

(2) insofar as they relate to the tax imposed by chapter 12 of such Code, shall apply to gifts made after December 31, 2000.

TITLE IV—MODIFICATIONS OF GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX

SEC. 401. DEEMED ALLOCATION OF GST EXEMPTION TO LIFETIME TRANSFERS TO TRUSTS; RETROACTIVE ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2632 (relating to special rules for allocation of GST exemption) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

''(c) DEEMED ALLOCATION TO CERTAIN LIFETIME TRANSFERS TO GST TRUSTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If any individual makes an indirect skip during such individual's lifetime, any unused portion of such individual's GST exemption shall be allocated to the property transferred to the extent necessary to make the inclusion ratio for such property zero. If the amount of the indirect skip exceeds such unused portion, the entire unused portion shall be allocated to the property transferred.

''(2) UNUSED PORTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the unused portion of an individual's GST exemption is that portion of such exemption which has not previously been—

''(A) allocated by such individual,

''(B) treated as allocated under subsection (b) with respect to a direct skip occurring during or before the calendar year in which the indirect skip is made, or

''(C) treated as allocated under paragraph (1) with respect to a prior indirect skip.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—

''(A) INDIRECT SKIP.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'indirect skip' means any transfer of property (other than a direct skip) subject to the tax imposed by chapter 12 made to a GST trust.

''(B) GST TRUST.—The term 'GST trust' means a trust that could have a generation-skipping transfer with respect to the transferor unless—

''(i) the trust instrument provides that more than 25 percent of the trust corpus must be distributed to or may be withdrawn by 1 or more individuals who are non-skip persons—

''(I) before the date that the individual attains age 46,

''(II) on or before one or more dates specified in the trust instrument that will occur before the date that such individual attains age 46, or

''(III) upon the occurrence of an event that, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, may reasonably be expected to occur before the date that such individual attains age 46;

''(ii) the trust instrument provides that more than 25 percent of the trust corpus must be distributed to or may be withdrawn by one or more individuals who are non-skip persons and who are living on the date of death of another person identified in the instrument (by name or by class) who is more than 10 years older than such individuals;

''(iii) the trust instrument provides that, if one or more individuals who are non-skip persons die on or before a date or event described in clause (i) or (ii), more than 25 percent of the trust corpus either must be distributed to the estate or estates of one or more of such individuals or is subject to a general power of appointment exercisable by one or more of such individuals;

''(iv) the trust is a trust any portion of which would be included in the gross estate of a non-skip person (other than the transferor) if such person died immediately after the transfer;

''(v) the trust is a charitable lead annuity trust (within the meaning of section 2642(e)(3)(A)) or a charitable remainder annuity trust or a charitable remainder unitrust (within the meaning of section 664(d)); or

''(vi) the trust is a trust with respect to which a deduction was allowed under section 2522 for the amount of an interest in the form of the right to receive annual payments of a fixed percentage of the net fair market value of the trust property (determined yearly) and which is required to pay principal to a non-skip person if such person is alive when the yearly payments for which the deduction was allowed terminate.

For purposes of this subparagraph, the value of transferred property shall not be considered to be includible in the gross estate of a non-skip person or subject to a right of withdrawal by reason of such person holding a right to withdraw so much of such property as does not exceed the amount referred to in section 2503(b) with respect to any transferor, and it shall be assumed that powers of appointment held by non-skip persons will not be exercised.

''(4) AUTOMATIC ALLOCATIONS TO CERTAIN GST TRUSTS.—For purposes of this subsection, an indirect skip to which section 2642(f) applies shall be deemed to have been made only at the close of the estate tax inclusion period. The fair market value of such transfer shall be the fair market value of the trust property at the close of the estate tax inclusion period.

''(5) APPLICABILITY AND EFFECT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual—

''(i) may elect to have this subsection not apply to—

''(I) an indirect skip, or

''(II) any or all transfers made by such individual to a particular trust, and

''(ii) may elect to treat any trust as a GST trust for purposes of this subsection with respect to any or all transfers made by such individual to such trust.

''(B) ELECTIONS.—

''(i) ELECTIONS WITH RESPECT TO INDIRECT SKIPS.—An election under subparagraph (A)(i)(I) shall be deemed to be timely if filed on a timely filed gift tax return for the calendar year in which the transfer was made or deemed to have been made pursuant to paragraph (4) or on such later date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

''(ii) OTHER ELECTIONS.—An election under clause (i)(II) or (ii) of subparagraph (A) may be made on a timely filed gift tax return for the calendar year for which the election is to become effective.

''(d) RETROACTIVE ALLOCATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

''(A) a non-skip person has an interest or a future interest in a trust to which any transfer has been made,

''(B) such person—

''(i) is a lineal descendant of a grandparent of the transferor or of a grandparent of the transferor's spouse or former spouse, and

''(ii) is assigned to a generation below the generation assignment of the transferor, and

''(C) such person predeceases the transferor,

then the transferor may make an allocation of any of such transferor's unused GST exemption to any previous transfer or transfers to the trust on a chronological basis.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—If the allocation under paragraph (1) by the transferor is made on a gift tax return filed on or before the date prescribed by section 6075(b) for gifts made within the calendar year within which the non-skip person's death occurred—

''(A) the value of such transfer or transfers for purposes of section 2642(a) shall be determined as if such allocation had been made on a timely filed gift tax return for each calendar year within which each transfer was made,

''(B) such allocation shall be effective immediately before such death, and

''(C) the amount of the transferor's unused GST exemption available to be allocated shall be determined immediately before such death.

''(3) FUTURE INTEREST.—For purposes of this subsection, a person has a future interest in a trust if the trust may permit income or corpus to be paid to such person on a date or dates in the future.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 2632(b) is amended by striking ''with respect to a direct skip'' and inserting ''or subsection (c)(1)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) DEEMED ALLOCATION.—Section 2632(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (a)), and the amendment made by subsection (b), shall apply to transfers subject to chapter 11 or 12 made after December 31, 1999, and to estate tax inclusion periods ending after December 31, 1999.

(2) RETROACTIVE ALLOCATIONS.—Section 2632(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (a)) shall apply to deaths of non-skip persons occurring after December 31, 1999.

SEC. 402. SEVERING OF TRUSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 2642 (relating to inclusion ratio) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) SEVERING OF TRUSTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a trust is severed in a qualified severance, the trusts resulting from such severance shall be treated as separate trusts thereafter for purposes of this chapter.

''(B) QUALIFIED SEVERANCE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified severance' means the division of a single trust and the creation (by any means available under the governing instrument or under local law) of two or more trusts if—

''(I) the single trust was divided on a fractional basis, and

''(II) the terms of the new trusts, in the aggregate, provide for the same succession of interests of beneficiaries as are provided in the original trust.

''(ii) TRUSTS WITH INCLUSION RATIO GREATER THAN ZERO.—If a trust has an inclusion ratio of greater than zero and less than 1, a severance is a qualified severance only if the single trust is divided into two trusts, one of which receives a fractional share of the total value of all trust assets equal to the applicable fraction of the single trust immediately before the severance. In

such case, the trust receiving such fractional share shall have an inclusion ratio of zero and the other trust shall have an inclusion ratio of 1.

''(iii) REGULATIONS.—The term 'qualified severance' includes any other severance permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(C) TIMING AND MANNER OF SEVERANCES.—A severance pursuant to this paragraph may be made at any time. The Secretary shall prescribe by forms or regulations the manner in which the qualified severance shall be reported to the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to severances after December 31, 1999.

SEC. 403. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN VALUATION RULES.

(a) GIFTS FOR WHICH GIFT TAX RETURN FILED OR DEEMED ALLOCATION MADE.—Paragraph (1) of section 2642(b) (relating to valuation rules, etc.) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) GIFTS FOR WHICH GIFT TAX RETURN FILED OR DEEMED ALLOCATION MADE.—If the allocation of the GST exemption to any transfers of property is made on a gift tax return filed on or before the date prescribed by section 6075(b) for such transfer or is deemed to be made under section 2632 (b)(1) or (c)(1)—

''(A) the value of such property for purposes of subsection (a) shall be its value as finally determined for purposes of chapter 12 (within the meaning of section 2001(f)(2)), or, in the case of an allocation deemed to have been made at the close of an estate tax inclusion period, its value at the time of the close of the estate tax inclusion period, and

''(B) such allocation shall be effective on and after the date of such transfer, or, in the case of an allocation deemed to have been made at the close of an estate tax inclusion period, on and after the close of such estate tax inclusion period.''.

(b) TRANSFERS AT DEATH.—Subparagraph (A) of section 2642(b)(2) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) TRANSFERS AT DEATH.—If property is transferred as a result of the death of the transferor, the value of such property for purposes of subsection (a) shall be its value as finally determined for purposes of chapter 11; except that, if the requirements prescribed by the Secretary respecting allocation of post-death changes in value are not met, the value of such property shall be determined as of the time of the distribution concerned.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to transfers subject to chapter 11 or 12 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 made after December 31, 1999.

SEC. 404. RELIEF PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2642 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) RELIEF PROVISIONS.—

''(1) RELIEF FROM LATE ELECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe such circumstances and procedures under which extensions of time will be granted to make—

''(i) an allocation of GST exemption described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b), and

''(ii) an election under subsection (b)(3) or (c)(5) of section 2632.

Such regulations shall include procedures for requesting comparable relief with respect to transfers made before the date of the enactment of this paragraph.

''(B) BASIS FOR DETERMINATIONS.—In determining whether to grant relief under this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into account all relevant circumstances, including evidence of intent contained in the trust instrument or instrument of transfer and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant. For purposes of determining whether to grant relief under this paragraph, the time for making the allocation (or election) shall be treated as if not expressly prescribed by statute.

''(2) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE.—An allocation of GST exemption under section 2632 that demonstrates an intent to have the lowest possible inclusion ratio with respect to a transfer or a trust shall be deemed to be an allocation of so much of the transferor's unused GST exemption as produces the lowest possible inclusion ratio. In determining whether there has been substantial compliance, all relevant circumstances shall be taken into account, including evidence of intent contained in the trust instrument or instrument of transfer and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) RELIEF FROM LATE ELECTIONS.—Section 2642(g)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (a)) shall apply to requests pending on, or filed after, December 31, 1999.

(2) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE.—Section 2642(g)(2) of such Code (as so added) shall apply to transfers subject to chapter 11 or 12 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 made after December 31, 1999. No implication is intended with respect to the availability of relief from late elections or the application of a rule of substantial compliance on or before such date.

TITLE V—CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

SEC. 501. EXPANSION OF ESTATE TAX RULE FOR CONSERVATION EASEMENTS.

(a) WHERE LAND IS LOCATED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 2031(c)(8)(A) (defining land subject to a conservation easement) is amended—

(A) by striking ''25 miles'' both places it appears and inserting ''50 miles'', and

(B) striking ''10 miles'' and inserting ''25 miles''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1999.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DATE FOR DETERMINING VALUE OF LAND AND EASEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2031(c)(2) (defining applicable percentage) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The values taken into account under the preceding sentence shall be such values as of the date of the contribution referred to in paragraph (8)(B).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 106–658, which may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 8.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today is another historic and proud moment for this House, for our country, and for me personally. When I came to Congress 30 years ago, I had three major goals. One was to balance the budget so that future generations would not have to pay the high debt service charges. The second was to eliminate the earnings limit on Social Security beneficiaries so that they continue to work without suffering the loss of their Social Security benefits. Both of those two are now the law of the land.

□ 1000

My third goal was to abolish the death tax. And today we will do that on a bipartisan basis. We will completely repeal it. We will erase it from the Tax Code forever, in hopes that it will never return from the dead to haunt American families, farms, businesses. This is truly an historic day.

The death tax is wrong. Death as an event should not trigger a tax. Some have even said that it is ghoulish to think that someone who works an entire lifetime saving, preparing to leave something to their children, starting a business, running a ranch or a farm, and all the time paying taxes to find that what is left over gets hit again from the grave.

The ancient Egyptians built elaborate fortresses and tunnels and even posted guards at tombs to stop grave robbers. In today's America, we call that estate planning.

Today, Americans are trying to avoid the death tax like never before. In fact, they spend millions and millions of dollars every year paying accountants, lawyers and financial planners to try to limit this tax in any way that they can. And why should they not? The death tax is the natural born killer of everything that they have worked for their entire lives. It is the wrecking ball of a life's worth of achievement and success.

Think about it. The top death tax rate today in the law is 60 percent. That means the IRS gets 122 percent to 150 percent of what the children get. Is something not wrong when the government gets more than the family? And that is just the first generation of children. If someone wanted to help their grandchildren, and I know many of us in this Chamber and those watching on C–SPAN have grandchildren, I have 14 myself, so just listen to this: Because of the death tax and what is part of it, a part of the death tax, the so-called generation-skipping penalty, the IRS gets 244 percent of what a grandchild does if a dying person leaves their assets to their grandchildren. That is outlandish. So today we are going to do what is right and we are going to fix it once and for all.

The death tax is especially threatening to the backbone of America's economy, the small business owner and the family farm. That is why repealing the death tax is priority number one for the National Federation of Independent Businesses and the American Farm Bureau.

Imagine a family owning and working on a family farm for 30 years. They build and develop the land with the hope of passing it along to their children so that they can have a better life. But after their death, the children tragically find that the farm will not be staying in the family but will instead be going on the auction block to pay the IRS. Unfortunately, this is not a rare occurrence. Many family farms must be sold to pay the Federal taxes due on the property and many, many businesses, too.

One-third of small business owners today will have to sell outright or liquidate a part of their company to pay death taxes. More than 70 percent of family businesses do not survive the second generation, and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation.

The impact of the death tax on small business means it is especially threatening to women, women who are creating business at twice the rate of men today. Since 1987, the number of female-owned ventures has doubled from 4.5 million to 9.1 million. Last year women-owned companies employed more than 27 million Americans, nearly 9 million more than in 1996. These are the new CEOs. U.S. News and World Report, on its cover, featured this exact item. That is why women business owners are in strong support of complete repeal of the death tax.

But the death tax does not just hit the business owner. It is a job killer, too. In fact, the tax hits hard-working Americans who lose their jobs and their health care when a business or a farm for which they work must be sold to pay the tax. Sixty percent of small business owners report that they would create new jobs over the coming year if estate taxes were eliminated. Half of those who must liquidate the business to pay the IRS will each have to eliminate 30 or more jobs. That is one of the reasons why liberals, moderates, and conservatives alike support getting rid of the death tax entirely. They understand this is not a rich against the poor issue, it is a jobs issue and a fairness issue. We should reward hard work and success and not punish it.

Finally, the death tax is the grim reaper of personal savings in this country. The only cloud on our economic horizon is the death of personal savings in the U.S. Today's personal savings rate is the lowest it has ever been in the history of our nation, and the death tax is a dollar-for-dollar tax on savings.

In summary, the death tax is simply unfair; and it is time to repeal it once and for all. No American, no matter what their income, should have to pay taxes when they die. They have worked all their life, they have paid taxes on that income all of their life, and they should not get socked one more time from the grave if they want to pass it on to their children or their grandchildren. Our children should come first, before the IRS, in the pecking order of family business, farm, or savings account.

Benjamin Franklin, one of the wisest Founding Fathers, said there were two certainties in life, death and taxes. But I doubt if Dr. Franklin, even with his extraordinary foresight, could have told us that today both would occur at the same time. It is time to bury the death tax.

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

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

The Committee on Ways and Means, under the leadership of the majority, has embarked on a political scheme before this election to present to the American people every week some type of a tax problem that they have not found a solution for. Unfortunately, before they bring the solution to the floor, they make certain that the President of the United States is going to veto it.

It is absolutely remarkable how if they find a mosquito, they have to run for a sledgehammer to get rid of the problem. Take, for example, our very complex tax system, which year after year that they have been in the majority they have made even more complex. Just weigh the Tax Code that we had before they had the majority and weigh it today and see what they have done to it.

Do our colleagues come and say to the Democrats and to the President that this system is overbearing, can we not work together to resolve it by simplifying it? No. No. What is the Republican solution? Let us pull the Tax Code up by the roots.

If we have a problem with people being married paying too much taxes, do they just take care of it? No. They will have a tax cut so severe that the President of the United States would say we should take care of that problem, but we should not have to do it at the expense of not reducing the Federal debt, placing into jeopardy the Social Security System and our Medicare system.

The emotional thing to talk about is how families would lose their businesses and their farms as a result of the hard work that their parents and grandparents have done. It would be wrong for this to happen. And even though we are only talking about 2 percent of the American people that would be subjected to a review of their taxes, they are still Americans, and they are still entitled to equity. But do we really say that the answer to this problem, and it is a problem, is to repeal the estate tax completely? Under the Democratic alternative the Republicans would be hard put to see whether any rancher, any farmer, any small business will be lost as a result of the $4 million exemption. I say exemption, which means that they do not even have to think about the reduced rate of taxes.

Every estate planner knows that we have a better alternative. They know we take care of the problem. But we do not take care of the multibillion-dollar estates. That is what we do not take care of. We do not take care of those people who have had creative ideas, who have built up equities and tax liabilities that go into many numbers in terms of tax liabilities, that have never been taxed and would only be exposed to taxation at death. We do not talk about those. Oh, we probably have some in Texas and some in New York, but what we wanted to do was take care of 99.9 percent of the businesses that would be adversely affected, and this we have done.

My colleagues have an emotional argument talking about repeal. But one day the American people will take a look at the cost of the Republicans' bill, the cost of repeal, and wonder whether the Republicans were thinking about them or whether they had a handful of people that have been kind to them that they are trying to get relief for. Because anybody can tell my colleagues that their bill in the year 2011 will start having a revenue hemorrhage of $50 billion a year. Maybe my colleagues are prepared to say that they feel that we can afford to do that and take care of Social Security, take care of Medicare, take care of the Patients' Bill of Rights, take care of affordable prescriptions; or, really, do they care at all?

This is a great shot in the arm for my colleagues because they know the President is going to be responsible. None of them would be so irresponsible to be proposing this if they thought it would become law. They know it is going to be vetoed. They know that next week they will be coming back with something else that will be vetoed.

I am just asking this. In the last weeks of this Congress, can we not come together on something and agree on it? Must we try to seek a Republican political statement instead of a bipartisan agreement? If everyone would conclude that the Democrat alternative takes care of the problem that we are talking about, why do we have to go beyond that and hemorrhage the revenue for those people that will become eligible in the next 10 years for Medicare and Social Security? My Republican colleagues know it is going to be vetoed, but it is not the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and that he be allowed to manage the time on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) will control the rest of the gentleman's time.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), who has authored this bill in combination with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) on a bipartisan basis. She has worked so hard over the years to get us to where we are today.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor of the House today.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), for the hard work he has done over the years as we move this important endeavor to the floor of the House. H.R. 8 has the support of 246 Members of the House of Representatives, 46 Democrats, and one Independent.

□ 1015

There is one main reason, Mr. Speaker, why the majority of this Congress and 85 percent of the American people support the repeal of the death tax, that reason is fairness. It has been said that only with our government are you given a certificate at birth, a license at marriage, and a bill at death.

One of the most compelling aspects of the American dream is to make life better for our children and our loved ones. Yet the current tax treatment of a person's life savings is so onerous that when one dies, the children are often forced to turn over sometimes more than half of their savings of their parent's hard work during their lifetimes to the Federal Government.

Even worse, not only does this take place at an agonizing time in the life of a family, but often these people are forced to watch their loved one's legacy be snatched up by an entity not known for its great insight in spending taxpayer funds. This is not fair.

Death should not trigger a tax. We should not dishonor the hard work of those who have passed on. This is especially true, Mr. Speaker, of minority and women-owned businesses.

Minorities understand that sometimes it takes two to three generations to build an economic foothold in a community through a family-held business. That is why the Black Chamber of Commerce, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the National Indian Business Association, and the Pan-American Chamber of Commerce support H.R. 8.

In addition, a recent study by the National Association of Women Business Owners revealed that women-owned businesses on average spend $1,000 a month complying for the death tax. These dollars should go to benefits like health coverage for the 44 million who are uninsured. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the floor to vote for H.R. 8.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a senior Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have a rather personal interest in this legislation, and I have heard a lot from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means about what we owe our children, so I have come to the well this morning and apologize to my children, I have 5, and 10 grandchildren.

I am probably one of the few Members of the House who started out poor. I used to say I was so poor as a kid I never slept alone until I was married. But through good luck and the action of commerce, I was able to amass what most of the people in my district would call a fortune. And I have not paid much tax on that. I pay income tax each year. I pay more income tax than you pay me salary, but most of what I have was accumulated through capital gains, and I have not sold it. I do not intend to.

My kids will get it pretty much free. So I apologize because I am going to vote against this. Kids, to Jeff and Bea and Thekla and Sarah, Fortney and the 10 grandkids, you are going to have to pay some tax. This is a little family business, it might be 7 figures, but you are going to get a down payment on that from your mother and me of $1,350,000 free. You have not worked a day in your life for that.

You have a college education, down payment on your homes, cars, but you have not worked worth squat. But you are going to get a million, a million and a half bucks. And then you are going to get half that business free and you may have to pay 50 percent, 55 percent on that tax if they appraise the business at its full value. And you are going to get 10 years to pay that off at a below prime rate interest rate. And, kids, if you are so dumb that you cannot run that business with over a 50 percent down payment given to you and 10 years to pay off the balance at a low rate, you do not deserve it.

You ought to have been trained in this country to earn your own way and pay your taxes every day so that Dad can have a prescription drug benefit and I can have a decent nursing home so you do not have to worry about taking care of me in my dotage.

There are not very many Members of Congress that are going to pay any inheritance tax, and do not believe them. This is a gift to the rich not for independent, smart kids like I have hoped I raised.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has quite a legacy. In response to the gentleman that just spoke, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), I am the first person in my family to ever graduate college, I do not have a fortune. I admire the fact that he wants to construct life for his children a certain way, but this gentleman is making decisions for millions of Americans, let him make his own decision.

What I would like to have is a decision made up here that empowers people that if they want to give money to the church instead of the government they can. We collect less than 2 percent from the death tax in this country, and to get that 2 percent here is what you lose: You lose family farms in my district in droves because people are land rich on paper and cash poor. You lose the small business that cannot go to the next generation to get less than 2 percent to monkey with the money up here.

Philanthropy is lost. The human spirit is suppressed. Most people want a legacy. They want to give something back, a library, a hospital wing, a donation to their church. This is a form of socialism that must go. Let us start a new century with a Tax Code that brings out the best in the American people not the worst. To get 2 percent of the money, we have to ruin a lot of families and that is unnecessary. I say congratulations to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, socialism? Teddy Roosevelt's idea? Members come here with all the talk about fairness and about women and minorities, we are talking about 2 percent of the decendents in this country, the very wealthy; that is what we are talking about.

What is the problem? The substitute addresses them, family farms? Ninety-eight or 90 percent of the family farms will be taken out of an estate tax by the substitute. Small businesses? Only 1/10 of 1 percent are subject to the estate tax. Members come here raising the banner of all of these small businesses. We are talking about a small portion of them, and the vast majority of them will be taken care of by the substitute. And all of the others who are subject to the estate tax, the substitute addresses their needs faster than your bill.

In a sense, those of us who are on the other side of this issue have lost the propaganda battle. Members have managed to move an estate tax to a death tax, but I have no hesitation to go back to my district and to talk about what

the impact of this repeal would mean for 98 percent of my constituents, 98 percent.

I will talk about Members coming here yesterday and not being able to fund Head Start, not being able to fund training; and we are going to give, 10 years from now, a $50 billion tax cut to the very wealthy in this country? I will take that battle on any time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished and respected Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, how sad and how cynical that the left can only embrace the politics of envy. How sad that today they rely on tired, shopworn old arguments attempting to divide Americans, when we will see in this Chamber later today a bipartisan majority standing up for tax fairness intent on putting the death tax to death.

Our constitutional republic was founded, in part, because the people in that time stood up against taxation, no taxation without representation was their rallying cry. Today, all Americans stand up to say no taxation without respiration, because it is fundamentally unfair, regardless of your economic station in life, to have this tax visited upon the American people.

And here is why for the disconnect that seems to affect my friends on the left when they lament the facts that this affects only 2 percent of the populace, a little economic primer, friends. Mr. Speaker, government does not create jobs. The American people, through their entrepreneurial endeavor and spirit, create jobs; and in the private sector, we should not inhibit that. That is why the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, that is why the Black Chamber of Commerce understands that the color of economic opportunity in this country is green, in terms of capital, to create jobs, to create growth and economic opportunity, to let families hang on to their farms and ranchers and small businesses and, yes, to succeed.

This is the fundamental difference, Mr. Speaker. We embrace the principles of prosperity. My friends on the left embrace the politics of envy.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for yielding me the time and say that I rise in support of H.R. 8. The estate tax is an outmoded, inefficient, complicated subjective tax. The Tax Code needs to be rewritten. This is a good first step.

This tax applies, as I am told, and I came to this from the standpoint of a small business and family farmer, over 70 percent of estate taxes that are filed on estates of $5 million or less, we are told that this costs 72 cents of every dollar collected simply to administer it, and for that reason, I support H.R. 8. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for her cosponsorship.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) .

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the House today for considering this very important initiative. In the late 1950s, many Hispanic-Americans came to this country. Cuban-born fleeing Cuba because of the tyranny of Fidel Castro. He stole their property. He stole their fortune, and they left their homeland penniless and came often to south Florida.

They worked hard against daunting odds, new to a country with no family roots in this Nation. They succeeded oftentimes because of hard work and a lot of the American freedom and spirit and integrity. Lo and behold those same, now Americans born in Cuba, are suffering because estate taxes are depriving their heirs of their heritage.

They left Communism to come to freedom and find our own policies here in America confiscatory. Now, a lot of people keep talking about the rich, oh, the rich in America. The rich know how to figure it out. They have the dollars in their pocket to buy high-dollar denomination insurance policies or they leave their money to trust. Ted Turner, Bill Gates, look at the billions they have given away, and they will deplete the accounts before the U.S. government will get their hands on it. They are smart. They are sophisticated. They made it their own way.

I started a little business when I was 21. My mother and I and my family invested a lot of money to build a small business. This debate is not about my parent. They do not have a large estate, nor is it about me. I do not either. But never did the U.S. government or the local government help me with my business. It was always a regulation of rule, a fee, a permit, a tax, a license, a this, a that and the other. And we spent, spent money to keep up with government's plans for us. Never did they be a partner with me, but lo and behold when I die, they sure join in the parade.

Let me pull money out of your pocket to spend on all kinds of programs. So, folks, let us get serious. Let us help all Americans and repeal the death tax.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, ''Inherited economic power is as inconsistent with the ideals of this generation as inherited political power was inconsistent with the ideals of the generation which established our government.''

□ 1030

''If ever our people become so sordid as to feel that all that counts is moneyed prosperity, ignoble well-being, effortless ease and comfort, then this Nation shall perish as it will deserve to perish from this earth.''

Those are the bold words of a Republican, a different mold of Republican than we find today, one named Teddy Roosevelt who was the person who first proposed the estate tax in 1906 that this new crowd of Republicans is so intent on mislabeling as the ''death tax.'' Teddy Roosevelt's words ring as true at the beginning of this new century as they did when they were uttered at the beginning of the last. This bill should rightfully be called the ''Billionaire Protection Act.''

Treasury Secretary Summers said yesterday that this represents ''the most regressive tax bill'' he has ever seen. That is because 95 percent of the benefits go to the richest 1 percent of the decedents. Masquerading as the defenders of small business and family farmers, this crowd saves its true benevolence every year for Steve Forbes, Ross Perot, and what Forbes magazine recently described as the ''overclass'' in America, because they have so very much more money than what we usually consider as being wealthy. This ''overclass'' of the privileged few will be welcoming this bill with open arms and open wallets.

Yes, we should modify the estate tax to meet the legitimate concerns of small businesses. The substitute that I support provides family-owned businesses more estate tax relief sooner than the Republican proposal will. There is no good public policy reason to eliminate taxes on the ultra-wealthy in order to meet the needs of family-owned businesses and farms.

As for the last speaker's comments about charity, remember that the wealthiest estates give twice as much to charity as they do to the tax collector. Every charity, every religious and educational institution in this country will be a loser under this bill. All of this harm to the Treasury and to our charitable institutions for the sole purpose of giving those at the very top, the richest few in this country, the ''overclass'' in this country, the benefits of this bill. It is wrong and it should be rejected.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), a distinguished and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was a long, hard road to reach this day; and we still are hearing repeatedly that some people just do not get it. The gentleman from Michigan said 98 percent of his constituents are not going to benefit from the elimination of the death tax.

Why did the polls repeatedly show a majority of Americans support repeal? It is pretty simple. It is called the American dream.

All one has to do is go to Ellis Island. My colleagues know the words: ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breath free.'' Yearning? The dictionary says, Yearning: to have a strong or deep desire. To be filled with longing. Free. Freedom to choose, to do what you want to do; freedom from want, from fear.

If someone works and really does not do a good job of developing and living the American dream, they get taxed once. If someone works hard, saves, takes care of their family, creates, produces jobs, currently, in this country, they get taxed twice.

Do my colleagues know what? Those 98 percent who are not going to get the immediate benefits of this believe in the American dream. They want to have the opportunity, the freedom, to leave their fruits to their children. Let us today vote yes on the repeal of the death tax and yes in favor of the American dream.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree, there are many people who have this dream, the dream of not doing very much during their life except have a good time, and then having been smart enough to have rich parents who have millions of dollars.

Now, there is an inconvenience if one inherits millions of dollars today. There will be some tax on them. But if the Republicans have their way, one will be able to dream one's way into wealth, not because of any single thing they did other than to be born into the right circumstances.

This is not a tax on death. Dead men tell no tales, and dead men and women pay no taxes. This is a tax on those who inherent the wealth that was earned by others.

Now, there is nothing the matter with that. If people ask my advice, I would say sure, I think it is a very good idea to have rich relatives. If I were you, I would try very hard to have rich parents. I would try very hard to have rich parents, and maybe they will leave you some money. But the tax is on the beneficiaries of other people's work, and what a tax repeal.

I think if we were giving a prize for the single worst idea to come forward from the group that has been rife with them, it would be this. The idea is this: let us make the Tax Code of America better for very rich people. Let us give substantial tax relief to the richest people we can find. Forget about the person making $40,000 a year and paying Social Security payroll taxes. Forget about all of those other people paying income tax. We are here to give tax relief to the richest 2 percent of America.

Small business. I must say, every cloud has a silver lining. For once, some of my friends on the other side have seen merit in trying to help minority businesses and women-owned businesses, but I would say to my colleagues, do not do that by using them as a front to give substantial tax relief, not to the wealthiest people in America, but to the relatives of the wealthiest people in the America, who may or may not have done anything to earn it. Yes, people should be able to enjoy what they earn, and they can even enjoy what other people earn, but not quite without any taxation at all.

This from a group that says we cannot afford to subsidize prescription drugs for middle-income elderly people. We have to cut Pell grants. My Republican colleagues want to help older people as long as they are very wealthy.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), another distinguished and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) for their leadership on this legislation.

The death tax is a bad idea. The death tax is bad social policy. The death tax is unfair, and it is just plain wrong for the Government to confiscate the life's work at the time of death. The death tax is also bad for the environment.

Why are so many major and respected environmental groups supporting elimination of the death tax? Because environmental groups say that the death tax is bad for the environment. The death tax encourages suburban sprawl in Illinois. The death tax encourages the loss of valuable farmland in Illinois. The death tax destroys valuable open space and wildlife habitat in Illinois. Let me give an example of why.

I represent the Chicago south suburbs surrounded by some of the best farmland in the world. This farmland is not only good farmland; but because of its location, it is prime and ripe for development and because of its potential price, the sale price for development, it triggers the death tax, and many children of family farmers in the areas surrounding the suburbs here in Washington, D.C., or in any major metropolitan area are forced to sell much or all of the family farm, just to pay the death tax; and usually it is sold to developers, losing its use as valuable open space and farmland.

Let us keep the family farm in farming by eliminating the death tax. Let us protect valuable open space by eliminating the death tax. Let us protect valuable wildlife habitat by eliminating the death tax.

I say to my colleagues, the death tax is bad for the environment. Oppose the substitute, support this legislation, vote aye. It deserves a good, bipartisan vote.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I hope that my colleagues will vote against this measure. We hear talk about the American dream and how we want to give every American this American dream. Absolutely, we want to give every American this American dream. Every American.

When America learns that what we are talking about is not giving ever American the American dream through this bill, but only 2 percent of Americans the American dream, because only 2 percent will ever receive a tax cut in this bill, because only 2 percent of estates ever pay any estate tax. Forget about 98 percent of America, and it is not any 98 percent of America, it is the 98 percent that falls below the 2 percent richest Americans, who will receive nothing. Only the 2 percent most influential and richest will get this break.

This is about as irresponsible as we can get. We are facing a time recently where we had $300 billion deficits. We are paying more than $200 billion a year in interest payments on the national debt. We finally have a surplus; we finally have a chance to be fiscally responsible. We finally have a chance to talk about perhaps getting prescription drug coverage for our seniors under Medicare. We finally have a chance to talk about shoring up Social Security. We finally have a chance to talk about giving our kids a chance to break away from the digital divide and have a computer in their classroom.

We could pay for a computer for every child in America, rich or poor, with the money we are about to give in tax cuts to 2 percent of America at the top of the ladder. We could provide prescription drug coverage with the money we are going to spend on this, because the $50 billion a year it will cost us is more than what we are budgeting than the Republican Congress is budgeting for prescription drug coverage and Medicare in its budget for the next 5 years.

Think of it. The budget that we passed out of this House says $40 billion should be allocated for prescription drug coverage for seniors, millions and millions of seniors. Yet over 1 year, it will take $50 billion out of the Treasury to make up the tax cut that only 2 percent of the wealthiest Americans will receive. That is not responsible. That is not what we should do. Let the American dream live for everyone, not just for 2 percent of Americans.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), who has contributed toward the development of this proposal.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, for 1 minute, can we just set aside all of this rhetorical, divisive language about left and right and who wants to stiff-arm 2 percent or 98 percent. That is not what this is about. The whole basis of this law has changed. We have to recognize that there are middle-income businesses, small businesses all throughout this country that would benefit from a change; and we all know that there is an objection with respect to whether or not the megawealthy may or may not be able to have more advantages than they have right now.

This is the first step in a legislative process, and we can be thankful to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), who are excellent legislators. Everyone knows that. They will put together a package that in the end is going to achieve tax equity and fairness for the overwhelming majority of Americans who deserve it, that is going to help preserve jobs and that is going to see to it that the small businesses throughout this country and the jobs that they create are going to be preserved and protected.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8. it is pro-jobs and pro-tax fairness, and the House should pass the bill by a wide majority.

As many of you know, I have been a long time supporter of working people and their interests. It is from those perspectives that I come here today to support H.R. 8 and urge the reform of the federal estate tax law.

A permanent federal estate tax was first enacted in 1916. there was clearly a revenue raising need as a result of the U.S. entering World War I. But there were also philosophical and political motives in that great fortunes had been amassed during the industrial revolution, and there was felt to be a progressive public policy objective of stopping the perpetuation and transmission of the great control that inherently accompanied vast wealth and estates.

At the time, there was compelling and legitimate concern that vast fortunes, estates and trust were limiting access to capital by the emerging middle-class entrepreneurs.

We are now, however, in the 21st Century. Our economy, society and means of production have radically changed. We are no longer primarily an agrarian economy, and in many ways we may be nearing the end of heavy industry phase of our economic development. The outdated laws governing industry, commerce and society of the early 20th Century must be changed to reflect the realities of the year 2000 and beyond.

Capital remains a key component of business formulation and development. It is not, however, being concentrated by entities subject to the estate tax as in 1916.

Irrelevant and antiquated 19th and early 20th Century laws may be a hindrance to how our society now functions. Federal estate and gift tax law fits that category.

My perspective on the issue is that current law diminishes the capability of small businesses, and the jobs associated with them, to continue after the death of an owner or owners. Some studies (Heritage Foundation) have indicated that as many as 145,000 additional new jobs could be created by repeal of the estate tax law. As much as $11.0 billion in additional economic output could result. The preservation and expansion of smaller, family businesses will protect jobs, and generate and expand the number of new jobs.

For example, I represent the State of Hawaii, a state dominated by small businesses. Plantation agriculture has virtually ended and with the demise and economic dislocation associated with economic change, we are working hard to diversify Hawaii agriculture. This means many more smaller scale farmers growing specialty and niche crops instead of millions of tons of sugar. The middle class in Hawaii has developed from small business origins, and we now have great hope that a new generation of entrepreneurs will help sustain the economy through the new farming opportunities available for the first time in generations. I want to help preserve and develop those elements in Hawaii and in the American economy and society that generate millions of jobs.

Regarding tax fairness, an equally compelling case is made that the wealthiest do not pay their fair share of estate taxes. The Tax Code has deliberately been riddled with exemptions and exceptions that are ruthlessly and thoroughly exploited by tax attorneys specializing in the preservation of inherited wealth. There is an entire body of tax law devoted to estate and gift tax avoidance and minimalization.

Tax attorneys, I assure you, are talented and hard-working. The result is the majority of estates paying estate taxes are valued at $5.0 million and less. These are not the Rockefellers, Vanderbilts, Carnegies and J.P. Morgan robber barons the 1916 law was enacted to curb. Huge fortunes have for generations been sheltered with sophisticated, complex tax machinations. It is family farm and small businesses owners who are being penalized when trying to pass down assets to new generations to keep middle-class businesses in operation and generating employment. I can assure you I know of no small businesses in Kaneohe, Makiki, Waianae or Mililani, Hawaii that resort to multi-generation skipping trusts in order to keep a bakery or a delivery service in operation.

Lastly, there is a human element in this debate that must be noted. One of my constituents, Steve Lee, is an estate attorney and planner in Honolulu. Mr. Lee's father inherited a few apartments from his parents some time ago. Mr. Lee's grandparents worked hard for years, acquiring the apartments as a means of assuring retirement income. Now his father is spending hours trying to figure our how to keep the property intact to pass it along to Mr. Lee and his brother. The Lees are middle-income in Hawaii. The value of real property acquired years ago, however, has been greatly inflated and the Lee brothers will face the need to liquidate at least part of the property in order to pay estate taxes in 9 months. The Lees justifiably feel they are being penalized for having kept their property intact within their family.

Mr. Speaker, our current estate tax fails to meet the goals we expect. It is overly complex to the point of being arcane, the burden on those upon whom it falls is unfair and inefficient.

Passing H.R. 8 today is the first major step. As we move through the legislative process, however, we will also seriously consider proposals that would provide interim, transitional relief. We will seriously consider any inequities that total elimination might engender. We will address Presidential objections. We can forge a bill acceptable to all who want tax equity.

Consequently, I look on H.R. 8 as both tax fairness, and pro-jobs and I am pleased to be associated with JOHN TANNER, JENNIFER DUNN, BILL ARCHER, EVA CLAYTON and others in helping move estate tax reform legislation through Congress.

I urge the House to pass the bill, and bring more fairness to the Tax Code.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we slashed money for education for teachers, for after-school programs, for Head Start. Today, they want to cut $50 billion per year from Federal revenues. Two percent of American families even pay this tax. Three percent of those involve family farms and family businesses, so only 6 out of every 10,000 families fit into the category of having a family farm or family business affected by this tax.

The Democratic bill does far more for those family farms and businesses. Immediate relief. A bill that will be signed into law. But only the Republican bill provides the billionaire's tax relief act. Not one penny for those who make $6 an hour or $10, not relief at the democratic level for small businesses, but huge relief for multibillion-dollar fortunes.

Furthermore, the Republican bill will slash major endowments for colleges, universities, and conservation programs. Those folks will be here asking for Federal help, and we will not be able to give it to them because we will have cut revenues by $50 billion. The Republican bill even contains a hidden provision which will increase income taxes on widows. There are plenty of reasons, 50 billion reasons, to vote no on the Republican bill and yes on the Democratic substitute.

□ 1045

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in America we pay income and capital gains tax; investment, business, pension tax, luxury tax, property tax, sales tax, fuel tax. We even pay a surtax, and once, a retroactive tax. We are taxed coming and going.

If that is not enough to glorify a 1040, we even pay a death tax in America. Beam me up. Once again, we hear the same old story. We come to the floor and beat up on the rich.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, to stop the class warfare in America. Why should families who achieve in life be destroyed in death? Why should farmers have to surrender their farms to the government and not pass their farms on to their kids? Tell me and answer that question.

Mr. Speaker, my family was very poor, really. But my dad never worked for a poor man. And tell me, who hires the workers in America? Is it the guy on the street corner, or the people who achieve and have success and make something from the great American dream?

I support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) today, because I believe that in America today, from womb to tomb, from farm to harm, the American people are literally taxed off, ripped off by a Congress that sees nothing but revenue.

I yield back the fact that I will not only vote to put the death tax to death, I also recommend to the chairman that we kill the income tax, abolish the IRS, and replace it with a 15 percent national retail sales tax, and give some tax freedom to the people of the United States of America.

I want to commend the chairman and commend those Democrats that are making some common sense.

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

Let me just remind my friend from Ohio, Mr. Speaker, that only 3 percent of the taxable estates have family-owned businesses or farm assets of any significance. That is less than .06 percent of all of the estates, and the Democratic substitute will deal with that problem in a far less costly way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a small business person and a former member of the Committee on Small Business, I am very aware of the burden under which many entrepreneurs and working families must operate. I have a family business, and I understand the concerns of those who want to pass their businesses on to the next generation.

I am also on the Committee on Agriculture, and I know my family farms in Maine, many of which are in the same families for generations, need to have relief. That is why we in this Congress were able to pass measures to reduce their tax burden. In such a case, 98 percent of the estates and family farms and farm businesses and small businesses have been exempted.

As a matter of fact, each member of a married couple is eligible for the exemptions we passed, which can be twice the initial amount, up to 2 million by 2006.

Having said that, I understand the importance of living within our means and planning for the future. The estimated cost for repealing this completely with H.R. 8 is over $104 billion in the first 10 years, or $500 billion over the next 10 years, blowing a hole in the budget and our fiscal responsibility, and our ability to reduce interest rates and protect the economy, and our ability to help all people who want to be able to retire with a strong social security, being able to modernize Medicare with prescription drugs and provide needed educational assistance for those that want to climb up the ladder, and provide health care for all of America's children.

We are not going to have that opportunity because, according to the Joint Economic Tax Committee, it estimates that only 2 percent of all estates will pay estate taxes, and only 3 percent of that 2 percent are family-owned businesses, 776 family businesses and 642 family farms. For that, we are mortgaging everyone's future.

The Rangel substitute provides a serious consideration of immediate reforms, where the bill that is being proposed now, we would have to wait until 2010 before any family business would be able to take advantage of that.

So this is a good substitute and it does it across-the-board. It does not mortgage our country's future.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a highly distinguished and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ran across an article out of the Dallas News this morning. I just have to tell Members about this.

David Langford, who is executive vice president of the Texas Wildlife Association, said, ''Since 1851, my family has worked the land in the Texas Hill Country. Through ups and downs of the past 148 years, we have run flour mills, farmed, ranched, and offered hunting and fishing opportunities.

''Our land also serves as a habitat for many species of birds. . . . As a result, my family and I consider ourselves stewards of precious natural resources.

''But as is the case for much of the wildlife habitat in this country, the estate tax threatens to tear it apart. The need to pay large estate tax bills often forces families to sell or develop environmentally sensitive land. The estate tax is the No. 1 destroyer of wildlife habitat in this country. . . .

''But for those of us who are stewards of wildlife habitat, the argument goes much deeper than the issue of business and money. Yes, families suffer financially,'' and his did. ''When wildlife habitats disappear, they disappear forever. We aren't a bunch of fat cats trying to hoard our assets. We are private citizens trying to preserve an irreplaceable resource for the enjoyment and benefit of generations to come.''

Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans agree that we need to get rid of this. Americans simply do not believe the IRS ought to operate a toll booth on the road to heaven.

Enough is enough. It is time to repeal the taxes on our American values. It is time to bury the death tax, giving a new birth of freedom to the next generation of farmers, ranchers, and small businesses.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 10, 1999]

ESTATE TAXES THREATEN WILDLIFE HABITATS

(By David Langford)

For many of us trying to preserve and protect our wildlife habitat, the federal estate tax is a deadly predator.

Since 1851, my family has worked the land in the Texas Hill Country. Through the ups and downs of the past 148 years, we have run flour mills, farmed, ranched and offered hunting and fishing opportunities.

Our land also serves as a habitat for many species of birds, including two endangered migratory songbirds the golden-cheeked warbler and the black-capped viero. As a result, my family and I consider ourselves stewards of precious natural resources.

But as is the case for much of the wildlife habitat in this country, the estate tax threatens to tear it apart. The need to pay large estate tax bills often forces families to sell or develop environmentally sensitive land. The estate tax is the No. 1 destroyer of wildlife habitat in this country.

Although we have managed to hold our land together, it hasn't been easy. Before my mother died in 1993, we did everything we could to protect our family's land. Like millions of other family businesses, we paid accountants, tax attorneys and estate planners to help manage our assets in ways to avoid the tax, but it still came to this.

In order to pay the estate taxes and keep the land together when my mother died, we had to sell almost everything she owned, including her home. My wife and I had to sell nearly everything we owned, including our home, and move into a two-bedroom condominium. We also had to borrow money for 35 years from the Federal Land Bank.

Because the value of the land has increased since 1993, if we were killed in a car accident tomorrow, my children would owe more inheritance taxes than the amount I originally had to borrow to pay mine. But that isn't the end of the story. Not only would they pay more taxes than me, but they still would inherit my 35-year note that they would have to continue to pay.

Could my children then keep the land? The short answer is no. It probably would become a subdivision. Like thousands of other hard-working, middle-class families, our children and grandchildren would be at the mercy of the punishing estate tax, which demands up to 55 percent of their assets at the time of death. They simply don't have the cash.

Private land stewards all over the country are being ravaged by the estate tax. Taxpaying citizens are being driven off the land. What is accomplished by breaking up natural habitats? The benefit to the federal government is negligible. The estate tax raises barely more than 1 percent of federal tax revenue. Many economists have concluded that, what you consider the revenue lost

from tax avoidance strategies, the estate tax contributes minimal revenue to the federal budget.

Congress has an opportunity to repeal the death tax or at least reduce its crushing rates. No other act of Congress this year could provide more help to family-owned businesses.

But for those of us who are stewards of wildlife habitat, the argument goes much deeper than the issues of business and money. Yes, families suffer financially mine certainly has but the real loss is one that affects the entire country. When wildlife habitats disappear, they disappear forever. We aren't a bunch of fat cats trying to hoard our assets. We are private citizens trying to preserve an irreplaceable resource for the enjoyment and benefit of generations to come.

David K. Langford of San Antonio is executive vice president of the Texas Wildlife Association.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, small family farmers and business owners in my district deserve tax relief. I support the Democratic substitute legislation that excludes up to $4 million for couples owning farms or small businesses. But this estate tax bill really should be titled ''the Billionaire Protection Bill.''

This Billionaires Protection Act is a terrible solution to an easily remedied problem, but it does tell America exactly what Republican priorities really are. Before anything else, the Republican leadership would give a huge, reckless, and dangerous backloaded tax cut, more than half of which goes to the 60,000 wealthiest families among our 60 million families.

Do Republicans really believe that the Bill Gates, the Steve Forbes, the John Corzines, need $25 billion of tax cuts every year? Does anyone listening and watching today believe they need $25 billion of tax cuts?

The Republican leadership would give this multi-billion dollar tax cut before limiting class size to 18 for more than 3 million children; before establishing a prescription drug benefit in Medicare for 13 million American senior citizens who cannot afford the expense of drug coverage; before raising the minimum wage for millions of Americans working full-time for less than $11,000 per year; before paying down the national debt, so interest rates will go down for all American homeowners; before extending social security so that our generation and our children's generation will have a secure base for retirement.

It is a stunning revelation to know that the Republicans' last priority is a huge tax cut for the super rich. Vote for the substitute and against this give-away.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Kolbe). The Chair would remind all Members participating in debate to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the viewing audience.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Lewis), another distinguished and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, many of those on the other side of this debate that are against this tax relief keep talking about a $50 billion cost to the government. It is going to cost the government.

My question is, whose money is this? It is the farmer down in Kentucky and the States across the country that get up every morning before the sun comes up, and that never get in from the fields many times until way after the sun has gone down, that put in 40, 50, 60 years of their life of hard work in the fields to provide something for the next generation, for their sons and for their daughters.

It is their money. They are the ones who are working to earn it, to provide something for their heritage, something that will allow the farm produce in this country to continue.

As my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Weller) mentioned a little while ago, urban sprawl is eating up the farmland because the hard work of farmers is going back into taxes. That is totally unfair.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if being fiscally irresponsible and unfair to middle class American families were crimes, passing this bill would be a felony.

Under this bill, 98 percent of American families will get nothing, not one dime, except for a larger national debt. But one-thousandth of 1 percent of America's richest will get billions in tax cuts.

Republicans are saying on one hand, we cannot afford to get soldiers off of food stamps, but let us give billionaires a massive tax cut. They are saying, we cannot afford to keep our health care promises to veterans and military retirees, but we can afford a $50 billion tax cut to the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans.

Republicans say, we cannot afford decent Medicare prescription drug programs for seniors, we cannot afford to enforce nursing home standards, we cannot afford to protect struggling rural hospitals from Medicare cuts in this Congress, but we can afford to give Bill Gates, Ted Turner, and Steve Forbes millions or billions in tax cuts.

The Democratic substitute values all Americans, not just a privileged few, by protecting family farms and businesses while paying down the national debt. Those are America's values.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I was there when the auctioneer's gavel fell and sold half of the family farm of a couple that I represented in Ogle County, Illinois, as their kids sat there and went.

Let us not talk about the Bill Gates and the Steve Forbes, let us talk about those people, farm people losing their farms because government wants more money to spend on more programs. It is not Steve Forbes.

Let us talk about the Cross family, dealing with the death of the grandmother and then the death of their mother, trying to desperately hang onto the family farm. These are not rich people. They are a small percentage of people, but they are real people with real names and real auction sales that deprive their children of the ability to carry on the family farm. Those are the names.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, what is interesting today is what is not being said. Our Nation is $5.7 trillion in debt. Five trillion dollars' worth of that debt was acquired by Congress in our lifetimes.

□ 1100

Most of it since 1980. We are squandering a billion dollars a day on interest on that debt.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that we have a $100 billion shortfall in our military. The Shows bill which would provide relief to our veterans and military retirees has 300 cosponsors, but the Republican leadership will not bring it to the floor because they say we do not have $5 billion a year to cover that cost.

So I have to admit I find it a bit unusual that the Republican leadership can find $50 billion a year to give the wealthiest 2 percent of all Americans a free ride on this. I hope someone will explain that.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I rise in support. This act is about more than economic policy or numbers. It is about fairness. It is about family preservation. We are trying to protect their heritage and their culture.

In Nebraska, family farms date back to the great-great-grandparents who were pioneers, yet these taxes force smaller farms to sell to the Ted Turners of the world. And in Omaha, my hometown, second and third generation family shops like print shops or the Hispanic grocery store where they migrated here 40 years ago to live the American dream which were built with the family's sweat and the toil and the sacrifice, must be sold now upon the death of the father or the mother to pay the death taxes.

This act is about fairness. It is about preserving family history and culture. Please preserve this family culture. Vote for this bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I come from a district where the average household income is just over $21,000. We know that less than 2 percent of all American families ever owe an estate tax. I can say that in the second district of Texas, it is less than that.

H.R. 8 targets the richest 2 percent of the families in the country and if it were to pass, it would amount to a $2 billion to $3 billion tax break just for the 400 richest Americans. It would cost over $50 million a year when fully phased in.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is simply not right to give the very richest billionaires a $50 billion tax break while everyone else is left to figure out how to pay off the national debt and how to save Social Security.

As the chart I have to my right indicates, the Democratic substitute gives even more relief to the smaller estates. In fact, the Democratic alternative gives the greatest tax relief to the smallest estates at a fraction of the cost to the Treasury.

Look here, a $2 million estate of the husband who dies and the family worth $4 million, under House Bill 8, that family owes $229,800 in estate taxes; under the Democratic substitute, there is no estate tax due. That is if we have a family farm or small business. If we do not happen to be a family farmer or have a small business, we still get more relief under the first 5 years under the Democratic plan than under H.R. 8.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is the best plan. It is fiscally responsible and gives the greatest tax relief to the smaller estates.

COMPARISON OF ESTATE TAX OWED ON $2 MILLION ESTATE

Year	House bill 8	Democratic substitute
Small business or family farm:		
2001	$229,800	0
2002	229,800	0
2003	222,800	0
2004	208,800	0
2005	188,200	0
All others:		
2001	491,300	$316,000
2002	491,300	316,000
2003	456,800	316,000
2004	375,800	316,000
2005	303,700	316,000

Soutce: Congressional Research Service.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a former small business owner, a family business, and a strong supporter of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. This bill finally phases out the Federal estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax commonly referred to as the ''death tax.''

Small businesses are a foundation of the American dream. My father, after he served in World War II, started a small coffee shop chain, started with one restaurant and built it up. My father passed away and as a family, we are facing this estate tax, as many families in this country face this tax. It is unfair, it is un-American, and we have an opportunity to end this tax today.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful that we continue this practice, and I am looking forward to a vote today that will finally start us down the road to ending this tax which hopefully will be signed into law.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of questions that have been raised in my mind since I have been listening to the debate. I guess if this tax is a bad tax because everybody earned the money, that is true. That is true for every single tax we have. Of course Americans earn the money. It is no different here than in the income tax or sales tax or any other tax.

If the argument is valid, it is valid for every tax. Let us just get rid of them all and base this country's entire economic system on gifts. It is not going to happen, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not propose it, so the argument does not hold water.

I also hear today about how difficult it has been on a few individuals. Of course, every system has problems. In general, though I have also heard many comments about different businesses that are second generation, third generation, fourth generation businesses. How did they make it? How did they get through the estate tax if it is so bad?

Let us tell the truth. The Democratic proposal deals with the problems that are on the table. Everyone here wants to deal with them. It will cut from 2 percent. If the Democratic proposal is adopted, it will be 1 percent. We take almost half of the people today and not tax them at all. On top of that, when we are finished if the Democratic proposal is passed, the average estate, the average estate that would be taxed would be worth $3.5 million. And they would not be taxed at 55 percent. Anybody who knows anything about taxation knows the difference between marginal taxation and effective taxation. The effective tax rate, the thing that is really paid by people, currently is about 20 percent. It is not 50 or 55 percent as everyone keeps saying because that is a nice number to use. But it does not mean a thing. It is 20 percent.

If the Democratic proposal is passed, it would be 16 percent. The Democratic proposal would still leave the average taxpayer with $2.7 million of that 1 percent of people.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) a member of the Republican leadership.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, when I first introduced legislation to repeal the death tax in 1993, the Democratic leader was seeking to increase death taxes. But slowly but surely over four congresses, we have put together a consensus of Democrats and Republicans in this body and the other body behind the simple notion: the death tax, even though it is intended to soak the filthy rich, does not really fall on them. It falls on low-wage workers.

Mr. Speaker, people who fall in the category of the top 2 percent richest Americans, names that we have heard during this debate like Ted Turner or Bill Gates, will not benefit from the passage of this legislation because they will not pay the death tax. To a certainty, the one person who will not pay the death tax is the rich dead person. But beyond that even those who survive, through estate planning, through all manner of complicated trusts and avoidance schemes, not to mention lifetime gifts, successfully avoid most of the burden of this tax.

The real burden of this tax falls on the low-wage worker, the woman who works for a business or a farm or a ranch that is family owned, because every day she does not know what happens when the founder dies. If part of that business has to be sold off or all of it has to be sold off to pay the tax man as so often happens, then people lose their jobs. Many more people than there are dead rich persons at whom this tax is aimed. And when they lose their jobs, their tax rate is 100 percent. It is for those people that we are passing this legislation today.

In California, we put this question to a vote of the people. Even though the left raised the battle cry that this was a tax break for the rich, nearly two-thirds of Californians voted to repeal our death tax in its entirety because they understood where the real burden of this tax falls. It is the right thing to do today for the working people of America, and I congratulate the leadership of this Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER), and all of the Democrats and Republicans who have come together to make this happen. We hope that this time the President will sign it into law.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to recommit to be offered later by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT). The motion simply says that section 527 political organizations that fail to disclose their donors will be subject to the gift tax.

It is time to fix our broken system of financing elections. This motion is an important step toward that goal. It would close a huge loophole by requiring simple disclosure by secretive political organizations and groups. The American people have a right to know. They have a right to know who is funding political campaigns in this country. They have a right to know who is trying to influence their votes. The American people have a right to a free and open election process.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to close this loophole. It is time to get rid of the secrecy. It is time to fix this mess.

The other body had the courage and voted with raw courage on yesterday to close this loophole. It is time for the House to do the same. I urge all of my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Chairman ARCHER's efforts to reform the estate tax. And I say reform, rather than repeal, because at the heart, that's what I think we're talking about here. I'm sure Chairman ARCHER would disagree emphatically with my point. But given the way our political process works, I think that today's vote represents the starting point in negotiation over the estate tax. By staking out a position of repeal, as it works its way through the political body, what we're really talking about is change. And the question I think we all need to ask ourselves is to what degree. While I am in favor of this vote because it stakes the position of the need for change, the reason I don't think that I would ever be in a position to support total repeal of the estate tax is tied to three things: history, the value of work and the belief in meritocracy, and, finally, the power of compound interest.

When you look through the pages of history, you see that anytime there's been extreme disparity of wealth, you've seen political problems. In short, the Banana Republics of South America are demonstrative of the fact that a few families holding all the wealth doesn't lend itself toward democratic rule. In fact, if you stop and think about it, would it be good for our form of government, if out of the 270 million people that make up America, 99 percent of the wealth was held by four families? I think undoubtedly, most people would say no, not a chance. And that illustrates the point that I think intuitively all of us know—that extreme wealth concentration isn't good for our form of government.

Two, I'd say there's a real value to work and meritocracy. I think that one ought to put on their jeans and go to work. It's good for the individual and it's good for society as a whole. In fact, Republicans have repeatedly made that very argument when they talk about welfare recipients. Our Founding Fathers were very deliberate about not having kings and queens, and yet if you have a couple of families that can hand on huge levels of wealth, tax free, generation after generation, what you develop is an aristocratic class that does nothing more than eat from silver spoons and play polo. I think the reverse would be good to have a merit-based system, wherein one can go out and earn as much money as they're able over the course of their lifetime with very little from the standpoint of government regulation or government taxation interfering with those efforts. Beyond a certain point though, families ought to be brought back to a neutral starting zone, with each new generation given that shot at making it to the top. I say that as one who's voted to cut virtually every form of government spending. Unfortunately, Congress as a whole is not willing to do that, and we have to pay for those government services that people so consistently vote for around this place. I'd rather not see the burden on the shoulders of people working and striving to develop new things. I'd rather see that, again, at the end of the day after one has succeeded, without government taxing them heavily on their rise to the top.

Which brings me to my third point, the power of compound interest. I do think the estate tax needs to be substantially reformed, and I'm talking about a very large limit here. One ought to be able to hand off perhaps $250 million or $500 million tax free to their children, should they so choose. But you shouldn't have a Bill Gates level of wealth that's $50 billion handed tax free to the next generation. For this family, within a couple of generations, compound interest could concentrate perhaps a trillion dollars of net worth.

So in the end that's where I am. Let's substantially repeal the estate tax; let's reform it mightily, raising the limit in excess of $100 million of tax free inheritance, to be handed on from one generation to the next. But let's not completely eliminate it, because extreme concentrations of wealth handed tax free from one generation to the next is not only bad for the individuals in question, but certainly bad for our system of government.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we began debate on a bad Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill, a bill that cuts $2.9 billion from education services; cuts $1.7 billion from labor with cuts to workforce development and safety investments; and cuts more than $1 billion from critical health programs. And next week we will be forced to vote on this bill that undermines so many of our nation's priorities.

Why? Because the Republican House leadership passed a bad Budget Resolution that puts tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans above investments to promote America's education, workforce, and health services. Their $175 billion tax cut exceeds the projected budget surplus and requires deep cuts in nondefense discretionary appropriations.

And here we are again, voting on a measure that would provide over $50 billion to the wealthiest 2 percent of taxpayers. How much is enough? When will Republicans be satisfied with the amount of money they have given to the wealthy, and turn their attention to the majority of Americans who want a good education, a strong work force, and a healthy future?

This bill will cost $50 billion per year when fully phased in. This monstrous hole in the federal budget will undoubtedly translate into cuts from areas that the American people care about, just as the proposed $175 billion Republican tax cut translated into cuts in yesterday's proposed Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill.

When we prioritize tax cuts over health, education, and labor, we make sacrifices, and these sacrifices affect everybody. The repeal of the estate tax does nothing for working families. Most American families would not receive a single dollar of tax relief from this bill. So I want the American people to know what they are sacrificing in order to provide a tax cut to the wealthiest two percent of their fellow citizens.

Republicans have proposed cutting $1 billion from targeted investments in education to improve teacher quality and recruit new teachers, denying afterschool services to 1.6 million kids, and eliminating HeadStart assistance to 50,000 kids.

They have also proposed cutting NIH $439 million below current services and cutting $16 million from Clinton's request for battered women's shelters.

These are the kinds of sacrifices that Americans are being asked to make in exchange for a tax cut that would give $300 billion to the 400 richest Americans. $300 billion is enough to pay for a prescription drug benefit for seniors for 10 years!

The Republican majority placed the needs of big business over working people yesterday by voting to once again delay the implementation of new ergonomics regulations which protect working people from repetitive motion injuries. And here they are again asking working families to make sacrifices so that the wealthy can reap benefits.

Slowing our progress in health, education, and labor in order to make room for tax cuts for the wealthy does not fit with our national priorities.

Democrats have proposed a fiscally responsible substitute that targets tax relief to farmers and small business. I urge my colleagues to support this alternative.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, hard working Americans should not be forced to liquidate their holdings and sell off the businesses their fathers or grandfathers started in order to pay their estate taxes. The estate tax, while only affecting a relatively small number of people, does harm small businesses, family farms and ranches. I am not talking about the wealthiest Americans; I am talking about hard working Americans.

This relief needs to be immediate. While I support the principles of H.R. 8, it does not help hard working families now, or even next year, it will not help 10 years from now. Additionally, it will take from our surplus that could be spent on shoring up Social Security, implementing a prescription drug benefit for seniors and improving education. H.R. 8 really helps the wealthiest Americans.

In today's economy, one million dollars does not make a millionaire. On paper, a family business may be worth six million dollars with property and buildings, but the family is really struggling to survive. The Rangel substitute addresses the inflation in our economy while still being fiscally responsible. The Rangel substitute increases the special exclusion to the estate tax to two million dollar per person. It provides further relief and simplifies the estate tax for this group by allowing any unused portion of the exclusion to be transferred to the surviving spouse, making the total exclusion four million dollars to eligible farm and small business owning couples. Importantly, the Rangel alternative increases the general

exclusion for the estate tax next year from $675.000 to $1.1 million. H.R. 8 would take ten years to make this increase.

Additionally, we all agree the top marginal tax rate of 55% is too high—taking away more than half of any estate. The Democratic substitute lowers marginal tax rates by twenty percent across the board in combination with converting the federal estate tax credit for state death tax credit into a deduction.

I believe the Rangel substitute will provide relief to the small businesses in my district as well as farms and ranches across the country. At the same time, it allows us to retain our budget surplus to help Social Security, Medicare and Education.

I support the Rangel alternative. I oppose the fiscally irresponsible H.R. 8 and urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, with my support, the House passed legislation (H.R. 8) to eliminate the Death Tax.

For too long, exorbitant tax rates have made it difficult for Americans to pass their savings onto their children, and for small businessmen and farmers to keep their enterprises within the family.

That's why I cosponsored and voted in favor of the Death Tax Elimination Act (H.R. 8), which would phase out the estate and gift tax over a period of 10 years.

It is my hope that phasing out the death tax will make it easier for individuals and families to accumulate savings for future generations.

In addition, during debate on this important legislation, a motion was offered to address another important issue—campaign finance reform. I supported this motion.

Congress's failure over the years to address the issue of campaign finance reform hurts all of us. It undermines public confidence in this institution and casts a cloud over every action we take in this House.

I have been actively fighting for campaign finance reform in this House for a number of years—from authorizing my own Independent Commission Bill to supporting a ban on soft money through Shays-Meehan to supporting today's motion to close the 527 loophole.

Recently, there has been an increase in anonymous campaign expenditures by third parties. Many of these organizations are classified by Section 527 of the tax code. These "527" organizations are currently free to participate in our electoral process, but are not required to disclose to the American voters from where their funds originate.

To establish disclosure requirements for individuals and organizations who wish to take an active role in affecting the outcome of federal elections is just plain common sense. Individuals and organizations who strongly believe in an issue or a candidate and are willing to back them up with their financial resources should not be allowed to hide behind a loophole.

Congress must act an legislation requiring disclosure for any group who wishes to participate in federal elections in order to help build greater public confidence in the integrity of our federal electoral process.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8, which provides for the elimination of the federal estate tax. By removing one of the most unfair, complicated and inefficient provisions on the tax books, we can provide critical tax relief to our families, small businesses and farms. I strongly believe that a person who works hard, pays taxes, and saves money should not be penalized with an onerous tax upon his or her death. Every American deserves to know that their heritage, livelihood and the sum of their life's work will be passed on to their children.

The estate tax undermines the traditional principles of our nation—hard work, savings, and fairness. There are too many cases of family-owned businesses and farms in Indiana that have been forced to sell their estates because it was too expensive to pay the estate tax. More than 70 percent of family-owned businesses are not passed on to the next generation, and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. Even as the estate tax creates such severe unintended consequences, it does not even succeed at its intended purposes. the estate tax brings in less than 1.4 percent of total federal revenues, but enforcement of the tax costs the government 65 cents for ever dollar it raises. This is a waste and simply unfair to hard-working American taxpayers.

I also support the Democratic alternative, which provides even more relief to small businesses and farmers by providing targeted and immediate tax breaks. For example, the Democratic alternative allows a married couple to pass on their family farm or small business intact with no estate tax whatsoever if it is worth up to $4 million. Because the Republican bill is phased in over ten years, a couple passing on their farm or small business in the near future would avoid more tax under the Democratic substitute. It also lowers estate tax rates 20% across the board. This alternative is a fiscally sensible alternative that targets relief to farmers and small businesspeople while protecting our ability to pay down the national debt and shore up the long-term future of Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, since the Democratic alternative is not expected to be passed by the House, I will vote for H.R. 8 because I do not support the status quo as it concerns the estate tax. Hard working American taxpayers deserve a change now, and for these reasons, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. The federal estate tax has come under a great deal of scrutiny because of its economic effect on family farms and small businesses. I support the effort to protect these farms and businesses but, unfortunately, H.R. 8 does not effectively target small businesses and farms. Rather, it would enable the wealthiest 2 percent in our country to pass vast fortunes to their heirs without a penny of tax, while working families are taxed on every dollar they earn. Further, Congress would be passing a greater share of the burden of saving Social Security and Medicare and paying off the $5.7 trillion national debt to all American children.

H.R. 8 would initially reduce and then fully repeal the federal estate and gift tax over a 10-year period. This bill would cost $28 billion over five years and $105 billion over ten years. The full repeal, however, does not take effect until 2010. In that year, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that estate and gift tax will generate nearly $50 billion. As a result, the revenue loss in the second ten-year period explodes to more than $500 billion at a time when our country can least afford it as baby boomers will be retiring and Social Security shifts from cash surplus to a deficit.

It is important to recognize when considering this full repeal of the estate tax relief that only 2 percent of decedents have enough wealth to be subject to the estate tax at all under current law. Further, of the 2 percent of Americans subject to the estate tax, only 3 percent are small business people or farmers. Additionally, only 6 in 10,000 American estates are farms or small businesses subject to estate tax.

I believe that we must provide relief to family farms and small businesses and that is why I support the substitute offered by Representative RANGEL. This substitute would provide fiscally responsible estate tax relief to small business and farm owners. Specifically, it would immediately raise the special exclusion from the estate tax from $675,000 to $4 million for a couple owning a farm or small business and would lower the estate tax rates by 20 percent across the board.

Our current strong economy has begun producing surplus federal revenues, and, as you might imagine, there is no shortage of ideas for "using" the surplus. I am in favor of addressing negative effects of the estate tax, as evidenced by my past votes, but I also believe we should give priority to using these surplus funds to save Social Security and Medicare and pay down the $5.7 trillion National Debt. Surplus funds allow us to pay down the principal on this burdensome debt, thus reducing the annual interest payments which amount to approximately $250 billion annually. In fact, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan stated, "Saving the surpluses—if politically feasible—is, in my judgement, the most important fiscal measure we can take at this time to foster continued improvements in productivity."

A lower national debt would help reduce interest rates, resulting in tremendous cost savings for all American families who make credit card, car, mortgage, and loan payments. Lower interest rates will also reduce the cost of capital for businesses, allowing for more investment and, therefore, more job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 8. Any tax cut must be done in a fiscally responsible manner, and not derail the opportunity we have to reduce our large national debt and prepare for our future obligations to our aging population.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately due to a family obligation, I missed today's roll call votes. On roll call vote number 252, had I been present, I would have voted "yea." On roll call vote number 253, had I been present, I would have voted "yea." On roll call vote number 254, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. KILPATRICK. Today, I rise in strong and stringent opposition to H.R. 8 which will repeal the estate tax. The majority, as it did earlier this year, is pushing legislation that will benefit an important, but small portion of the American population. I object to this legislation because it is taken up at a time when the

American people have, over and over, indicated that their priorities—their major concerns, are the ability of our nation's children to receive a quality affordable education and the ability to receive adequate and affordable healthcare and a reasonable minimum wage. The repeal of the estate tax is an issue that affects only 2 percent of all estates and will cost the treasury $50 billion when it is fully implemented.

Last year, the Republican party failed to pass its tax plan. A plan that would decimate the budget that we have worked so diligently to balance. The Republicans have resorted to a new approach designed to pass their tax cut piece by piece, instead of the broad sweeping tax cut they earlier proposed.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the repeal of the estate tax will cost the U.S. Treasury $28.3 billion over five years, $100 billion over 10 years and $50 billion every year after 2011. In addition, the Children's Defense Fund points out that:

> If the same funding were instead invested in children, millions of children throughout America would get a fairer and healthier start in life. Instead this bill ignores the needs of 13.5 million children living in poverty to give only the wealthiest Americans a huge tax cut. In fact, 100% of the benefits from an estate tax cut will go to people in the top 5% income group, those earning at least $130,000 a year, with over 90% of the estate tax going to those in the top 1% income group, those earning at least $319,000 a year.

If we are truly concerned about American small business owners and farmers who are most hurt by the estate tax, we should support the Democratic substitute. The Democratic substitute will effectively create a $4 million exclusion per family for farms and closely-held business. The substitute would result in a total cost of $22 billion over ten years instead of nearly $105 billion over 10 years. The substitute also provides an immediate, 20 percent across-the-board reduction to the estate and gift tax rates, with the maximum estate and gift tax rates reduced from 55 percent to 44 percent.

I say to my colleagues who argue that their concern is with the American people, where is the legislation concerning healthcare? Where is the legislation concerning the education of our children? Where is the legislation addressing those who earn an inadequate minimum wage? Why are we standing here today considering a bill that only affects the wealthiest 2 percent of the American people? These are the questions that this body must address. If, however, we must address the question of the estate tax, let's do so in a manner that addresses those most hurt by the estate tax and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I was not here to vote today on eliminating the inheritance tax. Instead, I am on the other side of the continent, celebrating my daughter's college graduation with family and friends. Frankly, I would have been embarrassed to be participating in today's debate, which is nothing more than a cynical political sideshow staged by the Republican leadership in their appeal for the support of some of the most spectacularly wealthy people in the country at the expense of people who look to the federal government for help.

The issue before us is straightforward. I believe, as do the majority of my colleagues, that no one should be forced to sell a family business, farm, woodlot or closely held business, simply because a family member or principal owner has died. Such sales are often economically disruptive and damaging to the family involved; certainly, they do nothing to make our communities more livable.

There is a way to solve what is a very real problem faced by some contractors, farmers, woodlot and other business owners. We can defer the inheritance tax permanently, so long as the business remains in the family or closely-held partnership. I don't care how much the business is worth—if the owners don't want to sell, they shouldn't have to. We should also increase the exemptions in the inheritance tax, and adjust it for inflation, just as we did with the income tax. These three steps would solve the problem for every person who has contacted me, and would be enacted by a large majority and signed into law by the President.

The bill we are considering, however, is far different. Even though it will not be enacted into law, the legislation offers clear insights into the thinking and priorities of the leadership of the Republicans. It would offer enormous benefits to a few hundred of the wealthiest people in America, whose billions in unrealized capital gains will pass to their heirs without ever having been taxed, but it ignores the pressing needs of hundreds of millions of other Americans. What about the 11 million American children who have no health insurance? What about their families, working hard, but still struggling on income of ten or fifteen thousand dollars a year? What about the elderly, who can't afford to buy the prescription drugs that would so improve the quality of their lives? What about the students with special educational needs? This Congress is about to consider a budget that shortchanges them once again.

It is scandalous that men and women who served their country may not receive the health care they were promised. It is damaging to our future that many of today's college graduates—the ones we will depend on to shore up Social Security—are beginning their careers staggering under a crushing load of student debt.

This Congress looks at all these problems and sees nothing of interest or importance. The problems of those most well-off are far more consuming—and far more rewarding to pretend to solve. In the end, this bill will be vetoed and America's small businesses will be right back where they started.

I came to Congress to help American families be safe, healthy and economically secure. Allowing family businesses and closely held corporations to stay in family hands would clearly help this effort. I am not opposed to helping solve the problems of the most well-off in society. At a minimum, however, we should pay equal attention, expend equal effort, and invest as much in those Americans who are struggling even in these best of times.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Repeal Act. I have long been a supporter of providing estate tax relief to American families, small business owners, and farmers who have worked their entire lives to transfer a portion of their estates upon their death.

While H.R. 8 is the vehicle that the House leadership wishes to pursue to achieve this goal, I believe there is a better way to provide relief and maintain our commitments to paying down the national debt, protecting Social Security and Medicare, and other priorities. This is why I will also be supporting the substitute to H.R. 8.

The alternative will increase the estate tax exclusion for family-owned farms and businesses to $4 million and simplify the rules to allow a surviving spouse to automatically receive any credits that were applied to the estate of the deceased. It will also increase the unified exemption to $1.1 million and reduce estate tax rates by 20 percent. All of these changes will be made immediately, instead of delaying relief to the small businesses and family farmers who truly need relief for several years as H.R. 8 would do.

H.R. 8 does not repeal the estate tax for 10 years; rather, it shaves the marginal tax rates by a total of 14.5 percent over 5 years, delaying estate tax relief to the small businesses and farms that truly need it. H.R. 8 uses a phase-in period to hide its real effects. While the first 10 years cost only $104 billion, I have deep concerns about the costs of this legislation outside the 10 year budget window. They explode to $50 billion per year, or $500 billion in the second ten years.

Mr. Speaker, in February 2000, I received a score from the Joint Committee on Taxation for H.R. 3127, a bill I introduced to provide estate tax relief by immediately increasing the exclusion to $3 million. I anticipated that this score would have less budgetary consequences than the vetoed estate tax provisions in last year's $792 billion tax package. Joint Tax scored the estate provisions in that bill, which tracks closely with today's bill at $65 billion, while they scored my bill at $211 billion. This perplexed me; and when I wrote Joint Tax back for an explanation, they replied: "your bill provides substantially more relief through fiscal year 2009 from the estate gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes than the relief contained in Title VI of H.R. 2488." I have enclosed copies of these letters for the record.

Simply, H.R. 8 would have the American people believe that they will receive immediate and substantial estate tax relief. This bill delays a full repeal, which will have budget implications that this country simply cannot afford. With over $500 billion in lost revenue, this has the potential to put this country back on the wrong fiscal track of increased deficit spending and an exploding national debt.

Although the majority claims to support retiring the publicly held debt, they have begun the session by scheduling several tax bills funded by the projected budget surplus without giving any consideration to the impact that the bills will have on our ability to retire our $5.7 trillion national debt. These tax cuts, however, must be made in the context of a fiscally responsible budget that eliminates the publicly held debt, strengthens Social Security and Medicare, and addresses our other priorities.

We can and we have cut taxes. In February, I voted for and the House of Representatives passed a $182 billion marriage penalty relief bill. In March, I voted for and the House passed a $122 billion small business tax relief

bill, which included estate tax relief. Later in March, I voted for and the House passed a bill eliminating the Social Security earnings test. And, in April I voted for and the House passed a bill to repeal the telephone excise tax at a cost of over $51 billion. Today, the House will likely pass a $104 billion estate tax relief bill. That brings the total tax relief approved by the House to date up to over $450 billion or a little more than 50 percent of the projected on budget surplus of $930 billion.

I supported all previous efforts to provide tax relief because each has had a relatively modest cost when considered in isolation. I am concerned, however, that the total costs of these bills will be nearly as much as the vetoed tax bill, and could even be more expensive. This is why I intend to support the fiscally responsible substitute which provides immediate estate tax relief targeted to farmers and small businesses while protecting other urgent priorities such as paying down the debt and shoring up the long-term future of Social Security and Medicare.

I will also support, however, final passage of H.R. 8 because it is the only vehicle the leadership will allow to provide estate tax relief. I will not obstruct that vehicle; however, I hope the Senate and the conference committee consider carefully compromise language that provides substantial and immediate relief, that is fiscally responsible, and that the President will sign.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act.

I strenuously oppose this unfair and unreasonable tax. This tax, one imposed on earnings and assets that have already been subject to income, social security, and other taxes at the federal and state level, is simply unconscionable.

To begin with, the rates for this ridiculous tax, which range from 37 percent to 55 percent, are even higher than the highest income tax rate of 39.6 percent. This tax is making an already difficult situation unnecessarily worse for our small, family-owned businesses and family farms. Even the most modest farm or business can easily exceed the current death tax exemption because of their investment in capital assets like land and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that today it makes more sense to sell a family-owned business before death rather than pass the business to one's heirs. These businesses are the backbone of America's economy—creating more jobs than any other facet of our economy. We must work to nurture and protect these businesses, not destroy them through unnecessary and unfair taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if we can't eliminate this tax—which only accounts for less than 1% of our overall revenue—in these times of tremendous budget surpluses, when can we?

This tax cost jobs, it prevents families from passing on their businesses or farms to their children, and ultimately it does nothing to our bottom line.

In short, Mr. Speaker, to put it simply, the federal government just should not be in the business of taking 55 percent of a family's business and destroying their livelihood. This tax should be eliminated, and it should be eliminated today, not next week or next month or next year.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the elimination of this onerous and damaging tax.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 8.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 8, the ''Estate Tax Elimination Act of 2000.'' This Member's vote for this legislation today is based on his desire to move the inheritance tax reform process forward by dramatically increasing the Federal inheritance tax exemption level. However, this Member does not support the complete repeal of the Federal inheritance tax.

This Member is a long-term advocate of inheritance tax reduction, especially in regard to protecting small businesses and family farms and ranches. This Member believes that inheritance taxes unfortunately do adversely and inappropriately affect Nebraskan small business and family farms and ranches when they attempt to pass this estate from one generation to the next.

Accordingly, to demonstrate this Member's very real support for inheritance tax reform, this Member supported the Taxpayer Relief Act in 1997 which passed on July 31, 1997. This Act phased-in an increase in the unified credit exemption from the current level of $675,000 to $1.0 million in 2006. Also, it provided an immediate exclusion of $1.3 million (not in addition to the broader exclusion) for a limited variety of eligible closely-held family farms and businesses.

At the current time, this Member does not support the complete elimination of inheritance taxes. It would be a great political error and controversy to eliminate the inheritance tax on people like Steve Forbes or the billionaires or mega-millionaires. Also, the very negative impact on the largest of the charitable contributions and the establishment of charitable foundations cannot be underestimated. The benefit of these foundations to American society are invaluable. Our universities and colleges, too, would see a very marked reduction in the gifts they receive if the inheritance tax on the wealthiest Americans was totally eliminated. Despite the legal talents the super-rich can afford, such an inheritance tax change would have major consequences. The total elimination of the inheritance tax is a bad idea.

This Member's vote for this legislation only should be regarded as a demonstration of his desire to move the inheritance tax reform process forward by increasing dramatically the exemption level to the Federal inheritance tax. In addition, there is overwhelming support among his constituents for inheritance tax reform.

Specifically, this Member does not support repealing the inheritance tax, with the final step completed in this legislation to zero percent inheritance tax from the year 2009 to the year 2010 as proposed. Instead, this Member prefers the Ewing approach which he enthusiastically support. This Member is an original cosponsor of H.R. 4112 which was introduced by Representative TOM EWING on March 29, 2000. This measure (H.R. 4112) would immediately increase the Federal inheritance tax exemption from a rate of $675,000 to $5 million and would then increase this exemption annually over the next three years until it reaches a total of $10 million in 2003. After reaching the $10 million level in 2003, the exemption would be indexed annually thereafter to account for inflation. Essential inheritance tax relief is provided by H.R. 4112 for even wealthy business and farm families. This Member is even willing to raise the exemption level beyond $10 million to, for example, $15 million.

By the way, most Nebraskans pay more state inheritance taxes than Federal inheritance or estate taxes so Nebraskans should also consider pushing for reductions or reforms in their state taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 8, if passed by the House, goes to an uncertain future in the Senate. In addition, if any legislation is reported from the Congress this year which totally eliminates the Federal inheritance tax, it is assured of a Presidential veto. Thus, this vote for H.R. 8 should be regarded as only demonstrating my firm conviction that we need to dramatically increase the Federal inheritance tax exemption level.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if a conference report comes back to the House that totally eliminates the Federal inheritance tax, this Member will vote against it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in demonstration of my support for family owned businesses and farms, and because estate taxes are, in general, too high and burdensome, I cosponsored H.R. 8. I am glad that my action helped to shed light upon this issue.

However, H.R. 8 was never a perfect bill. While rightfully focusing on the need to help reform the estate tax, the bill goes too far. I am concerned that although the bill does help small businesses and family farms, the majority of people who benefit if H.R. 8 passes are not average Americans, but the most wealthy. Furthermore, the bill would result in a substantial revenue loss over the next 10 years.

This week, I have reviewed the amendment to H.R. 8 which will be offered by our colleagues, Representatives RANGEL, CARDIN, and STENHOLM. This Democratic alternative specifically addresses the issue of providing relief to our farmers and families, which is the most important aspect of estate tax reform. I will, therefore, be very pleased to support the Democratic substitute as it addresses the very reason I cosponsored H.R. 8. It is my hope that this amendment will pass so that I can vote for H.R. 8, as amended. However, given that the Democratic substitute is markedly superior to the underlying bill, I will vote against H.R. 8 if the Democratic substitute fails.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, by bringing their estate tax elimination proposal to the floor, the Republicans are clearly pandering to the richest Americans. Most Americans are not affected by the estate tax. 98 percent of all estates are exempt from the tax. Of the two percent that are liable, only 3 percent of those are small businesses and farms.

The estate tax repeal will not become law; this vote is purely political. If the Republicans genuinely wanted to help the 6 in 10,000 American small businesses and farms subject to the estate tax, they would have worked with Democrats to craft a bipartisan compromise.

Over the past two decades, income and wealth disparities have increased. The Republican proposal will exaggerate this by making the rich richer and the poor poorer. Repeal of

the estate tax for the Forbes 400 richest Americans would amount to $200–300 billion. Enough to pay for a Medicare prescription drug benefit for 10 years!

The rhetoric the Republicans have invoked during the estate tax debate is misleading. Calling the estate tax the ''death tax'' infers that all Americans will lose half of their estate and needlessly scares people.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act, of which I am a cosponsor. We in the House of Representatives are poised to continue our commitment to tax fairness for all hard-working Americans by voting to repeal the Death Tax. The Death Tax ranges from 37 to 55 percent and can even get as high as 60 percent in some cases. The Death Tax Elimination Act (H.R. 8) would phase out the tax over the next ten years on the death of an American.

Since 1994, Republicans have been committed to balancing the budget, protecting Social Security and Medicare, and providing tax fairness to all hard-working Americans and their families. To date we have passed the Repeal of the Marriage Penalty, Small Business tax fairness, the Repeal of the Seniors' Work Tax, ended the 100 year ''tax on talking,'' and today we can get rid of the Death Tax.

Americans pay taxes their whole lives, then at their death, Uncle Sam wants to get some more—sometimes taking over half of the poor soul's legacy. I have talked to farmers and small business owners in my district who are extremely worried at what the Death Taxes will mean to their children and grandchildren. These hard-working Americans have worked a lifetime to build a farm or business only to have it stripped and taken from their children by the Death Tax.

The death tax is one of the most immoral taxes on the books, because it taxes farmers and small business owners twice. First these hard-working Americans pay all of their taxes throughout the years, then the federal government taxes the value of their property again at the time of death.

No American should be forced to pay up to 55 or 60 percent of their savings when they die. I'm proud to be part of the effort to repeal this tax. Let's bury the death tax once and for all.

Let's pass this repeal and end the tax on death.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am convinced this tax is completely unnecessary and in fact does more harm than good. The death tax penalizes business and job growth and impacts all individuals, not just the wealthy. It creates disincentive for expansion, long-term investment, and many times forces families to make difficult decisions about the future of their business.

The death tax discourages the entrepreneurial spirit held dear by so many Americans. Our country was founded on principles that encourage citizens to become as successful as their talents allow. The Founding Fathers gave us the liberty to acquire and dispose of personal property. Unfortunately, some were mistakenly led to believe that equality of economic opportunity and the joys of owning property could be imparted to all by redistributing wealth.

Today the death tax is actually burdening those it was once intended to help. Small business owners, farmers and self-employed individuals often fall victim to the tax. They sacrificed daily to build their business by reinvesting their profits only to realize that their hard work and frugality will be rewarded by an excessive tax of up to 55 percent.

Many small business owners are forced to explore ways to shelter their assets from taxation, but the death tax is complicated. The tax actually encourages people to find creative ways to avoid it. It takes well-paid lawyers and accountants to find the best ways to legally avoid the high death tax liabilities ranging from 37 to 55 percent.

The amount of money spent complying with, or trying to circumvent, the death tax is astronomical. Most of these solutions are costly, time consuming and inefficient. Gifts of stock, ownership restructuring, life insurance purchases and sales agreements are some of the tactics used to avoid the death tax. For most family farms, ranches and businesses, it's just too expensive.

Nearly 98 percent of the two million farms in this country are owned by families. Those who cannot pay the costly tax-planning fees are forced to pay higher estate taxes. It is a tragedy that a family grieving over the death of a loved one should have to worry about losing the family business or farm to the Internal Revenue Service.

Because the death tax requires a family to pay the federal government in cash within 9 months of the death of the decedent, it places a unique burden on a family farm or ranch like those in Colorado.

Due to the capital-intensive nature of ranching, the income generated by a typical family ranch is often minimal and is generally reinvested in the operation. The result is that the sale of land or livestock is often the primary, and in some cases the only, source of funds available to meet this tax obligation when a family member passes away. Many of the farms and ranches near cities in Colorado are being sold and are being replaced by housing projects, malls and roads.

Mr. Speaker, the death tax is also an example of double taxation. Small business owners, family farmers and ranchers pay income taxes throughout their lifetime. At the time of death, their surviving beneficiaries are forced to pay another tax on the value of the property.

The people of Colorado and across America are tired of losing their hard-earned money to the federal government. Small businesses are sometimes forced to sell income-producing assets or lay off workers. Often a small business owner makes the tough choice to sell the business in order to pay a significantly lower capital gains rate of 20 percent instead of the marginal death tax rate that could reach 55 percent.

Unfortunately, our Democrat friends who oppose this bill are dragging out the same old argument that the death tax prevents only the rich from passing on millions of dollars to their families. The fact is the IRS reports that 86 percent of all taxable estates have assets worth less than $2.5 million. Four out of five estates are valued at less than $1 million.

At the same time, the death tax accounts for a mere 1.4 percent of all federal revenues. This meager amount is not worth the money Americans spend to comply with the tax, or the number of jobs lost because family businesses must be sold. In fact, as the IRS collects up to 55 percent of the value of the estate upon death, it spends approximately 65 percent of that revenue on administration and collection costs.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 70 percent of small businesses do not survive the second generation and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. Today, Members of this House should ask themselves if families should continue to work hard only to lose their life's wealth to the government instead of passing it on to their families.

Mr. Speaker, the case is clear. Now is the time to eliminate the death tax. Let's give the American people to chance to develop their ideas and dream about the legacies they'll leave behind.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for targeted estate tax relief. Small businesses and farm owners should not be penalized for their success nor should they have to worry about their ability to pass the family business on to future generations. The Democratic Substitute offered by the gentleman from New York lowers rates and broadens the base and is a rational alternative for estate tax reform.

Many middle class Americans believe they do not receive value for their taxes. An important component of any tax reform debate should focus on renewing taxpayer's confidence that they are not only being taxed fairly, but that their tax dollars are being spent wisely. It concerns me that we are considering repeal of the estate tax today without a broader discussion of reform of our tax policy. We don't make decisions in a vacuum and the decisions we make today will have an impact on future revenues, individual tax burdens, and spending on priority initiatives such as prescription drug reform, school construction and paying down the debt.

The estate tax was originally enacted into law as a way to reduce wealth inequality by targeting the accumulation of wealth by sons and daughters of the richest in our society. The estate tax serves an important purpose by continuing to equalize wealth in our society. Historically, the richest in our society are the ones who pay the majority of the estate tax.

Currently, only two percent of people who die have enough wealth to be subject to the estate tax. Of the two percent who pay the estate tax, only three percent are small business owners or farmers. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the largest estates pay most of the estate tax—5.4% of taxable estates paid 49% of total estate taxes in 1997. Further a United States Treasury Department analysis finds that 99% of all estate taxes are paid on the estates of people who are in the highest 20% of the income distribution at the time of their death and 91% of all estates taxes are paid by decedents by decedents with annual incomes exceeding $190,000 at the time of death.

The estate tax is a progressive tax that serves the purpose intended by Republic Presidents Teddy Roosevelt and William Howard Taft who put this tax in place. Experts

point out that the majority of assets taxed under the estate tax are unrealized gains and tax-exempt bonds which have never been taxed.

Some small businesses and farmers are hit hard by this tax and it is a high priority for me to provide relief to these individuals. In my congressional district is Brown Industries a family owned small business which specializes in precision machined parts. I have toured their facility and met with members of the Kansas City Area Chapter of the National Tooling and Machining Association (NTMA). All of the firms represented focused their number one concern on estate tax reform. These firms face liquidating entire section of their plants to pay current estate tax so that the business can be inherited. Estate tax reform should consider estate tax and economic opportunity and address the concerns of small businesses like Brown Industries. The Democratic alternative does this. They will be negatively impacted by H.R. 8. I support estate tax relief which would exempt 99% of family farm estates taxes. The measure I vote for today increased the family exclusion for farms and closely held businesses to $4 million by increasing the limit on the small businesses exclusion from $1.3 million to $2 million per spouse. This would have provided real relief immediately. Without adoption of the substitute H.R. 8 would not provide relief to a single farm or small business from the estate tax until 2010. This relief is much needed now, not in ten years.

The measure I voted in favor of today would have immediately increased the exemption equivalent of the unified credit against estate and gift taxes to $1.1 million. It also would have provided a twenty percent across-the-board reduction to the estate and gift tax rates.

Finally, I voted for an estate tax relief proposal which was largely offset and would cost approximately $20 billion over ten years to maintain fiscal responsibility. H.R. 8 will cost the treasury $105 billion over ten years. Beginning in 2010, it will cost $50 billion per year. While I am pleased that fiscal discipline of the past eight years has brought us to a time where we are enjoying budget surpluses, the surpluses in future years have not materialized and are only projections. I am optimistic the surpluses will be a reality and believe that we must commit them wisely. At this time, I am unconvinced that completely repealing the estate tax without further modifying our tax policy to ensure that wealthiest among us are paying their fair share is a wise decision. Projected surpluses still require us to make difficult decisions about priorities, and I believe that the measure I voted for today provides fiscally responsible relief.

I strongly support targeted estate tax relief for individuals, small businesses and farm owners. I voted in favor of a fiscally responsible proposal today which would have provided immediate relief to many of the 989 individuals in Missouri who pay estate tax. As this bill moves forward in the legislative process I encourage both parties will work together to find a compromise which will provide the needed relief and which will be signed into law by the President.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill, but only very reluctantly.

My reluctance does not mean I don't support estate-tax relief for family-owned ranches and farms or other small businesses. In fact, I definitely think we should act to make it easier for their owners to pass them on to future generations.

This is important for the whole country, of course, but it is particularly important for Coloradans who want to help keep ranch lands in open, undeveloped condition by reducing the pressure to sell them to pay estate taxes.

But we do not need to do all that this Republican bill would do in order to make sure the estate tax is no longer too heavy a burden on the small business and farm owners.

The Democratic alternative—the substitute for which I voted—would have provided real, effective relief without the excesses of the Republican bill.

That alternative would have raised the estate tax's special exclusion to $4 million for a couple owning a farm or small business. So, under that alternative, a married couple owning a family farm or ranch or a small business worth up to $4 million could pass it on intact with no estate tax whatsoever.

Also, the Democratic alternative actually would have provided more immediate relief to small business and farm owners.

Unlike the Republican bill—which is phased in over ten years—the Democratic alternative would have taken effect immediately. That means a couple passing on their farm or small business in the near future would avoid more tax under the Democratic plan than under the Republican bill. They would not have to hope to live long enough to see the benefits.

In addition, by increasing the general exclusion (now at $675,000) to $1.1 million next year, the Democratic alternative would allow for any person to pass on "millionaire" status to their children without a penny of estate tax burden. And the Democratic alternative also would lower estate tax rates by 20% across the board.

So, the Democratic alternative—which I voted for and which deserved adoption—would provide important relief from the estate tax and would have done so in a real, effective, and prompt way.

Furthermore, the Democratic alternative would have provided this relief in a fiscally responsible way that would not jeopardize our ability to do what is needed to maintain and strengthen Social Security and Medicare, provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors and pay down the public debt.

By contrast, it is precisely the fiscal overkill of the Republican bill that makes me most reluctant to vote for it.

Once fully phased in, the Republican bill would forgo nearly $50 billion a year in revenue with no guarantee that this revenue loss will not harm Social Security and Medicare in future years.

The bill's sponsors say it will cost $28.2 billion over 5 years and $104.5 billion over 10 years. But that is far from the whole story.

Because of the way the bill is phased in, its true cost is cleverly hidden and does not show up until after the 10-year budget window.

That means the full effects of the Republican bill will come just at the time when we will have to face budget pressures because my own "baby boom" generation is starting to retire. And if we feel we need to "phase in" H.R. 8 because we cannot afford the full repeal now, how are we ever going to afford it 10 years from now?

We do not need to engage in this fiscal overkill.

According to the Treasury Department, under current law only 2% of all decedents have enough wealth to be subject to the estate tax at all.

To be more specific, the Treasury Department tells me that in 1997 estate-tax returns were filed for only 297 Coloradans.

Furthermore, according to the Treasury Department, of those estates that are affected by the estate tax, only 3%—that is only 6 in 10,000 American estates—were comprised primarily of family-owned small businesses, ranches, or farms.

Looking just at our state, that means that in 1997 fewer than a dozen estate-tax returns were comprised primarily of small businesses, ranches, or farms.

Of course, those numbers only relate to the cases in which an estate tax was actually paid. Clearly, in many other cases families have taken actions to forestall the estate tax. I understand that, and do think that in appropriate cases we should lessen the pressure that prompted some of those actions.

As I said, the Democratic alternative would have provided real, effective, and immediate estate-tax relief to the owners of small businesses, including farms and ranches, and would have done so in a fiscally responsible way. That is why I voted for it.

In contrast, the biggest beneficiaries of the Republican legislation are not those middle-class families who own small ranches or farms or other small businesses, but instead are very wealthy families with very large assets.

Over the past two decades, income and wealth disparities have increased. The Republican bill, while it does have some positive aspects, would increase those wealth disparities. I find this troubling, and it adds to my reluctance to support the bill.

However, I will vote for the bill because the Republican leadership has made it clear that it is this bill or no estate-tax relief bill, at least for now, here in the House.

That being the case, I have decided that the Republican bill—although very flawed and excessive—is just acceptable enough for me to vote for today.

I do so in the hope and expectation that the bill's faults can be corrected as it proceeds through the legislative process and that ultimately it can be refined into a bill that deserves to be enacted into law.

If that does not occur—if that hope and expectation prove unfounded—I will not vote for a bill that fails to meet that standard.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8, the "Death Tax Elimination Act," a fiscally-imprudent measure that the Republican Majority has brought to the floor, knowing that it provides tax relief to only two percent of all estates and benefits only the wealthiest in our society. I am supportive of federal estate tax relief, not a repeal, particularly for family farms and closely-held small businesses and strongly support of the Rangel Substitute Amendment, a fiscally responsible alternative that the President will sign.

Under H.R. 8, the federal estate tax would be reduced gradually over the next decade and would be fully repealed in 2010. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that it will cost $105 billion to repeal the estate tax in the first ten years. However, the Administration estimates that the federal revenue loss from H.R. 8 would be approximately $50 billion annually after 2010, once the estate and gift tax was fully repealed. Thus, the cost of H.R. 8 in the second decade of phase-in would be nearly six times the cost for 2001–2010.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I continue to advocate that Congress preserve the budget surplus and use it to pay off the national debt while strengthening Social Security. The $3.7 trillion dollar public debt is a tremendous burden on the economy. H.R. 8 jeopardizes our ability to protect Social Security and Medicare and pay down the national debt by creating a revenue loss, when executed, in excess of half a trillion dollars over ten years.

In the second decade of the century, with H.R. 8 costing $50 billion annually, the ''Baby Boom'' generation will begin retiring in large numbers, logically driving up the costs of programs such as Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. At the same time, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projects that total Federal budgetary surpluses will begin to decline. How will we pay for the programs? Will we cut Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid benefits?

H.R. 8 would only help the less than two percent of all estates that are currently subject to any federal estate tax. To be subject to the federal estate tax, the size of one's estate must exceed $675,000 in 2000. By 2006, the estate tax exemption will rise to $1 million. Furthermore, current law provides for an even higher exemption of $1.3 million per person for closely-held farms and non-public businesses. But H.R. 8, under the guise of helping family farms and ''mom & pop'' small business would repeal the estate tax on all estates including the wealthiest. Under this bill, Bill Gates would be able to transfer $80,000,000,000 tax free to his heirs, hardly the estate of a small businessman.

The Rangel Substitute is an appropriate affordable alternative which provides relief to real family-owned businesses and farms. Rather than repeal the tax and bust the budget, it provides an across-the-board 20 percent reduction to the top estate and marginal gift rates, including a reduction in the top marginal rate from 55% to 44%. It would immediately increase the exemption equivalent of the unified credit against estate and gift taxes to $1,100,000. It also would provide for targeted tax relief for farm and small business estates and raise the special exclusion to $2 million per person, $4 million for a married couple. Moreover, the Rangel Alternative is a fiscally responsible measure, costing approximately $20 billion over 10 years with no exploding outyear costs. Clearly, Mr. RANGEL has proposed a superior measure that truly helps those that the proponents of H.R. 8 purport to be helping.

Finally, I would also like to address the myth perpetuated by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that H.R. 8 enhances protections for small businesses and farms. H.R. 8 does not provide any additional exemption until 2010, while the Rangel Alternative would provide an immediate $4 million per family exclusion for family farms and closely-held small businesses and would exempt 99% of family farms form estate taxes. In the past, I have supported legislation that has provided relief to family farms. In 1997, I supported the Taxpayer Relief Act (P.L. 105–34) that raised the effective deduction for qualified family-owned business interests to $1.3 million per individual, which exempts almost all family farms and small businesses from the estate tax. Moreover, the few businesses and farms that are subject to the estate tax can make payments in installments over fourteen years at below-market interest rates. The Rangel Substitute would build on these protections by providing further immediate relief.

There is a need for estate and gift tax reform but outright repeal through passage of H.R. 8 is clearly not the way. If proponents are in favor of real reform to help owners of real small businesses and farms and not the wealthiest among us, I urge them to join with me in supporting the Rangel Substitute.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Death Tax Elimination Act. This unfair tax has long outlived its usefulness.

I come to this debate with something of a unique perspective on this issue. For more than twenty years, I practiced estate law. I have actually sat down and helped people navigate this extremely complex tax. I was not helping Bill Gates or Ross Perot—I was helping the sons and daughters of small business owners try to keep their parent's dreams alive.

Unfortunately, because they have to pay a tax of 37 to 55 percent on their estate, it is often impossible for them to continue. It is simply heartbreaking to see children who want to keep their parent's business alive have to sell it just to pay the taxes.

We are here in Congress to make things better for the American people. When more than 70 percent of small businesses do not make it to the second generation, something is wrong and must be made better.

The Death Tax Elimination Act will make things better.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Death Tax Elimination Act. The time is now to once and for all put an end to the death tax.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the proposition that an American who works hard, builds a business and saves for his family should have to turn over 55% of what he owns to the tax collectors in Washington when he dies.

The Death Tax reduces economic growth and increases the cost of capital. It causes individuals to shift much of their wealth to immediate consumption rather than long-term, productive investments. If these investments were made, it would create long-term economic growth by lowering interest rates and creating more jobs.

It shouldn't surprise us, however, to hear those who favor the Death tax argue that repealing it would help only the rich. Next time I go back to my district and hear from the farmers and small business men who ask me why their families will have to sell their business to pay the Death Tax, I'll tell them that some influential members of the other party in Washington said they were too rich to get relief.

To add insult to injury, I'll remind them that the federal government raises just 1% of its annual revenue from the Death Tax.

I'll even tell them that those who can afford to hire lawyers and accountants to tend to their finances have already figured out ways to avoid paying the tax.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak about another unjust provision of our tax code that this legislation will repeal. The Generation Skipping Tax effectively prohibits the transfer of your property to your grandchildren or someone 37½ years younger than you by taxing that transfer at a rate of 55%.

In my district, the long-time business owner of Key Industries, Kenneth Pollock, regularly paid bonuses to his employees based on loyalty and length of service to the company. Whether you worked in the executive office or on the assembly line, everyone was treated the same.

As Mr. Pollock prepared for his death, he determined that he wanted to leave his estate in trust for the benefit of his current and former employees. Each current or former employee was to continue to receive an annual distribution from the trust in an amount similar to their annual bonus based on years of service to the company.

Unfortunately, Mr. Pollock did not properly prepare the trust. All employees more than 37½ years younger than Mr. Pollock are now subject to the 55% Generation Skipping Tax on each distribution from the trust. Many of these workers earn less than $10 per hour. It is bad public policy to tax this much-needed annual bonus at 55%. It is bad public policy to discourage generosity.

To make things worse, the company was forced recently to make the difficult business decision to close two plants. Many displaced workers will receive one-time lump sum payments from the trust of $10,000 or more. The employees will lose more than 1/2 of this money at a time when they need it most.

Unfortunately, the repeal of the Generation Skipping Tax will not take place for nine years. That is why I have authored legislation to treat the annual distributions from this trust just like any other gift by exempting the first $10,000 from the tax annually. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and Chairman Archer will work with me to pass this much needed provision.

Today, however, we have the opportunity to encourage economic growth and remove this tax burden that falls heaviest on the family businesses and family farms across Kansas and the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote to repeal the Death Tax.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 8, the so-called Death Tax Act. While I would prefer a more targeted approach to eliminating this tax, I remain hopeful that passing H.R. 8 could be the first step in the process of finding a compromise granting the vast majority of Americans estate tax relief without jeopardizing the fiscal health of our nation.

Let there be no mistake, I have supported relief from the death tax for our family farmers and small business owners since I came to

this body in 1977. The first bill I introduced as a Member of Congress was H.R. 1845, the Family Farm and Small Business Estate Tax Relief Act of 1997. This legislation would have raised the inheritance tax exemption for small business people and family farmers from $600,000 to $1.5 million and indexed it to inflation for the first time. The Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 later raised the exemption to $1.3 million. This was not as much estate tax relief as I had hoped for, so I continued working.

On March 27 of this year, I introduced a proposal that would significantly reduce the estate tax burden faced by those who inherit family owned farms and small businesses. I believe that the current estate tax exemption should be raised from the current level of $1.3 million to $4 million over the next five years and indexed to inflation thereafter. Reducing estate taxes is vital to ensuring that family farmers and small business owners can pass their hard-earned assets to their loved ones. My bill accomplishes this important goal in a responsible manner that is consistent with our values.

The Democratic Substitute to H.R. 8, offered by my good friends from New York and Texas, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STENHOLM, also would provide for a $4 million estate tax exemption to family farmers and small businesses, as my bill would. It cuts estate taxes across the board by 20 percent and only costs $22 billion over 10 years. I am proud to support the Rangel-Stenholm plan because it is fiscally responsible and represents the kind of compromise that can not only obtain wide bipartisan support, but also be signed by the President.

Unfortunately, the Republican bill, H.R. 8, once fully implemented, would cost the U.S. Treasury $100 billion over 10 years and then an estimated $50 billion a year afterwards. This means less money for school construction, less money for Medicare, and less money to protect Social Security for the rest of this century.

There are other flaws to H.R. 8. While the Democratic alternative provides estate tax relief to family farmers and small businesses immediately, H.R. 8 forces farmers and businesses to wait 10 years before obtaining the same level of benefits. The President has indicated loud and clear that he intends to veto this bill if it reaches his desk. The Republicans should work in a bipartisan manner to find a compromise that can become law and provide immediate tax relief.

I reluctantly vote in favor of H.R. 8, I vote for H.R. 8 today to move the legislative process forward, hopefully toward a bipartisan conclusion that will accomplish real relief from the estate tax for North Carolina's family farmers and small businesses.

I vote in favor of H.R. 8 now, but reserve the right to vote against this or similar bills in the future if my concerns about the problems of this plan are not addressed. Additionally, I reserve the right to vote to sustain the expected presidential veto of H.R. 8 unless needed changes are made.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. During my tenure in Congress I have supported measures that would provide relief from unfair taxes to all Americans, and I have long believed that eliminating the estate tax is an important step in this process. It is past time to remove this onerous, unfair tax that punishes life-long habits of saving and discourages entrepreneurship.

The real burden of this tax falls on family-owned businesses and the people who work for them who lose their jobs when a business is forced to sell in order to pay these taxes. The death tax is a major reason that 70% of small businesses do not survive to the second generation and 87% do not survive to the third. A repeal of the estate tax will mean more jobs, economic growth and preservation of the American Dream.

Uncle Sam should not be sitting outside a funeral home waiting to take away the family business. It is time we allow families to pass on the family business to new generations without being hit by an arbitrary tax of 37 to 55 percent of the value of their business. I urge my colleagues to vote to remove this outrageous tax on hardworking American families.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8, although I would prefer to abolish the death tax immediately and completely. But, the unusual budgetary scoring rules which we must follow do not allow us to take into account real world consequences of changes in tax policy, and so we must phase it out.

While there is a lot of ''sound and fury'' in this debate, the essential point is this: It is wrong to tax death. It doesn't matter if someone has saved $5 or $5 million; it is wrong to tax death.

People in my district and all around the country have worked hard all their lives, paid taxes on what they have earned, saved, and want to leave something so their children can have a better life. It is wrong to punish them for doing so.

It also makes sense to get rid of this tax. A report by our Joint Economic Committee in December 1998 provides Members with a comprehensive look at the many studies that have been made on the effects of this tax. The JEC report found that:

The death tax reduced capital stocks in the U.S. by 3.2%, limiting growth, job creation, and higher standards of living for our people.

The death tax makes small businesses, particularly minority and female-owned small businesses, less likely to invest, expand, and hire new workers. Indeed, they are forced to spend thousands of dollars on lawyers, accountants, life insurance, and other tax avoidance measures.

The death tax is ineffective at redistributing wealth, for those who believe that should be a desirable goal of the federal government.

The death tax raises little, if any, net revenue for the federal government when the enormous costs of compliance and economic consequences of it are taken into account.

Mr. Speaker, we should not punish growth, savings, and job creation. We should not punish people who try to leave a better life for their children. We should abolish the death tax once and for all.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, during the recent consideration of H.R. 8, legislation which would repeal the estate tax, I supported an alternative which was drafted to give immediate protection to the American farmer and the small businessman whose heirs are in danger of losing their family's hard-earned, life-long business to the Federal government.

I have always supported the elimination of the estate tax. And even though I am a cosponsor of H.R. 8, I believe the Democratic alternative is better suited, at this time, for accomplishing what we need in eliminating this unfair tax. The Democratic alternative immediately provides a $4 million per family exclusion for farms and small businesses and it lowers the tax rate. H.R. 8 takes ten years before it is fully phased-into place.

In short, the Democratic alternative helps the right people right now. It does more and does it quicker than the version of H.R. 8 which I cosponsored back in July of 1999. At that time, there was no better alternative and it was assumed that a comprehensive tax package would be instituted which would provide across-the-board benefits for hard-working middle-class citizens as well as the wealthy. Standing alone, H.R. 8 does nothing for middle-income families. And by not enacting a full package of tax relief for all Americans, the lost revenues increase the burden on the same middle-income workers who must make up the shortfall in preserving Social Security and Medicare, providing a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, improving our educational system, and paying down the debt.

Like the rest of America, I am pleased that we are enjoying a period of prosperity with a strong economy. However, we have no guarantee that this respite will continue. In light of this uncertainty, it is patently unfair to grant a massive tax relief provision that benefits only 2% of the nation's richest persons while creating a drain on revenues which would ultimately burden two-income families who are struggling today to make ends meet.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8, The Estate Tax Elimination Act, which provides estate tax relief for family-owned small businesses.

The estate or ''death'' tax has deviated from its original intent and purpose. From a practical sense, it was established to provide revenue on a short-term basis to finance military action.

In theory, however, it was also viewed as a way to protect society against growing concentrations of wealth in the hands of a very few. Supposedly, this tax would encourage market growth which was hindered by the inheritance of estates.

Well, the market has grown. Family-owned small businesses have become the backbone of our economy and continue to provide invaluable services.

Recognizing their importance, programs were created to promote their existence and expansion in the form of loans and other assistance programs. Unfortunately, their lifespan is hindered by an unfair tax levied when ownership is transferred at the time of death.

Less than 30 percent of all family-owned businesses survive through the second generation. This is unacceptable.

The district I represent on Long Island, is dependent on the success of family-owned

small businesses. A lot of hard work and determination is involved to secure their prosperity.

More often than not the odds are usually stacked against them in the form of a complex tax code or competition by larger companies. The estate tax, however, is another hurdle small businesses must overcome that is more harmful than beneficial.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, the folks that I represent in Georgia's 8th, Congressional District are hard-working. The majority of these people own small family businesses and family farms. They get up each day, go to their jobs, work hard for their families, and pay their taxes like responsible Americans.

The federal government asks them to do all of this, but at the end of the line, after a lifetime of hard work and paying taxes, Uncle Sam reaches in and takes over half of their life's accumulation. This is simply wrong. Mr. Speaker, the death tax is immoral, un-American, and this House must bury it.

The death tax is an unfair burden that taxes farmers and small business owners twice. The farmers in Georgia's 8th District work tirelessly to feed and clothe America. They do this while battling severe weather, droughts, floods, and low prices. Times are tough in rural America right now, the burdens are high, and the death tax is just a slap in the face to our farmers, who produce the safest, highest quality food and fiber in the world.

The death tax affects one-third of small business owners, who are forced to sell outright or liquidate a part of their firms to pay estate taxes. When mom-and pop shops must close because of an outdated, unfair tax code, this Congress must take the lead and make a change.

The death tax is contrary to the freedom and free-market principles on which this nation was founded. Do we support the IRS or do we support the American family? We must help Georgia families continue their livelihood and pass their legacy and success on to their children and grandchildren, not burden them with taxes that kill a lifetime of hard-work. Let's bury the death tax here, today. I urge my colleagues to vote to end the estate tax.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. I commend the sponsor of the bill, my Ways and Means Committee colleague, Ms. DUNN, for her work on this issue. And I commend the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. ARCHER, for his long commitment to eliminating this unfair and unreasonable tax.

The death tax is bad tax policy. It is double taxation, because individuals who pay taxes on income throughout their lives are taxed again on the same income at their time of death on the value of their property. The rates—up to 60 percent—are the highest in the tax code.

The death tax is bad policy not only because of the costs it imposes after death—but also because of the costs it imposes during life. The additional costs of life insurance, attorneys fees and estate planning services cost hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

The death tax is also an inefficient drag on our economy. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress has reported that, while the death tax generates about $23 billion annually in revenue for the federal government, it also costs businesses, farmers and individuals another $23 billion just in compliance costs.

Unfortunately, in the area I represent in Southwest Ohio, many family farmers and family business owners just aren't prepared to deal with the consequences of the death tax. According to a recent study by Arthur Andersen's Center for Family Business, 28 percent of senior generation shareholders of family businesses surveyed in Greater Cincinnati had not completed any estate planning other than a will.

And, although 71 percent of these individuals wanted the family business to stay in the family after their death, the study found that less than 30 percent would be able to do so unless they better examined the issues of estate taxes and planning.

Small businesses and family farms have made the American dream possible for generations. At a time when 70 percent of family-owned businesses do not survive to the second generaton, and only about 13 percent survive to the third generation, our tax laws should be encouraging—rather than preventing—people to pass these assets to their families.

We're losing too many family-owned businesses and family-farms as it is. I urge my colleague to support the Death Tax Elimination Act—to put an end to this unfair, inefficient and confiscatory tax.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan legislation to repeal the federal estate tax over the next ten years, and I salute Representatives DUNN and TANNER for their long stewardship of this bill. As a family farmer myself and as the representative of the most productive agricultural region of the country, I have seen the impact that this tax has had on small businesses and family-owned farms, and I believe that the repeal of the estate tax will help ensure the survival of these businesses into the next century.

Seventy percent of family businesses are not passed on to future generations largely because of the burden imposed by estate taxes. In particular, I would like to point out the impact of estate taxes on family farms, since it is these family farms that drive the economy of California's Central Valley, which I represent. The estate tax has a devastating effect on family farmers who struggle to pass on their farms to the next generation.

Since most family-owned farms do not earn the kind of profits necessary to pay large estate tax bills, future generations are often forced to mortgage or liquidate assets. As a fourth generation family farmer, I have seen first-hand the difficulty that family members face in trying to keep farms operating when each generation passes. Eliminating the heavy burden the estate tax imposes on farmers will help keep more of our farms in operation from generation to generation.

I would also argue that elimination of the estate tax would have a positive impact on a number of the small rural communities that make up the fabric of my district and much of this nation. These small rural communities and the families that live there are highly dependent on the continued operation of family farms and small businesses in the area.

These family farms and small businesses employ the vast majority of people in these small communities. If we are to continue to spread our unprecedented national economic expansion to every corner of this country—including our rural communities—we must work to ensure that family farms and small businesses in these communities stay in operation. Elimination of the estate tax will brighten these communities' economic future.

I strongly support this legislation because I believe it will free our family farmers and small businesspeople of the estate tax burden that currently threatens their long-term survival, and strengthen our small communities in the 21st century.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, opponents to this bill argue that it will only benefit the rich.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at the group of "rich" people this bill unfairly helps.

In my district, and in rural districts across the nation, the death tax hits the farm family especially hard. Because of economies of scale and the ever rising cost of equipment, they have become land and capital rich.

Everyone should know by now, farmers live on the margin. They have very modest incomes and in today's world most farm families are far from "rich."

For year to year, farm families struggle simply to keep their heads above water. They may be land rich, Mr. Speaker, but they are cash poor.

Yet, when a farmer dies, we punish him for his hard work. Then we force his family to sell the land they grew-up on to pay the estate taxes and send them on their way.

The result, people who would like to carry on their family tradition of farming are instead being forced to sell their land to wealthy land developers who then turn that land into more cookie-cutter sub-divisions and strip malls.

If you don't believe me, Mr. Speaker, take a drive out to Dulles Airport some time. That all used to be farm land not so long ago.

The death tax is killing an American tradition and that's absolutely appalling.

It's time we end this travesty and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). All time for general debate has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. RANGEL:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Estate Tax Relief Act of 2000".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, 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 Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. 20 PERCENT REDUCTION OF ESTATE TAX RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2001(c) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

"If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax is to be computed is:	The tentative tax is:
Not over $10,000	14.4% of such amount.
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,440, plus 16% of the excess of such amount over $10,000
Over $20,000 but not over $40,000.	$3,040, plus 17.6% of the excess of such amount over $20,000
Over $40,000 but not over $60,000.	$6,560, plus 19.2% of the excess of such amount over $40,000
Over $60,000 but not over $80,000.	$10,400, plus 20.8% of the excess of such amount over $60,000
Over $80,000 but not over $100,000.	$14,560, plus 22.4% of the excess of such amount over $80,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$19,040, plus 24% of the excess of such amount over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $250,000.	$31,040, plus 25.6% of the excess of such amount over $150,000
Over $250,000 but not over $500,000.	$56,640, plus 27.2% of the excess of such amount over $250,000
Over $500,000 but not over $750,000.	$124,640, plus 29.6% of the excess of such amount over $500,000
Over $750,000 but not over $1,000,000.	$198,640, plus 31.2% of the excess of such amount over $750,000
Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,250,000.	$276,640, plus 32.8% of the excess of such amount over $1,000,000
Over $1,250,000 but not over $1,500,000.	$358,640, plus 34.4% of the excess of such amount over $1,250,000
Over $1,500,000 but not over $2,000,000.	$444,640, plus 36% of the excess of such amount over $1,500,000
Over $2,000,000 but not over $2,500,000.	$624,640, plus 39.2% of the excess of such amount over $2,000,000
Over $2,500,000 but not over $3,000,000.	$820,640, plus 42.4% of the excess of such amount over $2,500,000
Over $3,000,000	$1,032,640, plus 44% of the excess of such amount over $3,000,000''.

(b) RESTORATION OF PHASEOUT OF UNIFIED CREDIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 2001(c) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and all that follows and inserting ''$10,000,000. The amount of the increase under the preceding sentence shall not exceed the sum of—

''(A) the applicable credit amount under section 2010(c), and

''(B) the excess of the amount equal to 44 percent of $3,000,000 over the amount of the tentative tax under paragraph (1) on $3,000,000.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN EXEMPTION EQUIVALENT OF UNIFIED CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The table contained in section 2010(c) (relating to applicable credit amount) is amended to read as follows:

"In the case of estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, during:	The applicable exclusion amount is:
2000	$ 675,000
2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005	$1,100,000
2006 or thereafter	$1,200,000.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying, and gifts made, after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN ESTATE TAX BENEFIT FOR FAMILY-OWNED BUSINESS INTERESTS.

(a) TRANSFER TO CREDIT PROVISIONS.—Section 2057 (relating to family-owned business interests) is hereby moved to part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code, inserted after section 2010, and redesignated as section 2010A.

(b) INCREASE IN CREDIT; SURVIVING SPOUSE ALLOWED UNUSED CREDIT OF DECEDENT.—Subsection (a) of section 2010A, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) INCREASE IN UNITED CREDIT.—For purposes of determining the unified credit under section 2010 in the case of an estate of a decedent to which this section applies—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The applicable exclusion amount under section 2010(c) shall be increased (but not in excess of $2,000,000) by the adjusted value of the qualified family-owned business interests of the decedent which are described in subsection (b)(2) and for which no deduction is allowed under section 2056.

''(2) TREATMENT OF UNUSED LIMITATION OF PREDECEASED SPOUSE.—In the case of a decedent—

''(A) having no surviving spouse, but

''(B) who was the surviving spouse of a decedent—

''(i) who died after December 31, 2000, and

''(ii) whose estate met the requirements of subsection (b)(1) other than subparagraph (B) thereof,

there shall be substituted for '$2,000,000' in paragraph (1) an amount equal to the excess of $4,000,000 over the exclusion equivalent of the credit allowed under section 2010 (as increased by this section) to the estate of the decedent referred to in subparagraph (B). For purposes of the preceding sentence, the exclusion equivalent of the credit is the amount on which a tentative tax under section 2001(c) equal to such credit would be imposed.''

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 2057.

(2) Paragraph (10) of section 2031(c) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 2057(e)(3)'' and inserting ''section 2010A(e)(3)''.

(3) The table of sections for part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2010 the following new item:

''Sec. 2010A. Family-owned business interests.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 5. CREDIT FOR STATE DEATH TAXES REPLACED WITH DEDUCTION FOR SUCH TAXES.

(a) REPEAL OF CREDIT.—Section 2011 (relating to credit for State death taxes) is hereby repealed.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR STATE DEATH TAXES.—Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2058. STATE DEATH TAXES.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—For purposes of the tax imposed by section 2001, the value of the taxable estate shall be determined by deducting from the value of the gross estate the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any State or the District of Columbia, in respect of any property included in the gross estate (not including any such taxes paid with respect to the estate of a person other than the decedent).

''(b) PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS.—The deduction allowed by this section shall include only such taxes as were actually paid and deduction therefor claimed within 4 years after the filing of the return required by section 6018, except that—

''(1) If a petition for redetermination of a deficiency has been filed with the Tax Court within the time prescribed in section 6213(a), then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days after the decision of the Tax Court becomes final.

''(2) If, under section 6161 or 6166, an extension of time has been granted for payment of the tax shown on the return, or of a deficiency, then within such 4-year period or before the date of the expiration of the period of the extension.

''(3) If a claim for refund or credit of an overpayment of tax imposed by this chapter has been filed within the time prescribed in section 6511, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days from the date of mailing by certified mail or registered mail by the Secretary to the taxpayer of a notice of the disallowance of any part of such claim, or before the expiration of 60 days after a decision by any court of competent jurisdiction becomes final with respect to a timely suit instituted upon such claim, whichever is later.

Refund based on the deduction may (despite the provisions of sections 6511 and 6512) be made if claim therefor is filed within the period above provided. Any such refund shall be made without interest.''

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 2012 is amended by striking ''the credit for State death taxes provided by section 2011 and''.

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 2013(c)(1) is amended by striking ''2011,''.

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 2014(b) is amended by striking '', 2011,''.

(4) Sections 2015 and 2016 are each amended by striking ''2011 or''.

(5) Subsection (d) of section 2053 is amended to read as follows:

''(d) CERTAIN FOREIGN DEATH TAXES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c)(1)(B) of this section, for purposes of the tax imposed by section 2001, the value of the taxable estate may be determined, if the executor so elects before the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment provided in section 6501, by deducting from the value of the gross estate the amount (as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary) of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by and actually paid to any foreign country, in respect of any property situated within such foreign country and included in the gross estate of a citizen or resident of the United States, upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses described in section 2055. The determination under this paragraph of the country within which property is situated shall be made in accordance with the rules applicable under subchapter B (sec. 2101 and following) in determining whether property is situated within or without the United States. Any election under this paragraph shall be exercised in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(2) CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under paragraph (1) for a foreign death tax specified therein unless the decrease in the tax

imposed by section 2001 which results from the deduction provided in paragraph (1) will inure solely for the benefit of the public, charitable, or religious transferees described in section 2055 or section 2106(a)(2). In any case where the tax imposed by section 2001 is equitably apportioned among all the transferees of property included in the gross estate, including those described in sections 2055 and 2106(a)(2) (taking into account any exemptions, credits, or deductions allowed by this chapter), in determining such decrease, there shall be disregarded any decrease in the Federal estate tax which any transferees other than those described in sections 2055 and 2106(a)(2) are required to pay.

''(3) EFFECT ON CREDIT FOR FOREIGN DEATH TAXES OF DEDUCTION UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.—

''(A) ELECTION.—An election under this subsection shall be deemed a waiver of the right to claim a credit, against the Federal estate tax, under a death tax convention with any foreign country for any tax or portion thereof in respect of which a deduction is taken under this subsection.

''(B) CROSS REFERENCE.—

''See section 2014(f) for the effect of a deduction taken under this paragraph on the credit for foreign death taxes.''

(6) Subparagraph (A) of section 2056A(b)(10) is amended—

(A) by striking ''2011,'', and

(B) by inserting ''2058,'' after ''2056,''.

(7)(A) Subsection (a) of section 2102 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2101 shall be credited with the amounts determined in accordance with sections 2012 and 2013 (relating to gift tax and tax on prior transfers).''

(B) Section 2102 is amended by striking subsection (b) and by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(C) Section 2102(b)(5) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)) and section 2107(c)(3) are each amended by striking ''2011 to 2013, inclusive,'' and inserting ''2012 and 2013''.

(8) Subsection (a) of section 2106 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) STATE DEATH TAXES.—The amount which bears the same ratio to the State death taxes as the value of the property, as determined for purposes of this chapter, upon which State death taxes were paid and which is included in the gross estate under section 2103 bears to the value of the total gross estate under section 2103. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State death taxes' means the taxes described in section 2011(a).''

(9) Section 2201 is amended—

(A) by striking ''as defined in section 2011(d)'', and

(B) by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''For purposes of this section, the additional estate tax is the difference between the tax imposed by section 2001 or 2101 and the amount equal to 125 percent of the maximum credit provided by section 2011(b), as in effect before its repeal by the Estate Tax Relief Act of 2000.''

(10) Paragraph (2) of section 6511(i) is amended by striking ''2011(c), 2014(b),'' and inserting ''2014(b)''.

(11) Subsection (c) of section 6612 is amended by striking ''section 2011(c) (relating to refunds due to credit for State taxes),''.

(12) The table of sections for part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2011.

(13) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2058. State death taxes.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 6. VALUATION RULES FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NONBUSINESS ASSETS; LIMITATION ON MINORITY DISCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2031 (relating to definition of gross estate) is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

''(d) VALUATION RULES FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NONBUSINESS ASSETS.—For purposes of this subtitle—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the transfer of any interest in an entity other than an interest which is actively traded (within the meaning of section 1092)—

''(A) the value of any nonbusiness assets held by the entity shall be determined as if the transferor had transferred such assets directly to the transferee (and no valuation discount shall be allowed with respect to such nonbusiness assets), and

''(B) the nonbusiness assets shall not be taken into account in determining the value of the interest in the entity.

''(2) NONBUSINESS ASSETS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'nonbusiness asset' means any asset which is not used in the active conduct of 1 or more trades or businesses.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PASSIVE ASSETS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a passive asset shall not be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as used in the active conduct of a trade or business unless—

''(i) the asset is property described in paragraph (1) or (4) of section 1221(a) or is a hedge with respect to such property, or

''(ii) the asset is real property used in the active conduct of 1 or more real property trades or businesses (within the meaning of section 469(c)(7)(C)) in which the transferor materially participates and with respect to which the transferor meets the requirements of section 469(c)(7)(B)(ii).

For purposes of clause (ii), material participation shall be determined under the rules of section 469(h), except that section 469(h)(3) shall be applied without regard to the limitation to farming activity.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR WORKING CAPITAL.—Any asset (including a passive asset) which is held as a part of the reasonably required working capital needs of a trade or business shall be treated as used in the active conduct of a trade or business.

''(3) PASSIVE ASSET.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'passive asset' means any—

''(A) cash or cash equivalents,

''(B) except to the extent provided by the Secretary, stock in a corporation or any other equity, profits, or capital interest in any entity,

''(C) evidence of indebtedness, option, forward or futures contract, notional principal contract, or derivative,

''(D) asset described in clause (iii), (iv), or (v) of section 351(e)(1)(B),

''(E) annuity,

''(F) real property used in 1 or more real property trades or businesses (as defined in section 469(c)(7)(C)),

''(G) asset (other than a patent, trademark, or copyright) which produces royalty income,

''(H) commodity,

''(I) collectible (within the meaning of section 401(m)), or

''(J) any other asset specified in regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(4) LOOK-THRU RULES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a nonbusiness asset of an entity consists of a 10-percent interest in any other entity, this subsection shall be applied by disregarding the 10-percent interest and by treating the entity as holding directly its ratable share of the assets of the other entity. This subparagraph shall be applied successively to any 10-percent interest of such other entity in any other entity.

''(B) 10-PERCENT INTEREST.—The term '10-percent interest' means—

''(i) in the case of an interest in a corporation, ownership of at least 10 percent (by vote or value) of the stock in such corporation,

''(ii) in the case of an interest in a partnership, ownership of at least 10 percent of the capital or profits interest in the partnership, and

''(iii) in any other case, ownership of at least 10 percent of the beneficial interests in the entity.

''(5) COORDINATION WITH SUBSECTION (b).—Subsection (b) shall apply after the application of this subsection.

''(e) LIMITATION ON MINORITY DISCOUNTS.—For purposes of this subtitle, in the case of the transfer of an interest in an entity, no reduction in the amount which would otherwise be determined to be the value of such interest shall be allowed by reason of the fact that the interest does not represent control of such entity if the transferor and members of the family (as defined in section 2032A(e)(2)) of the transferor have control of such entity.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to transfers after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. TAX ON GIFTS AND BEQUESTS RECEIVED BY UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS FROM EXPATRIATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B (relating to estate and gift taxes) is amended by inserting after chapter 13 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 13A—GIFTS AND BEQUESTS FROM EXPATRIATES

''Sec. 2681. Imposition of tax.

''SEC. 2681. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If, during any calendar year, any United States citizen or resident receives any covered gift or bequest, there is hereby imposed a tax equal to the product of—

''(1) the highest rate of tax specified in the table contained in section 2001(c) as in effect on the date of such receipt, and

''(2) the value of such covered gift or bequest.

''(b) TAX TO BE PAID BY RECIPIENT.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) on any covered gift or bequest shall be paid by the person receiving such gift or bequest.

''(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN GIFTS.—Subsection (a) shall apply only to the extent that the covered gifts and bequests received during the calendar year exceed $10,000.

''(d) TAX REDUCED BY FOREIGN GIFT OR ESTATE TAX.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) on any covered gift or bequest shall be reduced by the amount of any gift or estate tax paid to a foreign country with respect to such covered gift or bequest.

''(e) COVERED GIFT OR BEQUEST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'covered gift or bequest' means—

''(A) any property acquired by gift directly or indirectly from an individual who, at the

time of such acquisition, was an expatriate, and

''(B) any property acquired by bequest, devise, or inheritance directly or indirectly from an individual who, at the time of death, was an expatriate.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS FOR TRANSFERS OTHERWISE SUBJECT TO ESTATE OR GIFT TAX.—Such term shall not include—

''(A) any property shown on a timely filed return of tax imposed by chapter 12 which is a taxable gift by the expatriate, and

''(B) any property shown on a timely filed return of tax imposed by chapter 11 of the estate of the expatriate.

''(3) TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any covered gift or bequest which is made in trust shall be treated as made to the beneficiaries of such trust in proportion to their respective interests in such trust.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF BENEFICIARIES' INTEREST IN TRUST.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a beneficiary's interest in a trust shall be based upon all relevant facts and circumstances, including the terms of the trust instrument and any letter of wishes or similar document, historical patterns of trust distributions, and the existence of and functions performed by a trust protector or any similar advisor.

''(f) EXPATRIATE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'expatriate' means—

''(1) any United States citizen who relinquishes his citizenship, and

''(2) any long-term resident of the United States who—

''(A) ceases to be a lawful permanent resident of the United States (within the meaning of section 7701(b)(6)), or

''(B) commences to be treated as a resident of a foreign country under the provisions of a tax treaty between the United States and the foreign country and who does not waive the benefits of such treaty applicable to residents of the foreign country.''

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle B of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 13 the following new item:

''Chapter 13A. Gifts and bequests from expatriates.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to covered gifts and bequests (as defined in section 2681 of such Code, as added by this section) received on or after May 25, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 519, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed, will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a decision today either to vote for the political solution to this problem that has been offered by the majority, where they know, and it is guaranteed, it would be vetoed even though they do not promise relief for another 10 years, or to vote for the substitute that gives immediate relief and they know, as I do, that it will be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who would explain more of this.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when we started the debate an hour ago, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), my good friend, pointed out with pride that we have balanced the Federal budget and that was one of his objectives during his career. This is going to be his last year in this body and we certainly, all of us, appreciate his service to our country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that we want to make sure that we continue to balance the budget in the future. That is why I urge the gentleman to vote for the substitute.

See, 10 years from now we want to also make sure that we also have a balanced Federal budget. Yet under the underlining bill, we will be losing $50 billion a year at that point. And I want to make sure that we have an affordable bill.

During general debate, it was interesting that there was a lot of talk about the family-owned business and the family farm. As pointed out, only 2 percent of the estates are subject to the estate tax, and only 3 percent of that 2 percent have family farms or family-owned businesses. Well, the substitute deals with that by immediately, now, increasing the floor on those family assets to $4 million, taking almost all of the taxable farms and almost all of the taxable family-owned businesses out of the estate tax.

The underlying bill phases in over 10 years providing very low relief in the next few years. As we pointed out, if we look at an estate worth $1.5 million, under the substitute, because we immediately reduce the estate tax by 20 percent and we immediately increase the unified credit from $675,000 to $1.1 million, in that estate that is $1.5 million under the Archer bill, they would still pay $277,000 in estate tax next year.

□ 1115

But under the Rangel substitute, that tax would be only 135 percent, 17 percent reduction versus a 60 percent reduction. We can do better, and the Democratic substitute does better.

We also provide this in a fiscally responsible way. The Archer bill spends $105 billion over 10 years and then balloons to $50 billion a year. The Democratic substitute spends $22 billion over 10 years and does not balloon at all.

The reason is that we close some loopholes in the estate tax. We not only provide relief, but we reform the estate tax. For those estates over $17 million who are receiving the benefit of a drafting error, we correct that. For those minority-owned stock that are currently getting unreasonable discounts, we correct that. So we provide a fiscally responsible approach that deals with the problem.

Yes, we have family farms that are suffering, suffering under some of our existing laws. But let us not help the .001 percent of the multimillionaires. Let us take care of those who really need it.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me is that if this bill became law, we are going to have the scandalous avoidance of tax by billionaires. At the same time, we are going to be jeopardizing our ability to pay Social Security and Medicare. I do not think any of us want to be in that position. Let us not create a scandal; let us do what is responsible. Let us deal with the problem; let us support the Democratic substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) seek the time in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. ARCHER. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply very briefly say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) he knows full well that nothing in this bill would jeopardize his Social Security or Medicare. That should never be inserted in this debate because nothing, nothing jeopardizes Social Security or Medicare in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I might just mention that the gentleman who has just completed his speech has just experienced in his own State of Maryland the repeal of the death tax led by a Democrat legislature, a Democrat government, and led in particular by Obie Patterson, a liberal Democrat himself.

Mr. Speaker, as much as it excites me to listen to the opposition talk about reducing the death tax, the substitute is a hollow attempt to make it look like we are providing relief. It does not do the trick here. Here are the four reasons why:

First, and perhaps most importantly, it does not repeal the death tax. The substitute maintains the fundamental unfairness of the death tax. It says that, at the end of one's life, after one has worked hard, one puts one's heart and soul into building a business or a farm to provide a legacy for one's family, the Government still is entitled, in, many cases, to more than half of the fruits of one's labor.

I cannot accept this because it is so grossly in violation of the fundamental virtues of this Nation: thrift, diligence, risk taking, hard work. Ninety-five percent of Americans believe it is wrong. Ninety-five percent of Americans, Mr. Speaker, believe that it is wrong to tax income during one's life and then tax the same assets again just because one dies.

Secondly, the current death tax rates are the second highest in the industrialized world. The only nation that is

higher than us in death tax is Japan at 70 percent. Under the substitute, the United States still would have the second highest death tax rate in the world, behind bastions of free market capitalism like France and Sweden. Our international competitors have recognized the unfairness of this tax. It is time now for the United States Congress to recognize it as well.

Third, opponents of H.R. 8 say they can exempt family-owned farms and businesses by raising the family-owned business exception to $2 million. It will not work. It has already been tried. It has already been proved to fail.

Let me explain. When the Treasury Department came out with their figures saying that only 3 percent of estate tax returns are primarily composed of farm and business assets, I wanted to know what they wanted. I did not argue with their number. I wanted them to explain.

So I called the Office of Tax Analysis at Treasury to ask them what their definition of ''primarily comprised'' is. Their answer? At least 50 percent of the overall value of the estate.

What the opponents of H.R. 8 do not tell us is that, in order to qualify for the family-owned business exemption, at least 50 percent of the overall value of the estate must be comprised of business or farm assets.

What about the individual's home? How about the 401–K or any other savings? What about any assets in that estate that are not the business or the farm? This definition hurts especially small family-held farms and businesses.

So if they do believe their Treasury numbers, which they must believe because they have been touting them throughout the debate, they must concede what we have always known, that only 3 percent of family farms and businesses will ever qualify for their relief. Their own Treasury analysis exposes the false relief they are proposing.

Fourth and last, the substitute raises the death tax burden on all States at the same time it reduces rates. Under current law in States that still have estate tax laws, a family will receive a Federal death tax credit equal to their State death tax liability. This substitute eliminates the tax credit for States that have a death tax.

The net result is that the substitute slightly reduces the rate, but this is offset by an increase in their death tax liability because of a loss of the credit.

The substitute raises taxes, maintains high death tax rates, provides hollow relief for family farms and businesses. Most importantly, it retains the death tax.

There is only one way to rid the Code of this immoral, unfair, onerous, economically unsound tax, and that is to eliminate it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this substitute. Let us get rid of the death tax once and for all. Support H.R. 8.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there is agreement from both sides of the aisle today that there are very real problems with the estate tax that we need to address.

Some small businesses and family farms cannot be passed from generation to generation because the estate taxes imposed upon the death of the owner plays too great a financial responsibility burden on the remaining family. This is wrong.

But I encourage my colleagues to examine carefully the substance of H.R. 8 and the Democratic alternative to see which proposal actually delivers the relief we all want to provide.

I want to bring estate tax relief to the people I represent in the 17th district of Texas. Family farmers and small business owners. But I want to do so from a fiscally responsible way, that which does not harm debt reduction or endanger necessary programs, such as defense, Social Security, Medicare, veterans programs. That is why I support the Rangel-Cardin-Stenholm substitute and oppose H.R. 8.

Unlike H.R. 8, the Democratic alternative does not threaten Social Security and Medicare, with all due respect to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER). The back-end loaded costs of the bill will threaten our ability to meet the challenges facing Social Security. This explosion in costs will come at the exact time the Social Security and Medicare trust funds will begin to face financial challenges and the Treasury will have to redeem the assets held by the trust funds to pay the benefits.

The Democratic alternative provides immediate estate tax relief. The $4 million per family exclusion for farms and small businesses, the 20 percent across-the-board rate reduction for all estates, and increase in the unified credit of $1.1 million in the Democratic alternative would all take effect immediately.

By contrast, H.R. 8 would make small businesses and family farmers wait for 10 years to receive the amount of relief that would be made available January 1, 2001, under the Democratic alternative. I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, why should we make them wait 10 years before they get the relief we have all been talking about today?

The Democratic alternative is much more fiscally responsible than H.R. 8. H.R. 8 would cause an enormous long-term revenue loss which will undermine the fiscal discipline that has produced a strong economy and jeopardized our ability to retire our national debt.

Many of my colleagues have stood here and made statements that I totally agree with. It is not the Government's money; it is the people's money. But how quickly we forget it is the people's debt, $5.7 trillion. How quickly we ignore the Social Security unfunded liability of $7.9 trillion when it comes to a tax cut that is politically popular to a few folks today.

Let us stay with fiscal responsibility. The Democratic alternative does a much better job of targeting. It would immediately exempt 99 percent, 99 percent of family farms and estates from estate taxes and reduce the number of estates subject to the estate tax by 50 percent.

The Democratic alternative provides meaningful relief which can become law. We can give the relief that we are all concerned about and give it immediately. H.R. 8 will not do so.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this floor that is simply not true. What is threatening Social Security today? The inaction of the other side of the aisle, the uncooperative spirit, not all Members. I am not speaking to all Members there. But we have reached out to the Democrats time and time again with the Archer-Shaw proposal.

We have been met with this wall of silence. We have reached out to the President who made this his big promise in facing the Nation, standing right behind where I am standing today. We have been met with a wall of silence. That is what is threatening Social Security today, not elimination of the death tax.

What I think has been missing from this debate and is certainly missing from the substitute is the answer to the question that each Member should ask themselves as they come down here to vote today.

Is the death tax a just tax? Should the event of death be taxed by the United States Congress and collected by the Internal Revenue Service? Should the family have to meet with the Internal Revenue Service the same day they meet with the undertaker? Is that a just tax? Is it a just tax? Is it a just tax that will destroy jobs and destroy businesses and destroy family farms? Is that a just tax? Is it a just tax to tax again at the highest rate that we have in our whole tax system, funds and wealth that has already been taxed by our income tax and God knows how many other taxes? Is that a just tax?

I think the resounding answer is no. That is not a just tax. To say we are going to lessen the effect of it by the substitute that does not make it an even more or any more just tax. The fact that maybe the wealthy are getting, or top 2 percent are the only estates that are being taxed in this country, is that a reason to keep an unjust

tax? That is not what this country is all about. That is not what this Congress is all about.

Let us reject the substitute. Let us get rid of this unjust tax, and let us vote to repeal the death tax forever more.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, of all the taxes that could be repealed, this is perhaps one of the least justified. The rhetoric would state that the Federal Government is decimating the lives of millions of families yearly by snatching away their hard-earned savings just when they are most vulnerable, driving small business and farm families into oblivion while squeezing every penny possibly out of them.

The facts have been stated before, but let me state them again. Only 2 percent of the families are even subject to estate tax under current law. Of this 2 percent, only 3 percent are families with small businesses or farms. In other words, for every 10,000 estates, only six of them are farms or small businesses subject to the estate tax. To put it visually, if this piece of paper represents all estates, then this tiny part of it represents the issue in front of us today and what we are about to do.

Of course half of the people in my district think they are going to pay. That misconception is what makes this work politically. Acknowledging reality, however, does not mean that there are no steps we can take to ease the problem for those who are subject to the estate tax or ease the minds of those who think they are. Those steps are represented today by the Democratic substitute.

Our substitute reduces the maximum tax rate by 20 percent to 44 percent. It increases the current $1.3 million exclusion to small businesses and farms to $4 million for a married couple, and it immediately increases the general exception to $1.1 million.

I had some small businessmen come by the other day. I explained to them what we were about to do. They said that is more than we need, based on the approach by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I came to Congress in 1988, but even I remember a time when a Member could get something into a House bill, see it dropped in conference and feel bad about it. Now Members seem to crow about getting a bill to pass the House that everyone knows is designed to die.

□ 1130

In Washington, representatives do their clients and we do our constituents a disservice by participating in such a farce. We face a choice: Support a compromise that provides significant relief for all estates, but especially small businesses and family farms; or kill the bill once again around here and get nothing. That is the vote on the floor today.

I suspect the majority intend to vote to kill the bill and get nothing. But, my God, let us not ask for credit for having done that.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), another respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and, Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post earlier this week denounced our actions today and the title of the editorial was Government by Bumper Sticker. And, of course, the editorial set out many of the same arguments we have heard from those on the other side.

I guess if I were to think of a bumper sticker, it would be one I saw over the break of the Memorial Day recess. The bumper sticker on the back of this RV traveling the highways of Missouri said, I am spending my kids inheritance. Now, I will confess, I took a quick double take to make sure the occupants of that RV were not my own parents on a cross-country spending spree. But then I began to think about the gist of that sticker, and how it is that in some instances it is cheaper to dispose of family assets before death than passing it on to our descendants and making them sell off those family assets after death.

I suppose our friends on the other side will say we should take some solace in the fact that at least predeath that they are enjoying the fruits of their labor rather than collecting those fruits, bringing them here to Washington and then letting 535 Members of the House and Senate decide how to spend the fruits of those labors. But I say, no. And with all due respect, and with high regard for my friend from New York and his substitute, I guess if I were to pick a bumper sticker for the substitute it would be Mend It, Don't End It.

I would ask the gentleman and everybody that would say we should not have a complete repeal to justify for me the continuation of the inheritance tax. And I see my friend from Vermont would like to justify for us why he believes we should not do that, and I will let him do so on his time, but knowing his political ideology, I imagine it would be that we should redistribute wealth in this country. And I appreciate that, yet we already have a redistribution of wealth in this country through the progressive tax rates and the fact that we deny tax deductions and credits for those that are successful in this country.

What has not been discussed here is the economic cost of compliance and avoidance of the tax. The fact is that the Joint Economic Committee says that in 1998, $23 billion were spent to avoid the tax. The same amount that we generated in revenue. My colleagues, it is time to be bold. And with all due respect to the substitute and the intent behind it, if I were again to pick out a bumper sticker that I support it would be ''It's Time to Give the Death Penalty to the Death Tax.'' Reject the substitute and vote in favor of H.R. 8.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) in order to respond to the previous speaker.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said, well, why should we not repeal the estate tax. Let me tell him why. There are millions of Americans in this country, senior citizens, who suffer and die because they cannot afford prescription drugs. And this country does not have a strong program to say to the sick that they can get the prescription drugs they need without taking money out of their food budget.

What the gentleman is doing today is giving the wealthiest 2 percent of the population, billionaires, a huge tax break. And then my colleagues will come before the American people and say, gee, we do not have the money to protect the sick and the old.

In my district there are middle-class families who are going deeply into debt so that they can send their kids to college, and some of these kids graduate college $50,000 in debt. And what my colleagues are saying today is, hey, Bill Gates and his friends, who contribute huge amounts of money to the political process, to the Republican Party, they need a tax break. I say that is immoral.

There are families in this country who work 40 hours a week and they sleep in their cars because we have not put money into affordable housing. Yet my colleagues say, hey, I have millionaire friends who have gone to a $25,000 a plate fund raiser, we have to give them a tax break. And my colleagues say, we do not have money for affordable housing, we do not have money for education. There are 44 million people in this country who have no health insurance, but my colleagues say we cannot afford that because they are too busy giving tax breaks to the richest people in this country.

I have heard my Republican friends use the word immoral and unjust to describe the estate tax. I will tell them what is immoral and unjust. It is immoral and unjust that we give tax breaks to those people who do not need it while we ignore the suffering of millions and millions of people who need help today. That is why.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a poem that I think says it all in our debate today.

Tax his cow, tax his goat, tax his pants, tax his coat;
Tax his crops and tax his work, tax his tie and tax his shirt;
Tax his shoe, tax his smoke, teach him taxes are no joke;
Tax his tractor, tax his mule, teach him taxes are the rule;
Tax his oil, tax his gas, tax his notes, and tax his cash;
If he hollers, tax him more, tax him till he's good and sore;
Tax his coffin, tax his grave, put these words upon his tomb: ''Taxes drove me to my doom.''
After he's gone, he can't relax, they'll still go after Death tax.

I would like to urge all my colleagues to vote against the Rangel substitute.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard from small business owners and family farmers who want to pass on to their descendents the fruits of their labor, and I empathize with them. And I have worked, as many of us have, to have estate tax relief for them. Particularly, and most noted, was the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. The law specifically helps owners of small businesses and family farmers.

But like many of my colleagues, I want to provide more help to those involved in family farms or small businesses. So this year, once again, I would like to support a fiscally responsible alternative that focuses estate tax relief where it is needed. The alternative would cut estate tax 20 percent across the board, reducing the maximum rate to 44 percent. The proposal would provide a transferable $2 million exclusion for farms and small businesses. That means a married couple with a farm or a small business would receive a $4 million estate tax exclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, especially those in agriculture, to see what the alternative means for them. Based on a 1998 USDA survey, only 1.5 percent of farms have a net worth of more than $3 million. In other words, more than 98 percent of the farmers benefit from the alternative that I am going to support.

The alternative has three other advantages over H.R. 8. First, it takes effect, which we have heard, in 2001 rather than in 10 years. If a person happens to die before 2010, that person's heirs will not enjoy the full benefit of H.R. 8. Second, it costs far less than H.R. 8; around $2 billion a year. Finally, we have heard, unlike H.R. 8, the alternative could be signed into law.

Let us look at the cost factor. By the time it is fully implemented in 2010, H.R. 8 will cost $50 billion a year. If the House were really interested in helping the living, it might have considered using the money in other ways. A bipartisan bill I am going to talk about with people on Ways and Means is H.R. 957. I talked to my farmers. They need relief today, not when they are dead. They said, give me the farm and ranch risk management, which I have supported and introduced with my fellow Republicans, which would give all growers an ability to defer taxes in good years and use the money in lean years. This bill costs $100 million a year, not billions.

There are all sorts of other bills, including one to provide a capital gains tax exclusion for farms similar to the ones given on homes. Well, we cannot find the funds for these and other proposals to help businesses, but we can find $104 billion in H.R. 8. But if H.R. 8 is vetoed, then thousands of taxpayers who operate family businesses gain nothing.

I wonder which is better for family businesses, a bill that will not become law or a bill that helps them?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a proposal to eliminate the estate tax in the future. The bill and the Democratic alternative will allow the continuation of something and the beginning of something. These are proposals to maintain small family farms and small family businesses. These are proposals that preserve the important past by protecting the precious future.

I intend to vote for both proposals. The Democratic alternative provides greater relief, more immediately. Providing up to $4 million would indeed help many small farmers and small businesses. H.R. 8, on the other hand, would repeal the tax all together. That is an attractive proposal. It is also, we must recognize, is a costly proposal.

As we seek to save the small family farm or business, we must also make sure we do not sacrifice Social Security, Medicare, or other progress made in reducing and eliminating the debt. I am hopeful that as we proceed with this legislation to provide estate tax relief, we will continue our fiscal responsibility.

Reducing or eliminating the estate tax is an essential thing to do. It is the prudent thing to do. It is the right thing to do. By doing what is prudent and right, we can ensure that the lifeblood of many American families, the small farm and the small business, will continue to survive.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

My friends, the American estate tax system is 85 years old. Who supported the creation of the American estate tax system? Well, one of the first supporters was Republican President Theodore Roosevelt. Why would he do such a thing? Well, he did not want to have two America's, a have and a have not. What do we have today in America? We have a nation where the top 1 percent of our people, the top 1 percent, own 40 percent of the Nation's assets, twice the amount held by them in the past 20 years.

Today, my friends, the House has a choice: The Democrat plan to reform the estate tax system, a reform plan that would leave 99 percent of Americans paying no estate tax and still cutting the estate tax for the top 1 percent; or the Republican plan, on the other hand, which adds another $40 billion in cost a year in order to eliminate the tax for the top 1 percent.

My friends, I believe that most Americans feel that that $40 billion extra would be better spent going to save Social Security and Medicare, or paying down our $5.6 trillion national debt, which is now being assumed by our children, or providing prescription drugs for our seniors, strengthening our military, fixing our public schools and providing health care for 45 million uninsured Americans.

The time may come when our country can afford to entirely eliminate the estate tax for the top 1 percent, but not today. Let us eliminate taxes for 99 percent of Americans, cut taxes for the top 1 percent, and pass the Democrat reform plan.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY), another respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Several Members in support of the Rangel substitute, Mr. Speaker, have begged us to adopt the Rangel substitute because their farmers need help now. Well, I find it curious that the Farm Bureau has endorsed not the Rangel substitute but the underlying bill, which I hope will pass this House today. That is real relief to farmers, not the Rangel substitute.

Let me talk about why that is. Three years ago, in 1997, I was the author of a bill to do what the Rangel substitute attempts to do today; that is to give a higher exemption, so to speak, to family farms, family businesses from the estate tax. I pursued that course for two reasons. Number one, in 1997, we were not expecting the huge surpluses at the Federal level that we are today. We had very much more limited revenue over expenditures to work with for any tax cuts. So I chose a route to try to do the most good with the estate tax that I could with the limited dollars that we had to spend. And the

route I chose was to try to direct the relief at family farms and family-held businesses.

We got a lot of support for that route. We finally got some of my bill into the tax bill that was signed by the President in 1997, and that became law. And since then, those family farms and family businesses have been eligible for a higher exemption from the estate tax than everybody else. Unfortunately, I was wrong in 1997. That relief that we tried to give family businesses and family farms has not taken place. Why? The Committee on Ways and Means heard testimony last year from tax experts and, indeed, from the National Federation of Independent Businesses, who had backed my proposal in 1997, and they told us that that attempt to exempt family farms and businesses from part of the estate tax has not worked because it is too complex.

There is no way to ensure that a family looking forward can comply with all of the requirements that are necessary to qualify for that exemption. As a consequence, we just have not been able to bring those family farms and businesses under this exemption. It was well-intentioned, I was well-intentioned in 1997, I think it is well-intentioned today, but it will not work.

So I will ask my colleagues in this House to reject the attempt of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to simply expand on the failed attempt that I made in 1997 to help family farms and businesses and, instead, to go with the Archer bill today that repeals the estate tax once and for all. We phase it in over 10 years. It is a responsible plan. We have the revenue to do it, and there is no reason to continue this extremely unfair, I would submit the most unfair, part of our Tax Code.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Here we go again, another week, another irresponsible Republican tax cut. Now, I believe that we do need to provide immediate estate tax relief for those who own family businesses, but this Republican repeal of the estate tax costs so much, $50 billion a year when fully phased in, that it does threaten Social Security and Medicare, and makes much less likely the chance that we will provide prescription drug coverage for our seniors.

Now, I have talked to a lot of small business owners in my district of Maine, and the stories they tell are compelling, and Congress should do more to lift the tax burden on these essential family businesses, family businesses that make up a large part of the life of our smaller communities. The Democratic alternative would provide immediate tax relief to closely-held businesses and family farms by reducing all estate tax rates 20 percent across the board and increasing the small business exclusion to $4 million per family. This Democratic alternative is a step in the right direction and provides more immediate relief than the Republican plan.

Now, let us be clear. The President will veto H.R. 8. So the choice for us today is clear: An irresponsible tax plan, with costs that explode in the future, threatening Medicare and Social Security for the baby-boom generation; or a bipartisan plan that will provide immediate tax relief to those who truly need it.

Vote ''yes'' on the Democratic substitute and reject H.R. 8.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 14½ minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 13 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

□ 1145

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it has been instructive to listen to the debate, because we are coming together, Democrats and Republicans, to appreciate that the death tax is unfair. It is unfair, because it is a double tax on the aftertax lifesavings of an individual.

The only cavil that seems to be, not all but some Members on the minority side have is, first, that the death tax is expensive, by which they mean it raises revenue that we might lose if we repeal it, and, second, that it is a way to keep us from having two Americas of haves and have nots.

But the truth is the death tax is expensive in a way that perhaps these people do not quite apprehend. It is expensive to collect. Every time we try to collect the death tax, we get thrown into a lawsuit that lasts for years. It is one of the most expensive taxes to collect that we have on the books.

It reduces other taxes, such as income taxes that we collect, because as a tax avoidance scheme, people give away money during life and, thus, reduce, because they get a deduction, they reduce the taxes that otherwise they might owe.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Lawrence Summers, in fact told us this when he was a Harvard economist just a few years ago that this tax might very well lose money for the Federal Government. So by repealing it, we should not worry that it is too expensive. The only expense that we are relieving is that on the American people. Second, this tax which was meant 85 years ago by Teddy Roosevelt to avoid undue concentration of wealth has resulted in just the opposite. We break up, not concentrations of wealth, but farmers and small businesses which are acquired by multinational corporations and real estate developers. That is why environmental groups are supporting complete repeal.

The substitute would keep all the complexities of the more than 80 pages of the Internal Revenue Code that are devoted to the death tax. When tax simplification is the cry of the American people, this is the best opportunity that we will have to achieve that result.

The substitute would raise taxes on families by repealing the current tax credit for State taxes. Let us not raise taxes. Let us cut them. Let us eliminate complexity. Let us do the right thing. Vote down the substitute and vote aye on H.R. 8.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I just rise to ask a few questions. I have heard an awful lot of comment today about how immoral, unethical, and somehow evil the estate tax is. Well, obviously, we can have philosophical agreements, but I would ask if that is the case, as of right now today, there are 16 States that have their own estate tax of significant nature, 7 of those have a complete Republican-controlled legislature and governor, none of them have repealed it.

Are they completely immoral and unethical, or are they just wrong? If they are just wrong, maybe we better get on the phone and call them and tell them that. And when we do, maybe we need to suggest to them how they are going to raise the $6 billion that they raised in the last year to pay for policeman, fireman, teachers and et cetera.

And on top of that, I just want to repeat what I said earlier, it is not a 50 percent tax, it is a 20 percent tax at this point. The democratic substitute will lower it to a 16 percent tax. The average person after tax, after tax, the average person who is subject to this tax will still have $2.7 million left. My gosh, how difficult it must be to get by on that amount of money.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), for yielding me the time, and I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, a bill to repeal the death tax. Small businesses and family farms are the lifeblood of our economy. Yet we have a tax system which unfairly taxes these small business employers and farmers twice. Less than half of all family-owned businesses survive the

death tax and only about 5 percent survive to the third generation.

After being taxed two, three or four times, Uncle Sam taxes us again at 55 percent when we die. At a time when families need to be thinking about what they can do to bounce back from such a tragedy, they have to worry about taxes. Fiftyfive percent is high enough, but it is 100 percent penalty on employees of small businesses and family farms who lose their jobs when their company or farm is liquidated to pay the death tax.

Since its beginning, America has been about building a better life for people and their children. A farmer's commitment to not sell his farm, to invest his profits in his farm, and to continue working instead of retiring, that is what America is all about. And there is nothing more un-American than telling that farmer and family, you are going to have to give the fruits of your labor and your children's future to the government.

Mr. Speaker, death by itself should not trigger a tax. The 50,000 farmers in Michigan deserve to have this tax repealed. Let us give them the opportunity to focus their attention on building their farms and providing for their children, rather than figuring out to avoid losing their farm to the government.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I respect thousands of family farmers in southern Indiana. I have family members who operate family farms. I understand how the estate tax can cause a lot of hardship for asset-rich and cash-poor family farms. It sometimes can prevent farmers from passing their farms on to their children which is a real tragedy.

I support the substitute to this bill, because it sends immediate estate tax relief for the family farmers and small businesses who really need it. The majority proposal requires farmers and small businesses to wait 10 years for estate tax relief. Family farmers and small business operators need estate tax relief now, not 10 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I also support the substitute to H.R. 8, because unlike the Majority proposal, it offers estate tax relief in a fiscally responsible way. When it is fully implemented, H.R. 8 will costs $50 billion a year which threatens our hard-won balanced budget.

I believe it is more important to continue paying down the national debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare than giving a tax break to people whose estates are worth tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the substitute.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a respected and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding me the time, and I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the ranking member of our committee.

Here is the fundamental reason why I rise in opposition:

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, this would leave in place all the intricacies, the infrastructure, if you will, in law of the death tax. There are those, as has been aptly illustrated in this body, there are those intent on raising taxes. There are those who believe in a radical redistribution of wealth, and those who have stood to defend the death tax essentially are accepting the notion of double taxation. This keeps in place all of the complexities, and it would actually raise taxes on families by repealing the current tax credit for State taxes. So that is something very, very important to remember.

The other thing I would point out today to the body, Mr. Speaker, is that having listened with interest to my good friend who joined us from Indiana and who offered his point of view on this, if the substitute is such a good idea, why does the American Farm Bureau embrace the complete repeal of the death tax? Why does the National Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, why does the National Black Chamber of Commerce join with a bipartisan majority to embrace total repeal of the death tax? It is because of efforts, well-intentioned though they may be, by some on the left to leave in place the infrastructure and bit by bit, brick by brick, element by element, reintroduce and expand the death tax.

I would remind our body collected here today, Mr. Speaker, that during a previous Congress, indeed, the 103d Congress, there was a move afoot to expand death taxes. We do not want that. Let us repeal the tax and vote against the substitute.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 8 and in strong support for the Democratic substitute.

Once again, the Republicans have shown us their recklessness by spending the budget surplus on an irresponsible tax cut for their special interest allies with no investment in Social Security and Medicare. Furthermore, just yesterday we were here discussing the massive cuts to our Education, Health and Labor Departments. How can we today stand here in good conscience and debate spending $105 billion on tax cuts when yesterday we could not even guarantee that all of our children will have a quality education in this, the richest country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support providing relief to smaller estates, family-owned small businesses and farms; but I believe that we can do this in a more fiscally responsible way with targeted relief. The Republican bill does not represent targeted relief; it represents preferential treatment. It seeks to benefit only 2 percent of Americans, and yet, with H.R. 8, it is evident that the Republicans feel that only 2 percent of Americans should be represented.

Well, I am here representing the other 98 percent, and I say no to H.R. 8.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I commend him and his very fine leadership on this, what I have called, traditionally, the most onerous tax in the Code. It is a disincentive against savings, a disincentive against investing.

I have heard countless presentations from this floor yesterday and today about horror stories where people who are not wealthy by any means have been devastated as a result of the imposition of the estate tax. Call it the estate tax, call it the inheritance tax, but call it what it is: the death tax. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and our Democrat friends that have supported us in this bill. This is a bill that is long, long overdue and should be enacted; and I urge its support.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic substitute provides targeted tax relief for middle-class families, small business owners, and farmers without putting at risk or fiscal discipline, our investments in education, and targeted tax relief that we could be providing to America's middle-class families.

The Republican tax break is another example of their misguided priorities. Before they have done anything to strengthen Social Security and Medicare or provide a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, they provide a tax break to the wealthiest 2 percent of all Americans who control 40 percent of the wealth in this Nation. It comes out to $105 billion over the next 10 years, over $50 billion in tax cuts to the richest people in the United States. That is their idea of tax fairness: millions for the rich, not a penny for the middle class.

We have heard a lot about family farms and small businesses. Well, the Democratic tax cut ensures that the

family farm will be passed on. It guarantees small businesses can continue as family-owned businesses. It provides immediate tax relief to these families, and it does this without squandering our surplus, undermining Social Security and Medicare, or risking our investments in education, health for our seniors. Vote for the Democratic substitute.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, do not be fooled by the spinmasters on the right. They are solving a problem that does not even exist, while the poorest in America who do not enjoy our great prosperity continue to be ignored by the leadership of this House.

We need real priorities: the Older Americans Act, which provides meals and other services to our seniors. Priorities: the Ryan White Care Act, which provides health care and medication for children suffering from AIDS remains to be reauthorized. Priorities: the Patient's Bill of Rights, which is supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans, still sits in conference.

The multimillionaires can take care of themselves. Let us pass legislation that really helps the working families, not helping the rich get richer under the House leadership.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing, the people that talk about how can we risk this much money on a risky tax scheme. Let me read a letter from somebody who has been impacted by this death tax, and then my colleagues can come back and say it is a risky tax scheme.

''Today marks the first day of the ninth month since my dad passed away. He was a physician specializing in chemotherapy treatments for cancer patients. He grew up in a very poor family in Brooklyn, New York and he still managed to put himself through school and become a doctor, without any help from government, I might add. His plan was to retire this summer, after doing so much good for his patients and our community, and spend the time sailing on his 15-year-old, 27-foot sailboat that he bought 2 weeks before he died. He paid untold sums of money in taxes throughout his lifetime while working to the age of 65, a requirement necessary to save enough money to retire at a financial level that a physician deserves. While paying 50 percent of his income in taxes to the government, money that might otherwise have been used to fund an early retirement, he died.

''I am his son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and did not get to enjoy. Today, I am going to have the pleasure of writing 2 checks totaling nearly $1 million divided between the State and Federal Government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposes on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. As a result of my dad's strong desire to save for his retirement, the majority of his estate is in Individual Retirement Accounts, and you know the tax consequences that creates when distributed to heirs, right? After all is said and done, the government will have taken over 50 percent of my dad's property and money.

''I adamantly believe that the government's only societal role is to protect the rights, lives and property of law abiding citizens. Period. All socialized legislation beyond that is an unnecessary intrusion into my life and a waste of my money.

''The government already confiscates too much money through taxation by means of income tax, property tax, capital gains tax, gasoline tax, Social Security tax, Medicare tax, telephone tax, hotel tax, airline ticket tax, energy tax, entertainment tax and numerous other hidden excise taxes that I continuously pay.

UPLAND, CA, *March 6, 2000.*

Representative GARY MILLER,

Diamond Bar, CA.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, Today marks the 1st day of the 9th month since my dad passed away. He was a physician specializing in chemotherapy treatments for cancer patients. He grew up in a very poor family in Brooklyn New York, and he still managed to put himself through school and become a doctor, without the help of the government I might add. His plan was to retire this summer, after doing so much good for his patients and our community, and spend time sailing the 15 year old 27 foot sailboat he bought two weeks before he died. He paid untold sums of money in taxes throughout his lifetime while working to the age of 65, a requirement necessary to save enough money to retire at a financial level that a physician deserves. While paying 50% of his income in taxes to the government, money that might otherwise have been used to fund an early retirement, he died.

I am his son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and didn't get to enjoy. Today I am going to have the pleasure of writing two checks totaling nearly one million dollars between the state and federal government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposed on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. I was sick to my stomach. As a result of my dad's strong desire to save for his retirement the majority of his estate is in Individual Retirement Accounts and you know the tax consequences that creates when distributed to heirs, right? After all is said and done, the government will have taken over 50% of my dad's property and money.

I adamantly believe that the government's only societal role is to protect the rights, lives, and property of the law abiding. Period. All socialized legislation beyond that is an unnecessary intrusion into my life and a waste of my money.

The government already confiscates too much money through taxation by means of Income tax, Property tax, Capital Gains tax, Gasoline tax, Social Security tax, Medicare tax, Telephone tax, Hotel tax, Airline Ticket tax, Energy tax, Entertainment tax and numerous other hidden Excise taxes that I continuously pay.

Having stated that, and inasmuch as you are supposed to be representing me, can you write me back with even one good reason that validates the usurpation of one million dollars that was left by my dad, to my family?

Sincerely,

TODD M. KOLBERT.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, how irresponsible have we become? How greedy have we become? We all pay taxes; we all have a responsibility to pay down the debt. This is irresponsible, and it is a callous disregard for all Americans, when we only favor the top 2 percent of the richest.

Let us cut the taxes on all Americans, not just on the richest 2 percent of this country. The top 1 percent own 40 percent of the assets. This piece of legislation would even cause the divide to even be more between the haves and the have-nots. This is un-American, it is unfair, it is unethical and irresponsible. It is heartless, to think that we are going to be giving $50 million to the top 2 percent richest when, at the same time, we have said no to our veterans. This same Congress has said no to our veterans. When we have promised them access to health care, we have said no. We have been unwilling to give them that $5 billion that they need; yet we say yes to the 2 percent of the richest of this country when we say that we are going to give them $50 billion.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act.

This is one of the worst taxes we have in America. America is renowned as the place where through hard work and sacrifice an individual can make a better life for himself and his family. We have an entrepreneurial spirit that is unmatched in any other country, and it is because of the ability to make it here in this country.

What is the trouble with the Federal estate tax? It does away with that. It kills small businesses; it kills the family farm. I say to my colleagues, my constituents who are not wealthy want that ability, and most Americans do. I say we should pass this bill, we should vote against the substitute, and we should eliminate the death tax in America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. The death tax is one of the most onerous taxes levied upon our citizens and is in complete contrast to the principles upon which this country was based. America is renowned as a place where through hard work and sacrifice, an individual can make a better life for himself and his family. We have an entrepreneurial spirit that is unmatched in any other country and we need to ensure that spirit remains.

That is what is so troubling about the Federal estate tax. It does not encourage hard work and entrepreneurship, but rather discourages it. The only message that the estate tax sends is that if you are hard working and industrious we will not reward you, we will punish you. This clearly is not the message we need to be sending.

Currently, small businesses and farms are being hit the hardest by this unfair burden. Heirs sometimes are forced to liquidate businesses just to pay estate taxes. Allow me to provide you with a personal example of the negative effects of this tax.

In my district there is a business called Niemann Foods which runs a small chain of grocery stores. This company was founded in 1917, by Ferd and Steve Neumann. By 1969 Niemann Foods was a thriving business consisting of two components: grocery stores and a wholesale distribution operation. But then something tragic happened. Ferd passed away unexpectedly. Suddenly the Niemann family was faced with an estate tax bill of several hundred thousand dollars. What could they do? Most of their assets were not liquid, they were tied up in the day-to-day operations and not readily available. The only option available to the family was to liquidate part of the business to pay their tax burden. As a result the wholesale portion of Niemann Foods was sold off and the proceeds given to the IRS, instead of being used to expand the business. The Neimann family now spends countless hours and dollars on estate planning trying desperately to avoid a repeat of this distasteful situation. This is time and money that could and should be put into expanding the business and creating more jobs, rather than being spent trying to guard against losing the business because of a bad tax. The sad and unfortunate reality is that everyone in this Chamber probably has a similar story that they can tell. We should encourage productivity and growth, not stifle it with unfair burdens. This tax is contrary to American ideals and should be repealed.

I have one problem with this bill, it takes too long to accomplish what should be done immediately. If this tax is wrong, it is wrong and we shouldn't take 10 years to rectify the situation. We speak of fairness, but is it fair for people dying today to have a larger tax burden than those who die a year or even ten years from now? I can see it now hospitals will be filled with individuals on life support for years waiting for this bad tax to be lifted. Let's pull the plug on this tax now.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I oppose H.R. 8 and strongly support the Rangel substitute. Proponents have said this about helping farmers pass the farm from one generation to the other. If that is the issue, then pass the Rangel substitute.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says 99 percent of the farms in this country have a net worth below $3 million. The Rangel substitute takes a farm couple and allows them to pass a farm worth $4 million of net worth. We take care of more than 99 percent of the farms in this country under the Rangel substitute.

Similarly, small businesses, up to $4 million. Another way the substitute is better than the majority bill is that it takes effect and it takes effect next year. No 10-year wait for the relief they are talking about. Next year.

Another thing about the Rangel substitute, the President will sign it. There is a veto threat on their bill. It will never become law. Let us provide the relief and make it real, not just issue press releases about another House debate. Vote the Rangel substitute for meaningful relief for family farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8 and in strong support of the Rangel substitute. Unlike the underlying bill, the Rangel substitute provides immediate estate tax relief for family farmers and small businesses, does not drain resources from other urgent priorities, and, most importantly, it could be enacted into law this year.

First, the Rangel substitute eliminates estate taxes for more than 99 percent of family farms not in 10 years, as under H.R. 8, but immediately. The Rangel substitute allows family farms an estate tax exclusion of $4 million, which exceeds the net worth of more than 99 percent of family farms according to USDA. For all but a handful of the largest farms in the country, the Rangel substitute provides greater estate tax relief than the underlying bill.

Because it is targeted, the Rangel substitute can offer more tax relief for farms and small business without draining resources from other urgent priorities, including tax cuts for working families. By contrast, H.R. 8 would ultimately result in a revenue loss of $50 billion annually, or $500 billion over the second 10-year period. For the cost of repealing the estate tax altogether, Congress could enact tax cuts to reduce the cost of child care, open the doors to higher education, increase the affordability of long-term care, and still have $35 billion left over either to reduce the debt, provide a prescription drug benefit, strengthen our national defense or address a similarly urgent priority.

Finally, the Rangel substitute is the only estate tax relief measure on the floor today that can actually be enacted this year. The administration supports estate tax relief for small business and family farms but has stated unequivocally that the President would veto H.R. 8. As estate tax bill that will never be signed is of no value to the farmers I represent.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Rangel substitute and to oppose H.R. 8.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak specifically on this substitute. First, at the margin, it is better than the current law. That is a great breakthrough to see the minority that was proposing increases in the death tax before 1995, to have at least come to where they marginally want to reduce the impact of the death tax.

But in many, many ways, it does not tell us up front what is really a part of the proposal.

□ 1215

It is very much like Peanuts where Lucy tells Charlie Brown, ''Come kick the football,'' and right before he gets there, she pulls the football away.

And so what they do here is they say we are going to reduce rates; and at the same time if you look at page 2, they raise rates, because they take away the credit, as the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) said, on the State inheritance taxes. So they raise those rates. At the same time they deny all of the small businesses, farms, the benefit of what they say they are giving them. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) spoke to that. They say only 3 percent of the small businesses and farms are taxed today. Let me also say that only 3 percent of that 3 percent will get any benefit from their proposal. That is sad but true as the gentleman from Louisiana said earlier.

And then they go on, and they increase the market value of minority-held interests in nonpublicly traded entities. The courts have ruled against this over and over again and say the tax should be applied only to what is the true market value at the time of death. They create an arbitrary market value that has nothing to do with the true market value for those minority-held interests in nonpublicly traded entities. So they give a little bit on one hand, and they take back big chunks on the other hand.

They also mask the 18 percent lowest marginal tax rate for the death tax. No one will pay the 18 percent. They will start out at 38 percent. It is in the Code. It says the first dollar is 18 percent, but not so. And so they give a little, and they take back a lot.

Vote against the Rangel substitute.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

I would like to respond briefly to the chairman of the committee because not too long ago a distinguished Member from the other side who serves on the committee commented that the Rangel substitute was no more than what he and Republicans had suggested several years ago and that he thought it was a good idea at the time; but he had no idea that President Clinton with a Democratic Congress would be able to have a budget to allow us to get the surplus that we are enjoying today, but now that he sees the surplus, then he would say, Let's go for the whole thing.

That is the problem that we have today. You people are not interested in passing laws to take care of the small farmer and small businesses. What you are interested in is politically a veto. If indeed you were concerned about helping the small family farmer and the small businesses, what you would do is say, well, listen, since we can agree with the President, let us get this signed into law, and then maybe if God is willing, you will be in the majority and you can take care of it.

You have been in the majority 6 years, and you have not done a darn thing except push for vetoes. Veto, veto, veto. Every time we reach agreement with you, you kick it up another notch and make it impossible for the President to be responsible and deal with this. This will cost $104 billion over 10 years, and then we have got to hemorrhage $50 billion each year. We have been able to take care of the problem that you have been crying and bawling about for a long time, and we agree that it is an inequity. Why can we not come together where we agree, get the President to sign something, and then for God sake get together and try to resolve some of the other problems, whether it is the marriage penalty, whether it is the Patients' Bill of Rights, whether it is the minimum wage.

You agree with us, but you always kick it up a notch to be irresponsible so that the President cannot sign it into law. There is still an opportunity. If you vote for the substitute, let the President sign it and take credit for it. The only difference between the bills that you have had and the bill that we have got is that we have decided to be responsible, we decided not to gut the budget, we decided to protect Social Security and Medicare and still take care of those people who inherit the businesses and the farms from their parents and their grandparents who worked hard each and every day to provide and leave this for them.

And so I am suggesting, vote for the substitute and then maybe next year we can go further.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague for his statement.

The other day I was talking, and I noticed that the Republican leaders had gathered around this coffin outside the Capitol building. Like anyone, I wondered, what is going on out there? I later learned that they were promoting their estate tax scheme. It was then that I realized what I had seen was a funeral. It was the death of credibility.

What else can you call a scheme that costs some $50 billion a year but fails to provide added relief for small businesses and family farms until the year 2010? You can call it a lot of things, but one thing you cannot call it is a credible tax relief package. Oh, sure, some people stand to gain from this. If you happen to be one of the richest people in the world, this plan could cut your family's taxes by literally tens of billions of dollars. But for 98 percent of Americans, this bill will not even provide one dollar's worth of relief.

It will do something, though. Oh, it will do something. It will squander $50 billion a year just at a time when we need it the most. That means undermining our ability to guarantee the solvency of Medicare and Social Security. It means harming our chances of paying down the debt. And it will work to prevent us from investing in better schools, in child care, in a clean environment, in fighting crime, in taking care of our veterans.

We Democrats have an alternative, a responsible plan that provides an estate tax break that we can bank on without breaking the bank. Our plan immediately provides a $4 million per-family exclusion for farms and small businesses. In fact, it immediately exempts 99 percent of family farms from estate taxes. It reduces by almost half the number of estates subject to the estate tax.

So what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a choice between credible estate tax relief or tax cuts for the incredibly rich. If you believe in standing up and working for working families, the choice in this debate is clear.

I urge Members to vote no on the Republican scheme and to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the respected Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the minority whip who just spoke, but I think he made a mistake when he walked by that funeral display. The funeral is the death of and putting away the death tax.

When we talk about credibility, we can talk about a lot of things. When I first came here, we had a deficit of a huge number, $450 billion. We had a debt of $5.5 trillion. We started turning that around. Just in the last couple of years, we have said, none of our dollars in Social Security are going to go into the general fund. We are going to set that aside for Social Security. We are going to do a better job of education. We have seen a steady increase in dollars for education. We are going to help our young men and women in defense so that they do not have to be on food stamps to feed their family. We do have a surplus. We are talking about a big surplus in the next couple of years. We have two things that we can do: we can pay down the debt with that surplus, or we can give some of that money back to the people who made it in the first place.

As of September of this year, we will have paid back $350 billion on the public debt. That is a first good step. We have not done it all by ourselves. We have done it with help from our friends on the other side of the aisle. I do not say it is all partisan one side or the other because we have to work on a bipartisan basis. But the other question is, what do we do? The gentleman from the other side of the aisle said, We're going to take $50 billion. We can't afford it. And where does that money come from? The Federal Government reaches in and takes it away from people who have paid taxes all their life, that have built a small business or a family farm. When they die and they want to pass it on to their children and their grandchildren, the Federal Government comes in and takes it away, 52 percent to 55 percent of that entity; it takes it away.

Let me tell you a story. When I was a young man, my father-in-law died. He was a farmer in southern Illinois. I thought maybe I would like to be a farmer. But by the time that we got the death tax taken care of and at that time Illinois had a death tax, too, every tractor, every combine, every extra roll of fence, every head of cattle was sold off so we could pay the State estate tax and the Federal death tax. I might have been a good farmer. But I did not have that choice.

I ran for the legislature in 1980. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and I helped take the death tax off in the State. We helped relieve that a little bit. I have always given him a great deal of credit for doing that. I was giving a speech not so long ago in Wichita, Kansas. It was a small dinner group of probably 50 people. Halfway through my speech, there was an older gentleman who stood up and said, Wait a minute, young man. He got my attention. He called me young man. He was probably 85 years old. He said, I have a small business just west of town. I write 96 pay checks a week. Something is going to happen to me someday. I want to pass that business on to my children and my grandchildren. The Federal Government is going to come in and take 52 percent of that business. When they do, we are going to have to sell every truck, every piece of equipment. I cannot pass that business on as an entire entity from generation to generation. There are 96 families in this town that will not have a job anymore.

We talk about big entities, multinational businesses and big corporations. Do you know what happens when you have to sell the family farm? Do you know what happens when you have to sell that small business? You sell it

to the big guys, because you get the cash out of it and pay the Government. And so when you deprive families from passing that entity, that business, that farm, that ranch from one generation to the other, you say, we are going to give this to the big guys. We are subsidizing the big guys. We are pushing the bigger and bigger entities in this country. We are taking away from the families.

I say this is a vote for the families of this country, of the United States of America. Defeat the substitute, vote for the proposal, and let us get on with it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000 and strongly support the Democratic Alternative.

I think we are in agreement on both sides of the aisle that the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes are unduly burdensome on all taxpayers and that changes must be made. However, H.R. 8 is not in the best interest of our Nation, particularly in terms of relief to small businesses and small farms.

Although, H.R. 8 attempts to alleviate the heavy burden of the estate tax, it lacks a feasible solution to alleviate these tax burdens faced by many small businesses and small farms. Many small business owners and farm owners have told me compelling stories regarding their plight and they want to ensure that in the foreseeable future that they will be able to pass on their farms and small businesses to their loved ones.

The Democratic Alternative will provide immediate tax relief to these same small businesses and farm owners. Specifically, this alternative will raise the special exclusion to $4 million for a couple owning a farm or small business. For instance, a small business owner in my district can pass on their business intact with no estate tax whatsoever if it worth up to $4 million.

In addition, because H.R. 8 is phased in over ten years, a couple passing on their farm or small business in the near future would avoid more tax under the Democratic plan than under this bill with calls for a full repeal. See—More people than ever before are becoming millionaires by working hard and investing wisely. By increasing the general exclusion (now at $675,000) to $1.1 million next year, the Democratic Alternative will allow for any person to pass on their wealth to their loved ones without the burden of an estate tax.

In fact, unlike the Republican's full repeal, nobody has to worry about living long enough for the bill to be fully phased in. The Democratic $1.1 million exclusion is effective immediately in 2001. Also, the Democratic alternative will lower estate tax rates by 20% across the board (i.e. the 55% rate would be 44%, the 37% would be 29.6%). As a result, I fully support this fiscally responsible estate tax relief unlike Republican leaders who insist on a full estate tax repeal before any plan is in place to save Social Security and Medicare, or provide a prescription drug benefit for our Nation's seniors, or pay down our national debt.

"H.R. 8 will relinquish nearly $50 billion a year in revenue with no guarantee that this revenue loss will not harm current plans to save Social Security and Medicare in future years. While the official estimates show H.R. 8 costing $28.2 billion over 5 years and $104.5 billion over 10 years, the true cost is cleverly hidden by phasing in the repeal so that the real drain on revenue does not show up until after the 10-year budget window."

By enacting this full repeal, the very richest in our society will be able to pass their immense fortunes to their heirs without a penny of tax. Hence, our Nation's children will share in our burden of saving Social Security and Medicare and paying off our massive national debt. Hence, the real winners of this repeal legislation are not small farms and small businesses but are very wealthy families with immense assets.

Finally, President Clinton has already pledged to veto H.R. 8, because it provides such an unfair relief to the very richest in our society, before saving Social Security and Medicare and paying down the debt. The Democratic Alternative would provide fiscally responsible estate tax relief that the President would sign. However, Republican leaders appear not to care that their repeal bill will not become law! See—the real choice is not between the Democratic Alternative and H.R. 8, but between a negotiated bipartisan compromise or no estate tax relief at all for all of America. I choose relief for all America!

In closing, I again urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 8, and instead adopt the democratic alternative.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8, The Estate Tax Elimination Act. This bill would do nothing to help the average family businesses. Only 2% of estates are now subject to the estate tax. Hard-working Americans should be able to pass their businesses on from generation to generation. However, a full repeal of the estate tax is not necessary to preserve family businesses.

The Democratic alternative offers immediate, fiscally responsible relief targeted to small business owners and family farmers. It would exempt up to $4 million per family in assets from the tax and cut estate tax rates by 20 percent. The Democratic alternative would cost only 20 billion over the next 10 years.

H.R. 8 would cost $105 billion over the next ten years. From 2011 to 2020, the proposal would cost $620 billion. The full costs of this bill would come just when the retiring baby boomers will begin to require more services. This is money we could use to strengthen Social Security and offer a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Full repeal also reduces the progressivity of the tax code. The wealthiest Americans would pay tens of billions of dollars less in tax. This bill would cause the gap between low-income people and the wealthy to grow even faster. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. RANGEL's fiscally responsible proposal for estate tax relief targeted to immediately help small businesses.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic alternative which does three important things to ease the estate tax burden on individuals and family businesses.

First of all, the substitute would nearly double, effective immediately, the estate and gift taxes exemption for individuals to $1,100,000, from the current level of $675,000. This means a husband and wife can exempt $2.2 million of their assets from estate taxes.

Secondly, the Democratic proposal significantly raises the estate tax exclusion for small businesses. Under current law, there is a $1.3 million exclusion from the estate tax for interests in farms and closely held businesses. The Democratic substitute would effectively create a $4 million exclusion per family for farms and closely held businesses. It would accomplish this by increasing the limit on the small business exclusion from $1.3 to $2 million and by providing that the portion of the exclusion not used in the estate of the first spouse to die will be allowed to the estate of the other spouse.

Finally, the substitute would provide a 20 percent across-the-board reduction to the estate and gift tax rates.

I support the Democratic substitute because it provides needed estate tax relief to small business and individuals without breaking the bank. My Republican colleagues have offered a plan to totally eliminate the estate tax, that when fully phased in, will cost $50 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to sacrifice our chance to pay down the national debt, ensure the long-term solvency of Social Security, and modernize the Medicare program by passing the Republican bill which will benefit only 2% of the population—those with the wealthiest estates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic proposal, a common-sense and affordable way to give Americans estate tax relief and still provide funds to meet our responsibility to reduce the national debt so this burden will not continue to be placed on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 519, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 222, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—196

Ackerman	Baldwin	Berry
Allen	Barcia	Bishop
Andrews	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Baca	Becerra	Bonior
Baird	Bentsen	Borski
Baldacci	Berman	Boswell

Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—222

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Blumenauer
Clay
Conyers
Cunningham
Danner
Gillmor
Gilman
Istook
Kind (WI)
Klink
Lazio
Markey
McDermott
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Vento
Watt (NC)

□ 1248

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. WOLF, DICKEY and DUNCAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOGGETT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill (page 35, after line 5), add the following new title:

TITLE VI—DENIAL OF GIFT TAX EXCLUSION IF POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS FAIL TO MEET REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 601. DENIAL OF GIFT TAX EXCLUSION IF POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS FAIL TO MEET REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DENIAL OF GIFT TAX EXCLUSION.—Paragraph (5) of section 2501(a) (relating to transfers to political organizations) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) TRANSFERS TO POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the transfer of money or other property to a political organization (within the meaning of section 527(e)(1)) for the use of such organization only if such organization is in substantial compliance with subsections (d) and (e).''

(b) INCREASED REPORTING BY POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 2501 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) RETURNS BY POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

''(1) STATEMENT OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Every political organization shall file a statement of organization with the Secretary (in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe) which contains the information described in subparagraph (B). Such statement shall be filed not later than 10 days after the date that such organization is established (or, in the case of an organization in existence on the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 10 days after such date of enactment).

''(B) STATEMENT OF ORGANIZATION.—The information described in this subparagraph is—

''(i) the name and address of the political organization,

''(ii) the name, address, relationship, and type of any person which is directly or indirectly related to or affiliated with such political organization,

''(iii) the name, address, and position of the custodian of books and accounts of the political organization,

''(iv) the name and address of the treasurer of the political organization, and

''(v) a listing of all banks, safety deposit boxes, and other depositories used by the political organization.

''(C) CHANGES IN INFORMATION.—If there is a change in circumstances such that the most recent statement filed under this paragraph is no longer accurate, the political organization shall file a corrected statement with the Secretary (in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe) not later than 10 days after the date that the statement first ceased to be accurate.

''(D) RELATED AND AFFILIATED PERSONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii), a person is directly or indirectly related to or affiliated with a political organization if such person, at any time during the 3-year period ending on the date such statement is submitted to the Secretary—

''(i) was in a position to exercise substantial direct or indirect influence over the process of collecting or disbursing the exempt purpose funds of such organization, or

''(ii) was in a position to exercise substantial, overall direct or indirect influence over the activities of such organization.

''(2) STATEMENTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND DISBURSEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Every political organization shall file a statement with the Secretary (at such time and in such form and

manner as the Secretary shall prescribe) which contains the information described in subparagraph (B) with respect to each reporting period.

''(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this subparagraph is—

''(i) the name and address of each person to whom the political organization made any disbursement during the reporting period in an aggregate amount or value in excess of $200 within the calendar year,

''(ii) a certification, under penalty of perjury, whether such disbursement is made in cooperation, consultation, or concert, with, or at the request or suggestion of, any candidate for public office or any authorized committee of such candidate or agent of such committee or candidate,

''(iii) the name, address, and occupation of each person (and the name of his or her employer) who made (in the aggregate for the reporting period) a contribution in excess of $200 to the political organization,

''(iv) the name, address, and business purpose of any entity, as well as whether the entity purports to be exempt from tax under this title and (if so) the provision under which the entity purports to be so exempt, which made (in the aggregate for the reporting period) a contribution in excess of $200 to the political organization, and

''(v) the original source and the intended ultimate recipient of all contributions made by a person, either directly or indirectly, on behalf of any particular person, including contributions which are in any way earmarked or otherwise directed through any intermediary.

''(C) REPORTING PERIODS AND DUE DATES FOR FILING STATEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The reporting periods and deadlines for filing statements required by this subsection shall be the same as the periods and deadlines set forth for reports under paragraph (4) of section 304(a) of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)). The Secretary shall issue such guidance as may be necessary concerning the filing deadlines for such statements.

''(ii) CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS FILE ANNUALLY.—In the case of a political organization described in clause (iii)—

''(I) subparagraph (A) shall not apply,

''(II) the reporting period shall be such organization's taxable year, and

''(III) the due date for the statement required by this subsection shall be the due date (without regard to extensions) for filing the return of tax for such year, whether or not such organization is required to file a return for such taxable year.

''(iii) ORGANIZATION DESCRIBED.—An organization is described in this clause if such organization is a political organization which is organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of securing the nomination, election, or appointment of a clearly identified candidate for State, local, or judicial office.

''(D) ELECTRONIC FILING.—The Secretary shall develop procedures for submission in electronic form of statements required to be filed under this paragraph.

''(3) POLITICAL ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'political organization' has the meaning given to such term by section 527(e) without regard to whether such organization claims a tax exemption under section 527.

''(4) PAPERWORK AND BURDEN REDUCTION.—An organization shall not be required to file any statement under paragraph (1) or (2) for any period if, with respect to such period, such organization submits to the Secretary, under penalty of perjury, a certified statement that the organization has made a filing, which is publicly available, with another Federal agency which includes all of the information requested by paragraph (1) or (2), whichever is applicable, and which specifies the public location where such information may be found.''

(c) INCREASED DISCLOSURE BY POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 2501, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) INSPECTION OF STATEMENTS OF POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a political organization (as defined in subsection (d)(3))—

''(A) a copy of the statements filed under subsection (d) shall be made available by such organization for inspection during regular business hours by any individual at the principal office of such organization and, if such organization regularly maintains 1 or more regional or district offices having 3 or more employees, at each such regional or district office, and

''(B) upon request of an individual made at such principal office or such a regional or district office, a copy of such statements shall be provided to such individual without charge other than a reasonable fee for any reproduction and mailing costs.

The request described in subparagraph (B) must be made in person or in writing. If such request is made in person, such copy shall be provided immediately and, if made in writing, shall be provided within 30 days.

''(2) 3-YEAR LIMITATION ON INSPECTION OF STATEMENTS.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to any statement filed under subsection (d) only during the 3-year period beginning on the last day prescribed for filing such statement (determined with regard to any extension of time for filing).

''(3) LIMITAION ON PROVIDING COPIES.—A rule similar to the rule of section 6104(d)(4) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. DOGGETT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), a leader in this political reform effort.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit. The majority whip said, ''I am for full disclosure and immediate disclosure.'' What we say is not nearly as important as how we vote.

This motion only requires organizations engaging in political activity to name the contributors, how much was contributed, and how the money was spent. Disclosure, simple disclosure.

The American people are fed up with hypocrisy and delays. What we need now is action. Last night, JOHN MCCAIN stood up in the United States Senate and stood up for the American people on behalf of disclosure. I urge all of my colleagues on this body on both sides of the aisle to stand up for disclosure. The American people deserve, expect, and demand it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), another leader in this effort.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is pretty simple today. It is whether we are going to have sunshine in the political process or whether we are not. We all know we do not need another study. We do not have to wait on another study. All we need to know is whether or not the 527 and all other groups shall disclose how much they are spending, how they are spending it, and who is, in fact, contributing the money.

Let us let sunshine shine on the legislative process. It is pretty simple. Vote for the motion to recommit. Let us move this process along.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate said that stealth political committees have to disclose their donors and expenditures. These tax exempt 527s and other like groups could be the Communist Chinese, Colombian drug lords, the Mafia. Who knows?

Both Republicans and Democrats say they want full disclosure. Last year, the majority whip said in support of the Doolittle full disclosure bill, quote: What reform can restore accountability more than an open book? Letters from the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) shout, ''Full Disclosure,'' ''Scrap the Failed Rules'' and ''Full Disclosure.'' Another Dear Colleague screams, ''Hypocrisy.''

What will the headlines scream tomorrow? Mr. Speaker, 115 Republicans voted last year for full disclosure only. If my colleagues are really for full disclosure, vote yes. A ''no'' vote is going to be mighty hard to explain in November. We can get this done today. Vote yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the leader of the campaign reform effort here.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United States Senate took a small but important step towards restoring some accountability to our elections system. We have a chance today to match that step with one of our own.

We cannot afford to wait. The election season is already upon us. There are millions and millions of dollars

being raised and the public has no idea where it is coming from. We have to stop this corrupt system of raising money and having no one know where it comes from. The opportunity is now. Now is when we need to change this system.

Let us match step with the other body and send a message across America that whoever contributes to campaigns in America in this cycle, the American people are going to know where that money came from.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, last night, across this Capitol, 14 Republicans stood up to their leadership and took a firm stance against the corruption of our American political system. This motion once again seeks to achieve what now they have really already accomplished.

Mandatory full disclosure by every secret political organization is the one modest reform that we can put in place in time for this year's election. Like yesterday's successful McCain-Feingold amendment, this gift tax motion presents each of us with a moment of truth, a choice for more secrecy or more democracy.

Six Republicans joined 202 sponsors of this measure to choose openness and reform on my previous motion to recommit in May. We need only a few more to make reform a reality.

This motion, effective immediately, will not delay by 5 minutes the estate tax repeal. This motion specifically applies to all organizations engaging in political activity. It does not exclude, contrary to what my colleagues have been told, or offer any special treatment, for labor unions or trial lawyers or any other group allied with Democrats. This motion seeks no organization's constitutionally protected membership list.

Mr. Speaker, this motion parallels language that I offered and had rejected in the Committee on Ways and Means almost 3 months ago. The last-minute offer this morning of a vote by July 4 on a new bill, not yet filed, is just another way of running out the clock on reform, which each day more dirty money is collected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, please, do not be hammered into submission. Do not be hammered into submission to cast an indefensible vote against disclosure. Join us to stop the collection of money so dirty that your leadership is ashamed to identify the donors.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am often asked if we can do anything here this year in a bipartisan way to solve the obvious problems that our country faces. This is an issue on which the Senate has taken a definitive position 57 to 42. Senator MCCAIN said yesterday, what could be more simple. What could be more fair, honest, and straightforward? I cannot say it any better than that.

This is a moment in which Democrats and Republicans can come together to pass an end to the secret organizations with undisclosed money. Vote yes for the motion to recommit. Let us get something done for the American people in this Congress.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I know there is a lot of emotion on this. But I would like to speak on the other side of this issue. On May 25 of this year, just before we left for the Memorial Day break, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) offered a 527 amendment to the telephone tax repeal. I understand what he was getting at. We are all trying to accomplish the same thing. But it was a curious proposal. It would repeal the telephone tax for everyone except for political organizations that do not comply with the new disclosure requirements.

So the end result would be, at the end of the day, if section 527 organizations were willing to pay a 3 percent phone tax, they could avoid disclosure. I do not think that was in the spirit of what we were trying to do.

Today the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is proposing still something else. Though we are trying to repeal the estate and gift tax, we keep it on the books for section 527 organizations.

These proposals bother me. They only attack part of the problem. Also, before we left for Memorial Day, I indicated that I was working with a group of people to try to get together a hearing, and we have been in session only 3 days since that time. We are going to have the hearing. It is going to be set for the 20th of this month.

An article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal noted that, under the proposal offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), that many tax exempt organizations would be shielded from disclosure laws, not full light on all the organizations that are contributing. Why is it fair to the American people, therefore, to require some tax exempt to disclose political activities and not all? Why is it right for one party or another to benefit from bringing some groups into the sunshine while allowing others to operate under the cloak of secrecy.

We are taking a looking at lobbying and campaign intervention by all of these groups, regardless of their agenda, not just the 527 groups. What we would like is disclosure by these groups, but we have to be careful because we do not want to regulate constitutional rights to death so that the rights become meaningless.

Yesterday I announced we were going to be having a hearing in Committee on Ways and Means on the 20th of this month. There are some that say that we do not need a hearing and just do it. But by doing it, we can do it the wrong way.

If the majority were to bring this to the floor without a hearing, I think this would be wrong. My colleague and I serve on the key committee of the House. The committee has a strong tradition of trying to do things the right way. We try not to enact legislation piecemeal, imposing disclosure requirements on some tax exempt organizations but shielding others for not disclosing them.

Senator MCCAIN said yesterday that he was interested in broadening this. It was a first step. He wanted to broaden this. This is, of course, what we are trying to do.

Now, in a political year, there are all sorts of pressures from the press and from parties and things like that. But I would like to think that most of us want to reject this.

I am a very strong advocate of campaign finance reform. I signed a discharge petition on this House floor. I voted for the Shays-Meehan bill. But I do think that there is another way of doing this and doing it right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing here is an important issue. It is recognized as such by the American people. It is an issue that requires a much more dignified response by this Congress than what it is getting on this floor today.

This is not about political vendettas or partisan politics. It is about the key principle of full and fair disclosure for, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) said so eloquently, all institutions that engage in political advocacy. There are many people on this side of the aisle that have taken that position for a long time.

Within the next week, we will have hearings on a measure that will require full and fair disclosure for all institutions that engage in political advocacy. There will be a vote on this floor on a bill prior to the July 4th district work period where we will require full and fair disclosure for all institutions that engage from political advocacy without political exemption and without political vendetta.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise Members that a vote on passage, if ordered, will be reduced to a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 216, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—202

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—216

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Blumenauer
Clay
Conyers
Cunningham
Danner
Gillmor
Gilman
Istook
Kind (WI)
Klink
Lazio
Markey
McDermott
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Vento
Watt (NC)

□ 1323

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 279, noes 136, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—279

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon

Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—136

Ackerman
Allen
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clyburn
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer
Boehner
Clay
Conyers
Cunningham
Danner
Gillmor
Gilman
Istook
Kind (WI)
Klink
Lazio
Markey
McDermott
Packard
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Vento
Watt (NC)
Whitfield

□ 1332

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, I was unable to attend and vote due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I was meeting with the clerk and staff of my subcommittee in preparation for our markup on my appropriations subcommittee and unavoidably missed the last vote apparently. I feel badly having missed such a crucial vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and unable to vote today because I was in Seattle attending my daughter's graduation.

I would have voted in favor of the Rangel substitute amendment (rollcall No. 252).

I would have voted in favor of the Doggett motion to recommit (rollcall No. 253).

I would have voted against H.R. 8, the Estate Tax Elimination Act (rollcall No. 254).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the majority leader, to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet on Monday, June 12, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later today. On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m. We will also continue consideration of H.R. 4577, the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001 after the suspension votes on Monday evening.

On Tuesday, June 13, and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures:

S. 761, the Millennium Digital Commerce Act conference report;

H.R. 4601, the Debt Reduction and Reconciliation Act of 2000;

H.R. 4578, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001;

H.R. 4461, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001;

H.R. 4516, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001;

VA–HUD appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

I would like to wish all my colleagues a good weekend back in their districts. I should mention to my colleagues there will be no votes on the floor next Friday, but we should all be prepared to work late all evenings next week because we indeed intend to complete five appropriations bills next week.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas knows, last night we worked out a unanimous consent request on the major amendments that still divide the two parties. It was our expectation that having done that, we could finish that bill within a reasonable length of time, because outside of those amendments, I think most of the remaining amendments that are to be offered are on your side of the aisle with probably one or two exceptions on this side at most. When we made that agreement, I had indicated that it was with the understanding that that bill would not be considered either while Members were in the air trying to get back or in the dead of night.

Our reason for feeling that way is that this is the major domestic appropriations bill which divides us. Under the rule that the bill is being considered under, we cannot get votes on the major issues, but at least we wanted to be able to have a structured, coherent debate on the issue. I would urge the gentleman to simply look at moving some other appropriation bill or any other vehicle in for Monday evening. I have no preference as to which one it is. But we would not be able to finish the Labor-HHS bill Monday in any case starting that late. For example, if we were to proceed to it on Tuesday after the markup of the bill in full committee, I am confident we could finish consideration of the bill that day. But with 160 possible amendments pending if we do not have an agreement, I would hate to see us unravel an agreement which I thought we had with the accompanying understanding last night.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin's observations. Whenever floor managers on legislation work out a unanimous consent agreement to manage their bill, we try our very, very best to work with them and honor that. We will be examining the attendance levels that we have when we take the earlier votes on Monday evening regarding the suspension votes. We will be able to get a measure of that. We will also be paying attention to the things mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin. We will certainly give consideration to anything we can to accommodate those overall concerns.

Mr. OBEY. All I would say is that we are trying to accommodate the leadership without any extraneous delays of any kind. All we are asking in return is that we have an opportunity to make our case in one solid block of time. That obviously will not be possible Monday night. It would be possible on any other day of the week. I am confident that if we can reach an understanding, it would speed up rather than significantly delay the consideration of that and other appropriation bills.

Mr. ARMEY. I can only say to the gentleman from Wisconsin at this time given that we will be working late Monday evening beyond the votes on the suspension bills, I can see no alternative to working on the health and human services bill. I will tell the gentleman from Wisconsin, I have heard his concerns and I will look for what alternative we might be able to work out, but at this time I do not see that.

Mr. OBEY. All I would say is that if we cannot work it out, we are not going to make very much progress on that bill on Monday.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's point.

COMMEMORATING HOUSE PAGES ON THEIR GRADUATION

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to speak about our pages. It is the last day of their service to us. I am going to yield to the chairman of the page board first, but as she speaks, I wonder if all the pages would come down and join us here in the well so that your families and others and everybody can see you here. I would like for all the pages to come down here to the well.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Today is a special day for our pages. It is graduation day. It is a time to reflect on their past year of service to this body, on the school, on building relationships, on dorm life, and the range of experiences and emotions they have felt in their time in Washington. For many of you, this was a challenging experience. But I hope it was a special time for you as well. You are part of a select club, a small group of people who have served in Congress as congressional pages. Some of the Members of that club stand before you today as Members of Congress themselves. You are a special group of people. You have been given the opportunity to witness history's greatest experiment in democracy firsthand. During your time here, you have not heard this as much as you should have, but thank you. Thank you very much.

□ 1345

We thank you. I thank you from all of the Members and the staff of this House. You have been a very special part of this institution. You have witnessed firsthand the fact that Members of Congress tend to become wrapped up and focused on the day's floor activity and the tough debates which frequently characterize the House of Representatives.

Do not think for a moment, however, that we have not noticed the essential work that you perform every single day. You are a special part of this place, you lend character to this place, and you are a daily reminder to all of us of why our work is so important, because you are our future leaders.

Over the course of the last year, as I have gotten to know each of you, I have seen something special in you. Many of you have told me how much you have learned about while you are being here. Remember this, knowledge is power only when you turn on the engine, so do not be afraid to turn on the ignition as you go on through life.

We are grateful for your service here. Your future and the future of this Nation is limited only by your ability to dream and the courage to pursue your dreams. I wish all of you the best of your future and the best of luck in all of your dreams.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who has served in a very distinguished capacity as chairman of the page board. We recognize that the gentlewoman has another event that she has to get to, but we certainly appreciate her taking the time to speak to the pages and of the pages this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to yield to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to be down here, not just as Speaker of the House, but I spent a great deal of time before I got into politics as a teacher. I taught economics and U.S. history and world history and sociology and government and all of those things that we talk about here day in and day out.

Every time that we see a new set of faces come in, pages in this Congress, we also see a new challenge for each of you, a challenge of learning what this government is about, actually living the lives of what people do inside this House day in and day out.

It is certainly a lot different than what you read in the textbooks. It is a lot different from what you hear in lectures, because this really is the essence of this place. As we struggle here, day in and day out on issues that some of us care very, very dearly about and some of us other issues that we struggle on, trying to get things done, that is the essence of what this government is about.

It is the essence of what this country is about, that we can come here and we can sit on two different sides of an aisle, and we can disagree and we can fight, but at the end, we have a product, we have a law. We have something that guide the people in this country, and for a year you have been a part of that. You have seen the struggles. You have seen the fights. You have heard the debates.

You know that is something that I think you will take with you for the rest of your lives. We appreciate the work that you do. We appreciate the challenges you have taken. You know we appreciate your families giving you up for a year to have this experience here. We depend on you. We appreciate you. We thank you for what you have done, and we just ask you to go on and live the rest of your lives as best you can.

You have seen what people can do. You have seen the very best and sometimes you have seen the toughest side of life here, but if you put your mind to it, you can do anything in this country. This country is an open door. It is an open book, all you have to do is write your page down. Thank you for being part of it. God bless you all.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the Speaker for his kind remarks.

It is my privilege to yield to a very distinguished gentleman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my colleague, my ranking member of the subcommittee that I chair.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for yielding.

This has been an extraordinary experience for all of you young people. Some of the best young people in America are chosen to come here to see firsthand American democracy in action. You have heard Members from time to time talk about this as the people's House, and that is what it is. A group of extraordinary human beings got together in 1787 in Philadelphia in what Catherine Drinker Bowan in a book the Miracle at Philadelphia called appropriately a miracle and created a government, a way that people could resolve their differences and set policies for their future.

It perhaps does not seem quite extraordinary from the vantage point of the 21st century as it was in the 18th century, such a construct was unknown in the world. Now, in the world, there is a shining example for every Nation in the world, and it is the United States of America. It is that Constitution that was written in 1787.

It is an extraordinary document, and this House was created specifically to represent the people, directly to represent their passions, their fears, their hopes and their vision, and it does so. And as all of you live in communities and you see sometimes the people have great aspirations and sometimes they have feelings that are not so great, that are small, and, perhaps, not worthy of themselves or their community, and you see that reflected here as well sometimes.

But over the decades and, yes, the centuries that this House has been the repository of the hopes and visions of the American people, it has for the most part acted well and, as a result, is the example throughout the world of what a democratic institution ought to be.

Now, the body across the way, in which you have not served, the United States Senate, was created, as you know, as a representative of the States, of those 13 independent Nations that got together and formed a Nation, and, in effect, it gave up some of their sovereignty but made a deal in the process to make sure that the States were represented in the United States Senate.

In the last century, of course, we amended the Constitution, they are directly elected, not by the State legislatures, it is this House elected every 2 years that was designed to reflect the will of the American people. And you, as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) said a little earlier, had been given an extraordinary privilege.

Think of all the millions of young people your age in America today and think of how few of you got the opportunity to visit here, be here and work here every day that we were in session. And you got to learn firsthand how well this extraordinary experiment in democracy, in people working together to resolve problems and set policies can and does work. Because you had been given a significant privilege, you also have a very serious responsibility, and that responsibility is to go home and talk to your friends, your fellow students, people who you will work with, your parents, your sisters, your brothers, your aunts, your uncles and other relatives, and tell them about their democracy. And, hopefully, you will go from here excited about what you have learned and excited about this process and urge people to participate in their democracy, by voting certainly, but by participating as well on behalf of the party or candidate or policy of their choice, because that is what makes this an extraordinary body.

It reflects the sentiments of citizens, but it can reflect the sentiment of citizens only to the extent that they participate and articulate those sentiments and let the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) know those sentiments and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). And because you have firsthand knowledge that millions and millions of Americans will never have, you have had a special privilege, but also, as I said, a particular responsibility.

I would be remiss if I did not say to James Kelly from my district, who, in a few short years, will either vote to hire me again or fire me again, how pleased I have been to have him here. And I know every Member feels as keenly about each of you whom they had the privilege of representing as I do about Jim Kelly.

This is a graduation of sorts. I see some tears, and there will be more, but those ought to be tears not just of sadness. You will have made friends that you will keep for all of your lives and information and knowledge that you will never lose. Use it well.

Thank you for your service, not only to us, not only to this institution, but to your country as well. Congratulations. And Godspeed. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his extraordinarily eloquent remarks.

It is my privilege now to yield to an individual who can speak firsthand about the page program, in fact, I think he served certainly longer than I did here, he was here 4 years as a page. I only was here 3, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) was here for 2. Okay. So the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) holds the record. And we appreciate the gentleman coming today and speaking to the pages. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address this first page school class of the millennium here today. And although I served 4 years, it was in the other body, so it seemed like about 10 years. And this is a much faster and brisker pace over in the House of Representatives than we have down the hall.

I know it has been an extraordinary privilege and honor for all of you to serve here, and I hope that it has been worth your while in terms of the lessons you learned, the discipline you have had to achieve to move forward, and we appreciate you doing this.

This is probably the most difficult time to become a page because you are trying to balance your academics with working as a page on the floor, and it is very difficult with late night sessions coming back and forth. We understand the sacrifices that you have made, many of you coming from high schools where you had interests in sports and other activities, and you gave those up to come here to Washington to pursue this. We are very much appreciative of that.

You will make lifelong friendships here. My best friend today was someone who served with me as a page. I am going to see him this weekend out in California. He went on to be mayor of his town and we ended up marrying sisters, who would have thought when we were sitting here in the page school class. So you join a long list of page alumni, including many Members of this body, some Members of the other body. Bill Gates was a page, but not only that, every other segment of society, teachers, homemakers, attorneys, look around.

The important thing is when you leave here, the lessons that you have learned here, you take what you have learned and you use it to become better citizens and you have a better understanding of government. And, most importantly, even if you do not pursue any role in politics, you can pursue helping others, that is what this is all about, that is why we serve here, to try to help our country and to help other people.

And I hope you will take that with you, that is what inspires us to get up every morning and go through those long hours. And I think that is what has inspired you to come here and give up what you had back home and get up early in the morning and go to the school all day and then work the rest of the day and study at night.

I am just most appreciative for what you all have done here over the last session. The best of luck to you as you pursue your dreams in this very most exciting time in history and thank you very much for what you have done.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize another former page, who has had the distinction of having served at one of the most dramatic moments in history for pages and he is memorialized forever in that photograph in the cloakroom as he was carrying stretchers down the front steps of the Capitol after the attack by some of the independent-minded people from Puerto Rico in 1954. And with, I might add, our former and beloved colleague who is no longer with us, Bill Emerson. It is my privilege to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). Today really was an interesting day, because it allowed me to relive my youth in a way. I had the great pleasure of having a night conversation and lunch with my sponsored page Becky Hoffman, who is part of this class. And her grandmother and her grandfather are very old and dear friends of mine are in the gallery watching this ceremony.

I went over and thought how being a page some 47 years ago had changed my life. And as my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) said, it allowed me to form my best friend relationship through my entire life, Bill Emerson, who I met here on my first day as a page, was a roommate with him for 2 years while I was here. And he continued on for his 3rd year, and then we had the honor to come back and serve in the Congress together for about 7 years prior to his untimely death.

□ 1400

My class and my Congress that I served in was exceptional because out of that class of pages we produced three Members of Congress. I know that after having been here, maybe you all think, gee, that is the last thing in the world I would ever want to be; but

I hope you have taken the charge that Mr. HOYER has given you, and that you have had this window of opportunity to see from within, as the Speaker said, the real activity of the legislative process and democracy in action. I hope it spurs you on to develop an ambition to be in public service, particularly to be participants.

I know you are the best and brightest from all over the country, and you are going to go to great attainment in your life. If I could give you a little advice for when you go back to your schools: you will be different. You are more mature, more worldly; there will be some jealousy toward the experience you had. You have to treat that gingerly so that your peers learn something from you and do not have envy for what you had. Take the opportunity to bring them along in your peer groups in your various high schools. Do that. Do not be foolish enough to think about this experience as having made the touchdown, as being the most important game of your senior year in high school and as the high point of your life. Page activity is very important, but do not let it ever be the high point in your life. You are just beginning now to go on to attainment and to great success, and you should look forward every day in your life to doing bigger and better things, and every one of you can.

I would just like to say that over the last 47 years since I started here as a page with Bill Emerson and Bob Bauman, we were both in the 83rd Congress, the last Republican Congress before these three Congresses when the Republicans were in power, I formed a friendship for life, I learned what I wanted to do, and I had an experience that I have carried with me, and I want to pass it on to you. These Members that you deal with day in and day out and you see and you witness, and the Members of the Senate, you have already met four or five future Presidents of the United States. They are here among us. How to discern who they will be is another matter, and that will test how perceptive you are; but they are here.

I was thinking back how fortunate I was in 1953 and 1954. I got to meet almost every President of the United States who subsequently became President when they were either a Member of this House or a Member of the Senate. So you have had that same enjoyment. You have probably met and have served with a lot of future cabinet officers, governors, all kinds of individuals. You, if you are interested in public service, can be like Bill Clinton, the President of the United States. You are about the same age as he was when he met with President Kennedy when he was your age in Washington. He looked around, he looked at his classmates, and he decided that he too would like to be President of the United States. He tells an interesting story, because 30 years later from that day, almost within 3 or 4 days, he took the oath of office as President of the United States. Every one of you have that opportunity. But most of all, every one of you have the opportunity to serve, to distinguish yourselves and honor your classmates, and the institution of being a page.

I cannot think of all the great pages, but the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned Bill Gates. Well, he is the wealthiest, I am sure, of the former pages. But people like Daniel Webster, people like Senator Arthur Vandenberg, one of the original charter writers of the United Nations charter, and on and on we could go. It is quite a tradition. Now that you are part of it, you have an obligation to use it wisely, treasure it, and not to embarrass it. We are honored to have served with you, and I am sure I speak for all 435 Members of the House. You have done a great job. Go on now and do an even greater job in life.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his wonderful remarks. I am sure I speak for all of the pages when I say that one of the favorite Members is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), who never fails to stop by the page desk and inquire about the pages and spend a little time talking to them. It is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. First let me pay back the compliment you have just given me and ask the pages to salute him for his dedication to the page program.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish I was in Bill Gates's class. I would be planning my estate taxes and issues like that, because obviously, he has done very well. It is not just about wealth; it is about this country. I hope I can get through this, because this is a sad day. We watched the kids come here, excited, exuberant, happy about serving their country; and we see them leave as mature young people who are ready to carry out life's dreams.

In this class we had several Andrews and several Adams and multiple Christophers, several Lindseys. Some came with dyed hair, Christopher; some have used the Nation's supply of gel; Spike, as I call him. Some of you have changed outfits and changed looks, but the thing that I think unites us all is that you are outstanding young people.

Oftentimes, you read the newspaper and you look at the TV news and you hear about the bad kids in life. Happily for America, that is only about one-half of 1 percent. Regrettably, we do not read about the good kids, the kids that are here today that are sacrificing being away from their friends and family back home, the time that they could spend in high school, the favorite years of your life in your hometown, in your home community, with your boyfriends and girlfriends and family.

But instead you chose to venture to our Nation's Capital, the seat of government, the center of the world. You have served, and I know at times you have been frustrated. I have seen some of you dragging in at 10:30 at night while some of us continue to talk to the cameras above, talking to our residents back home on C–SPAN, and you say, are they ever going to stop? Will they cut special orders sometime soon? And yet you get up the next day full of exuberance.

As I am running in the morning, in fact, I run on Thursdays with KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, I said, KAY, you better watch your job, because Parker Payne may be running for Senator some day in this class. He is already threatening, so I think you and I should keep running and keep working to make sure that you are the Senator from Texas.

But you will have elected officials in this class. You will have entrepreneurs; you will have doctors and lawyers and scientists. But the one thing that is sure, as was mentioned, you will have lifelong friends. You will have bonded together; and 10, 15, 20 years from now you will look back and think of that special time you had when you were sharing dormitory space and thinking about how your senior year would be and how the prom would be. Tonight we will send you off back to your families and back to your parents, many of whom I have met; and I know that they are proud today and that they have helped raise you. And I think you have to recognize how proud you are of them, for thinking of you and to recognize your maturity to allow you to leave home. Your fathers were ready to get rid of you when your mothers were probably weeping daily as the time approached to head to Washington.

But in all sincerity, I am going to stop soon, because I see some of you crying already; and I will start too, because I am sad. But knowing you are going off a better person makes me all the more happy.

In conclusion, let us make sure that we thank some people here that have also made your experience both memorable and wonderful, and I am sure Jim is going to do that; but Ms. Sampson, Harroun and all the staff, for their stewardship, guidance and leadership of this class, we should salute them as well.

God bless you, kids. You are great, you are fabulous, and I love you. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks. If I might, just in conclusion, make a few of my own.

About 3 weeks ago, we held a reunion here in Washington, it was the 40th page school reunion for my class. Among those in that class are two that are known to most of these pages here.

One, of course, is one of the most beloved former pages, Donn Anderson, who served this House as the Clerk of the House for many years and has been the staunchest supporter of the page program. Also in that same class was Mr. Ron Lasch who serves as a floor assistant for the Republican majority here and has been a stalwart person for a number of years on behalf of our party in the House of Representatives. Both of them believe so strongly in this institution, and I hope that is part of what you will take away from here.

There is no doubt, as I had that reunion, while I know what you are thinking; you are thinking, certainly I could never look that old some day, but maybe some of you will, although most of you will probably be in much better shape 40 years from now. But what I remember, what I think was evident at that reunion for all of us is this was a very life-changing experience. Several people have talked about the friendships that you will make and that you will have for a lifetime, and you will. It is incredible how bonded our class has become over the years. For all of us, this was very much a life-changing experience. It has brought us closer to each other through the trials and tribulations; and yes, I am sad to say we have lost 4 members of our class now. But it has brought us closer together. And as we watched our families grow, we have shared those experiences with each other. That is very much the human part of what this program is all about.

I am often asked as a member of the page board, why do we need a page program? Why do we not just hire messengers? It would be so much easier to do that than to maintain a staff and a place for the pages to live and a school and all of that. There is no question there are easier ways to handle the invaluable services that you provide for us. But I do not think there are very many Members of this House of Representatives that have ever wanted to give up this program, because we all understand that it is an opportunity every year to give a handful, a small handful, but a wonderful handful of young people an opportunity to understand their government in a way that their friends and classmates and others across this country will never, ever be able to have.

But you can share that experience with them. That is really the message that I want to leave with you today as you go forward from this experience. You go forward as ambassadors, really, for our government, for the institutions of democracy that make this country such a great place. Your responsibility, having completed this year as pages, is not to be elected to office, though there will be some of you that will be elected. I will guarantee somebody in this class that will be serving some day in the House of Representatives or the United States Senate, and others of you will serve in State legislatures and city councils and school boards, other kinds of equally important tasks in life. Your job is not to be elected and your job is not to make as much money as Bill Gates; very few of us could ever hope to accomplish that. But your job is to serve, to serve your community, your country, your family in the best way possible. You have been given a great opportunity, and I know that each and every one of you will make the very most of this opportunity.

So I hope that you will go out from here and help others understand what our government is about, and how wonderful it is, because these institutions of democracy, for all of their failings, is still the very best that we have been able to devise. You have done us a great service during this last year. Sometimes we do not even realize how the work of the House of Representatives depends on what you are doing every day, and it becomes a part of us, and yet you are so important to the operation of this House. So we will miss you. On Monday there will be a new batch of pages in here, and we will all be busy trying to orient them and get to know them. But we will miss you, and we hope that you will stay in touch with us and with others that you have gotten to know back here; and we look forward to the great service that you will be providing for your country in whatever capacity that might be, and there will be very many different kinds of things.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD a list of all of the pages.

Max Abbott, Dominic Adams, Sarah Baca, Thomas Bazan, Christopher Bower, Geoffrey Brown, Diane Bruner, Michael Buck, Eric Cercone, Adam Cheatham, Christopher Clark, David Cook, Andrew D'Anna, Ashley Daugherty, Ashley Foster, Katherine Fortune, Kara Frank, Amy Gaddis, Adam Gellman, Dana Hall, Kristopher Hart, Laura Heaton, Androni Henry, Rebecca Hoffman, William Hooper, Jay Kanterman, James Kelley Stevens, Kelly, Susanna Khalil, Jule Kolbe, Julia Koplewski, David Kroontje and Adam Kwasman.

Ray LaHoud, Andrew Lerch, Yun Hsin (Amy) Leung, Brad Lyman, Alison Lowery, Renee Mack, Megan Marshburn, Jeffrey Mannion, Marcella Martinez, Lindsay Moon, Clinton Morris, Nancy Nicolas, Casey Osterkamp, Parker Payne, Ashley Percy, Christopher Perr, Jessica Porras, Tessa Powell, Lindsey Ransdell, Jennifer Reed, Moriah Reed, A.J. Rosenfeld, Chase Rowan, Danielle Ruse, David Schweinfurth, Samuel Sinkin, Megan Smith, Nouvelle Stubbs, Erin Sweeney, Christine Tancinco, Anika Tank, Margaret Theobald, Lindsay Thomson, Amber Walker, Lauren Weeth, Julie Wise and Jessica Wood.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I would, in conclusion, also just like to mention my own page, as others have done, Adam Kwasman from Tucson. He has been a great page this last year and has become a great friend of mine, but each and every one of you have become great friends of mine. Some I have gotten to know, obviously, better than others. But I admire what you have done, we appreciate the service, we thank you for that, and we wish you Godspeed. Thank you.

□ 1415

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2000

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b) and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Federal Judicial Center Foundation for a 5-year term:

Mr. Benjamin Zelenko of Maryland.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF FIRST FLIGHT CENTENNIAL FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to section 12(b)(1) of the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143) and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following citizen on the part of the House to the First Flight Centennial Federal Advisory Board:

Ms. Mary Mathews of Ohio.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, I led an hour of debate on the topic of prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. I read three letters from around the state from seniors who shared their personal stories. On the 12th, I made a commitment to continue to read a different letter every week until the House enacts reform. This week I will read a letter from Julia Kanopsky of Livonia Michigan.

In conjunction with Mother's Day, the Older Women's League (OWL) published a report entitled, "Prescription for Change: Why women need a Medicare Drug Benefit." The report describes the special problems older women face in obtaining prescriptions.

More than one in three women on Medicare lack prescription drug coverage.

In 1997, 2.6 million women on Medicare spent more than $1200 a year on their medications and another 2.4 million women spent between $612 and $1200 a year on pharmaceuticals therapies.

The high costs of prescription drugs are especially hard on older women, most of whom live on fixed incomes. More than half of women age 65 and over have personal annual incomes of less than $10,000 a year and three out of four have incomes under $15,000.

On average, women's overall out-of-pocket spending for prescription drugs is higher than their male counterparts. In 1999, women on Medicare were projected to spend $430 a year on medications, compared to $380 for men.

Women are expected to make up a greater share (58 percent) of beneficiaries with high ($500–$999) or very high ($1,000) annual out-of-pocket drug costs in 1999.

Women make up more than six in ten (61.4 percent) Medicare beneficiaries with hypertension and women with hypertension have higher overall out-of-pocket spending for prescription drugs ($800) than men do ($694).

OWL shares the disturbing fact that Medicare beneficiaries without drug coverage are less likely to receive drug therapies compared to those with coverage. In 1996, women without coverage used 24 percent fewer prescriptions than did women with coverage.

I agree with the conclusions in the OWL report that these numbers cry out for the inclusion of a prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

I will now read the letter from Julia Kanopsky:

I was so thrilled to find your address I was allowed to express myself on [the] high price of prescriptions. I am one of the least fortunate ones who does not have any . . . health care . . . [I have a] pension [and] when I pay for my three prescriptions for heart and blood pressure, and 2 for pain, pay for my Blue Cross, half of my check is used up and every time you get a refill on prescription drugs, the price differs. Blue Cross [also] goes up. I [have] talked to so many seniors like myself and it has us worried to death. I just wish the government would take an interest in different problems like this, to curb like prices. I eat two meals a day . . . any more hike in health cost, I'll have to go to one meal. [I get] a little Social Security raise, and then . . . property tax and utilities go up. I just can't win. Voice your opinion, Debbie! Maybe someone will listen. Thank you, Julia Kanopsky. P.S. I'm too old to get a job if I were younger, maybe [I would]. I could pick up a job to at least pay for prescriptions for Healthcare. I'm trying to maintain my home and being independent, these prices are scaring me.

The time is now to enact legislation that will reduce the price for prescription drugs for seniors and that will include a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program.

HOUSE BIPARTISAN VOTE ON THE ESTATE TAX IS A VICTORY FOR TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I want to celebrate today's victory on behalf of the taxpayers. That is the outstanding vote produced by this bipartisan Congress, 279 to 136. Sixty-five Democrats joined the Republican majority in signalling to America and to taxpayers everywhere that we think it is punitive when a person dies after working all their life to increase wealth, to increase opportunities for their family, that the government now becomes their partner; the government becomes, if you will, the primary recipient of all that person's hard work.

Growing up in this country, my parents told me, work hard, strive for the greatest heights, and you will be richly rewarded for your efforts. America, home of entrepreneurs and opportunity everywhere, signals to people, come one, come all, from around the world to this great Nation. We are in fact a home of opportunity.

Many people agreed with us today, and thankfully many people, everyone from the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), joined. The list is endless of people from virtually every State who joined in recognizing the egregious nature of the estate tax or death tax, as we call it.

The calls on the House floor, today, though would indicate otherwise. In fact, the minority portrayed this as simply a Republican bill rammed through this process with no debate and no consideration. Death taxes have been on the books since 1913, so I do not think we got to this point in time quickly. In fact, I think we have been waiting for this a long time.

I think the voters of the minority Democrat party in fact enjoyed the bill today and supported the bill today, and in fact, we are just within the threshold of a veto-proof number in this Chamber.

While we are on the subject of bipartisanship, I think it is important to not only compliment those, and the numbers and names can be found probably in many newspapers around the country, the 65 brave hearts that stood up and recognized the estate tax is patently unfair. But let us talk about the tactics being used by the minority party this week in fact as it relates to getting bills passed on behalf of the citizens of the country.

The front page of the Roll Call newspaper on the Hill said, "Wyden Lands in Hot Water." That is Senator WYDEN, a Democrat from Oregon. "Bipartisanship may cost the Oregonian a finance panel seat."

It goes on to say that, "Senator Ron Wyden may have won plaudits from the New York Times editorial page for trying to reach across party lines to craft a Medicare prescription drug reform plan, but the move infuriated many of his Democratic colleagues. Several Democrat sources says Wyden has now dashed any hope of landing one of the three coveted seats opening at the end of the year on the powerful Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over entitlement and tax policy."

That is amazing, that in a day when we have had dialogue about a lack of bipartisanship, we read that headline, that one of their own reached out to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, to try and craft a proposal that would actually pass, that would actually ensure prescription drug coverage for our seniors, prescription drug coverage that is vitally necessary for our seniors throughout America.

A brave soul, a Democratic Senator, decided it was more important to start to reach out to help our constituents, rather than score political points.

It goes on to talk about how he gave Republicans ground to stand on, and what have you. Let me just suggest, Mr. Speaker, the problems we are facing in this country are great. The problems we are facing as it relates to policy are important. I applaud Senator WYDEN, and I know I am probably stretching by referring to people by name, but I want to thank him for at least reaching out to try and find some common ground.

We have a lot of issues. The Patients' Bill of Rights, I will alert many of my colleagues as a Republican, I am a proud sponsor and supporter of that bill. That does not bring my party any great happiness, because they don't like when some of us are off the reservation, but nevertheless, I support it.

Campaign finance reform is another issue I take a great deal of pride in supporting.

I think there are a number of issues we can resolve on this floor, in this Chamber, relative to the needs of Americans. But I do think it is good that this is a time when bipartisanship

is finally starting to reach through the cacaphony, right now, again, 65 Democratic yea votes on the bill today to eliminate death taxes, and that now maybe we can move on to other important aspects of public policy.

Let us go ahead and try to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to fruition. Let us try and bring prescription drug coverage to fruition. Let us meet on the educational needs of our children around America, rather than just talk about it for campaign purposes. Let us make certain that every American is benefited by the debate and the dialogue here on the floor, that ultimately it is not about who runs this place.

God forbid we have that kind of fight. Let us not worry about who is in charge next year. Let us do something on behalf of the people. We have a chance. We can do it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from personal references to individual Senators.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TODAY'S VOTE ON THE ESTATE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, might I take just a moment to add my appreciation and congratulations to this first class of Pages of the millennium. Clearly, the eloquence of the words said by my colleagues cannot be matched in the short period of time that I have to simply say thank you, thank you, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciated hearing the words of my colleague, and enjoyed the fact that we have the opportunity to work on a number of issues together. I truly believe that when we debate an important issue that has gotten the attention of the American people, it is important to come forward and tell the truth.

I campaigned and worked with constituents around my district on the issue of allowing them to retain the hard-earned dollars that they have worked for in their family farms and their small businesses. My district is an urban district, so I do not have that many small farms, but I have those beneficiaries who have small farms of their relatives in rural areas of Texas.

So I likewise am concerned about those who would want to benefit from this Nation's recognizing their hard-earned dollars.

I think that today's debate did not fully tell the truth. Death is final, and the suggestion that what we voted on today, the repeal of death taxes, is final is really untrue. It is untrue because unlike the suggestion that we have done this in a bipartisan manner, we have not. This bill that was passed today is destined to be vetoed by the President of the United States.

Legislation only passes when this House passes it, when the Senate passes it, and when it goes to the President's desk.

Many of us wanted to join in bipartisan legislation, but it was not to be heard of by the Republican majority. It seems that there was an effort to really play to the headlines the repeal of death taxes.

But really, under current law, there is a $1.3 million exclusion from the estate tax for interest in farms and closely-held business. Did they not tell us that the substitute that was offered, that I did vote for, that would be supported by the President of the United States and the Senate, gave a $4 million exclusion per family for farms and closely-held businesses?

I wanted to be sure that this would pass both Houses and be signed by the President of the United States, so I did not just take my impressions to the floor of the House when I voted, I spoke to the Secretary of the Treasury, representing the administration, and the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, representing the administration. They fully appreciate the back-end balloon of burden that we will have with this bill that was passed today.

Deputy Secretary Eisenstadt said the administration is committed to passing relief on death taxes for closely-held businesses and, as well, family farms. The legislation that the President will sign, that will go into law, was the vote that I made today to support the legislation that would give a $4 million benefit to those closely-held businesses and family farms.

In fact, the substitute would provide a credit of $1.1 million right now, and in 2006 have a further increase of $1.2 million.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the repeal that the Republicans are talking about has to be phased in, whereas the vote that I made today, the $1.1 million exclusion, is effective in 2001.

It is important to tell Americans the truth, and the fact that we take $28.5 billion in estate taxes now, over 5 years a repeal will result in $104 billion being taken out of the government's revenue source. That money will come just at the time that the baby boomers will be reaching the age of depending on social security, and how will we make the choice of the amount of money that we lose from the estate taxes and not being able to pay social security?

Sometimes it sounds like a cycle that is being said over and over again, but the government does have its responsibilities. I am certainly someone who applauds the strength of the economy right now. I applaud that so many Americans have found their way to the Dow Jones and NASDAQ, but as we look at Wall Street, may I also suggest to those who are investing that we have watched the roller coaster go up and down and up and down.

That means that the government still has its responsibility to deal with social security.

Might I close, Mr. Speaker, to simply say that if anybody thinks that what we did was to help the bulk of the American people, this is the pie documented by the Joint Committee on Taxation and Treasury, and that pie says that for non-taxable estates that will be impacted by this bill today, it is 98 percent that will not be impacted.

□ 1430

Only 2 percent of those businesses and family farms, if even that, will be impacted. The Democratic alternative responds to all of those who need relief.

In Texas, there would only be 1,900 businesses that would even be impacted. Why not give a responsible relief? And the Democratic alternative will be turned into law; this only creates headlines today. I am not willing to vote for headlines. I want to vote for Americans.

SWEET NEWS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have sweet news. The General Accounting Office just released a report today on the United States Sugar Program. This is an update of the 1993 report, and the report says that the United States program supporting sugar prices increases user costs while benefiting producers.

The bottom line in this 100-page document is that the sugar program in the United States costs the American consumer, the American economy, $2 billion a year. $2 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the General Accounting Office. This is the independent, nonpartisan office here in Washington that works for Congress. The head of the agency has got a 15-year term. So there is no partisanship in this. This report was requested by Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN, the Democrat from California, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), Democrat, and myself, a Republican from Florida.

This is not a biased report coming from the Agriculture Department or the sugar growers, but the most authoritative source; and it shows that the sugar program costs $2 billion a year. The sugar program is bad for consumers, bad for the environment, and bad for jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly explain what the program is first. The program

that the Federal Government runs makes the price of sugar about three times world price. The price of sugar in Canada is about a third of the price it is in United States. The price of sugar in Mexico is about a third of the price in the United States. The Federal Government maintains the price at about three times what the world price is for sugar.

The way they do this is a complicated process of controlling imports and also a government loan program that means the Government will have to buy back sugar if the prices ever drop below this guaranteed price that the United States Government will offer.

In 1996, we had a chance to reform this program. Unfortunately, we did not reform it. And what has happened is that the price is so high that everyone is growing more sugar. In the past 3 years, sugar production has gone up 25 percent in this country. What is happening now is that the Federal Government is having to buy sugar. The Federal Government has not had to buy sugar for 15 years.

Last month, Secretary Glickman announced they were going to buy 150,000 tons of sugar that the Government has no use for. They cannot give it away in the world because nobody wants it. The corn people will not let them use it for ethanol; so we are going to store it, and that is just the beginning.

According to news reports, they are projecting $500 million worth of sugar that the Federal Government is going to buy and does not know what to do with. They cannot use it. They are going to store the stuff.

Now, that is just real crazy Federal Government policy, and it is going to get worse because people are growing more sugar because it is so profitable to grow. What is bad about that is it is costing consumers. Sugar is part of all kinds of items, whether it is candy or ice cream, whether it is bread or baked goods. It is used for sweetening cranberry juice. Any product one can think of, sugar is a small part of the cost of that product. So it is going to cost all consumers.

It is a very regressive type of program because low-income people pay so much more for their food products. It is bad for their environment. I come from Florida, and we have the beloved Florida Everglades. One of the problems that we have with the Everglades is the agriculture runoff from the huge sugar plantations in Florida that help destroy the Everglades, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys. What the sugar program does, it provides incentives to grow for sugar which means we have more runoff and more damage to the Everglades.

One of the things that is crazy about the program is that we are going to spend $8 billion to save the Everglades. One of the methods of doing that is by buying a lot of land from the sugar growers to take it out of production. Mr. Speaker, we are paying an inflated price for the sugar land because we have a sugar program that make its more costly to buy that land.

It is bad for jobs in this country. One company that we talk about is a candy company, Bob's Candy, in Georgia, makes candy canes. For three generations they have been making candy canes. Well, when sugar is a third of the price in Canada, they cannot afford to compete with Canadian and Mexican candy canes, so we are just going to drive them out of business.

The cranberry growers up in Massachusetts are struggling because cranberries need sugar to sweeten them. The cranberry growers in Canada love it because they get to buy their sugar for a third of the price to sweeten their product, and they can underprice our cranberry growers.

When the Federal Government tries to manage prices, it is bad economics. It does not make economic sense. We have a private enterprise system in this country that allows for competition. But the one program that we allow basically a monopolistic type of situation, because the Government sets the prices, is in sugar. So it is hurting jobs, it is hurting the environment, and as this GAO report says, the independent nonpartisan General Accounting Office, this is the authoritative source, says it is almost $2 billion a year. That is up from 1993 when the estimate was only $1.4 billion.

So I hope we can start the process, and I have got legislation to do away with the sugar program. We will have an opportunity during the Agriculture Appropriations bill to address part of the problem and certainly next year when the authorization bill is up that hopefully we can get rid of this program and allow the marketplace to work in this country and give benefits to the American consumer.

ESSENTIAL HOSPITAL PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of the Essential Hospital Preservation Act of 2000. It is a bill designed to use Medicare to assist economically distressed hospitals in regions where the combination of managed care, Medicare, and commercial payments changes have threatened to destroy the entire health care delivery infrastructure.

My proposal would give hospitals in regions of the country like northeastern and central Pennsylvania a minimum of a 5-year 10 percent increase in Medicare payments while they work through the development of long-range economic recovery programs.

These payment increases will constitute no new Medicare spending, and will not affect other existing providers.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 9 months I have met with chief executive officers, financial officers of institutions within my district and outside of my district in Pennsylvania, with the General Accounting Office, with the Payment Advisory Commission Medicare, with HCFA, with staff members of the committees of jurisdiction in the House. And when I studied and have analyzed the problems of the hospitals in my district, they are not unlike some of the problems in other districts of the country where similar phenomenon exist. That is where the hospitals rely on an overly elderly population in high concentration, and where the formula of Medicare as applied to those hospitals returns them an insufficient payment to meet their basic costs.

One hospital in my congressional district loses $1,500 for every Medicare patient they serve. As one of the board of directors' members said, prudent business would mean that they should meet the patient at the door, hand him a check for $500 and send them on their way to another hospital in another area.

If Medicare fails to pay its way because of the Medicare formula, or because of the failure of this government to recognize that there are disproportionate areas of the country that are distressed economic areas and that contain very large proportions of Medicare patients, then we have to have a system in effect to make sure that we do not lose the health care infrastructure system while we redress the Medicare problem as we will over the next several years.

My bill effectively allows hospitals to gain an increase of Medicare payment on an emergency basis for 5 years, to a maximum of 10 percent. It requires the hospitals to reorganize the wherewithal and come up with an economic recovery program that the Secretary and HCFA will participate with so that the managed care system, the Medicare system, the emergency systems, the other high-cost systems could be put into play in a more efficient economic way, but we will not lose the efficiency of the structure itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this Congress to join in reviewing this bill. Study the problems that are a crisis in many of the senior citizen areas of this country as a direct result of underpayment by Medicare, and to cooperate with myself, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and Senator Arlen SPECTER, who are the three of us trying to work together to come up with a methodology to save our hospitals. This is a start. This is

one of the potential alternatives we have.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have very much time. I urge my colleagues to address this issue and to understand that legislation must be passed this year and a remedy must be put in place or all our decisions to try and help Medicare, to provide prescription drugs, or do anything we want to do will come to naught if we fail to provide the basic essential care under the Medicare program that was intended some 35 years ago today.

So I urge my colleagues to study and join us in supporting the Essential Hospital Preservation Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Essential Hospital Preservation Act of 2000, a bill designed to use Medicare to assist economically distressed hospitals in a region where the combination of managed care, Medicare, and commercial payment changes have threatened to destroy the entire health care delivery infrastructure.

My proposal would give the hospitals in regions of the country like Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania a minimum of a five-year, 10 percent increase in Medicare payments, while they work through the development of a long-range economic recovery program. These payment increases will constitute new Medicare spending and they will not come out of payment reductions to other providers.

The extra payment will help the hospitals in a distressed region develop new, more economically viable services, right-size acute care beds and covert to needed nursing facility, rehabilitation, psychiatric, or long-term care hospital beds. It will also allow the hospitals in a region to cooperate in ensuring that the emergency room network survives and, indeed, is improved. It permits hospitals to work together to ensure that high cost services are coordinated and shared so as to deliver quality care at less cost. Most of all, my bill helps finance these long-term conversion plans through additional payments above and beyond the 10 percent five-year increase.

Mr. Speaker, the hospitals in my region are in deep distress. Many of them are in economic difficulty. I believe other regions of Pennsylvania and the country are facing the same crisis. We simply cannot allow these hospitals to go out of existence. Simultaneously, we also know that the nature of hospitals and the need for acute care beds in changing dramatically. My bill would provide a path by which essential hospitals can survive to serve their communities now and in the years to come.

By enabling these economically distressed healthcare facilities with a short-term revenue enhancement and a long-term plan for success, hospitals like those in my district will receive aid for the next five years now and receive additional sums for successful completion of their economic recovery plan. For the last nine months, I have met with Chief Executive and Financial Officers of hospitals in my district, members of their Board of Directors, as well as representatives from the Health Care Financing Administration, the General Accounting Office, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, and staff of the committees of jurisdiction in the House. These conversations have helped me to develop the legislation that I am introducing today.

In the next few weeks, I look forward to working with Congressman DON SHERWOOD and Senator ARLEN SPECTER to look at various alternatives like this proposal to save our hospitals. Additionally, I hope that other Members, hospital associations, and individual hospitals will feel free to recommend additions and improvements in these definitions and in the type of relief that can be provided.

I also hope that this type of proposal can be enacted this year. The need is critically urgent for all of our hospitals in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania. The crisis is painfully real. We must act immediately for the sake of all of our constituents.

THE SAFE PIPELINES ACT OF 2000

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the tragic pipeline explosion that claimed three lives of people in my district. It has been a difficult week for all of us as the attention has been once again focused on that terrible accident a year ago and we remember the sad day when hundreds of thousands of gallons of gasoline suddenly erupted in flames in a quiet part of Bellingham, Washington.

I have long held reservations about our system of pipeline safety regulations. Before I came to Congress, I worked to block construction of a pipeline in my home community. In 1996, I voted against a pipeline deregulation bill because I felt that it removed too many essential safeguards.

Since last year's accident, I have redoubled my efforts to improve the regulatory climate. Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 3558, the Safe Pipelines Act of 2000. Under my legislation:

Number one, pipelines will be required to be inspected both internally and with hydrostatic tests. Pipelines with a history of leaks will be specifically targeted for more strenuous testing.

Number two, all pipeline operators will be tested for qualifications and certified by the Department of Transportation.

Number three, the results of pipeline tests and inspections will be made available to the public and a nationwide map of all pipeline locations will be placed on the Internet so ordinary citizens can easily access it.

Number four, all pipeline ruptures and spills of more than 40 gallons will be reported to the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety.

Number five, States will be able to set up their own pipeline safety programs for interstate pipelines, provided that the States have the resources and expertise necessary to carry out the programs and that State standards are at least as stringent as the Federal standards.

In addition, the bill requires studies on a variety of technologies that may improve safety such as external leak detection systems and double-walled pipelines.

It has been difficult to get the attention of many of my colleagues on this issue. The phrase ''out of sight, out of mind'' certainly applies when pipelines are involved. Until a tragedy happens in a Member's own district, it is easy to ignore the many seemingly harmless pipelines which run underground.

Yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agreed to hold a hearing on my legislation in the coming weeks. I thank him for his efforts, and I hope the hearing will help draw the attention of more Members as we continue to work to pass comprehensive pipeline safety legislation this year.

The tragedy in my district was not the first deadly pipeline accident, and it will not be the last unless we come together to bring meaningful improvements to our pipeline safety regulations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIND (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family obligation.

Mr. MARKEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family illness.

Mr. GILMAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. LAZIO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 5:30 p.m. June 8 and today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 12:30 p.m. on account of giving commencement address at Ohio State University.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1953. An act 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. 2484. An act 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.

H.R. 3639. An act 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''.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 291. An act to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District.

S. 356. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

BILL 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, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4542. An act to designate the Washington Opera in Washington, D.C., as the National Opera.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2000, at 12:30 p.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:

8062. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft bill entitled, ''Institute For Professional Military Education and Training''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8063. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, ''An Assessment of the External Factors Influencing Schedule and Cost Risks of the Chemical Demilitarization Program,'' pursuant to Public Law 106—65; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8064. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program; Executing or Terminating Leases on Moderate Rehabilitation Units When the Remaining Term of the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) Control Is for Less Than One Year [Docket No. FR–4472–F–02] (RIN: 2577–AB98) received May 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8065. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 00F–0813] received May 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8066. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on employment of United States citizens by certain international organizations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276c—4; to the Committee on International Relations.

8067. A letter from the Director, Employment Service, Workforce Restructuring Office, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Reduction in Force Notices (RIN: 3206–AI99) received May 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8068. A letter from the Executive Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999, through March 31, 2000; and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8069. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN–149–FOR] received May 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8070. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries' Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; At-Sea Scales; Community Development Quota Program [Docket No. 9910108298–0145–02; I.D. 092199C] (RIN: 0648–AL88) received May 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8071. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting amendments to sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8072. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft bill entitled, ''National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2000''; to the Committee on Science.

8073. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft bill that contains provisions to implement the President's FY 2001 Budget and other improvements and initiatives with respect to programs of the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA); to the Committee on Small Business.

8074. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the draft bill entitled, ''Consolidation of Auhorities Relating to Department of Defense Regional Centers For Security Studies''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

8075. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the draft bill, ''Internet Prescription Drug Sale Act of 2000''; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and the Judiciary.

8076. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal relating to Department of Defense operations and management; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, International Relations, Science, and Government Reform.

8077. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft legislation entitled, ''Consumer Financial Privacy Act''; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Agriculture, and the Judiciary.

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. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1775. A bill to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–561, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 4201. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the service obligation of noncommercial educational broadcast stations; with an amendment (Rept. 106–662). 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 Committees on Commerce and Education and the Workforce discharged. H.R. 1656 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 4620. A bill to provide for planning, design, construction, furnishing, and equipping of a Riverside School for the Arts in Riverside, California; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GANSKE,

Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BASS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 4621. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the Communications Act of 1934 to require sponsors of certain election-related communications to provide information regarding their identities and sources of funds used to make the communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 4622. A bill to amend title 18 of the Social Security Act to provide for immediate relief for essential hospitals in a region, to assist in the long-range economic recovery of such hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 4623. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the calculation of base payment rates for the prospective payment system for home health services furnished under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 4624. A bill to provide targeted payment relief under the Medicare Program for hospitals that primarily serve Medicare and Medicaid patients and have been disproportionately impacted by the payment reductions under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4625. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2108 East 38th Street in Erie, Pennsylvania, as the ''Gertrude A. Barber Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 4626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4627. A bill to provide for a program to educate the public regarding the use of biotechnology in producing food for human consumption, to support additional scientific research regarding the potential economic and environmental risks and benefits of using biotechnology to produce food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4628. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of oral drugs to treat low blood calcium levels or elevated parathyroid hormone levels for patients with end stage renal disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 4629. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code to require States to providing Federal highway funds for projects in high priority corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 4630. A bill to provide for the health, education, and welfare of children under 6 years of age; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 4631. A bill to establish the Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management, and Policy to provide opportunities for leadership and management training and policy analysis for Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and others involved in tribal leadership and management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4632. A bill to control the sale of gun kits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. PORTMAN):

H.R. 4633. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the Social Security Administration's payment system for representation of claimants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 4634. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for awards by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to develop and operate multidisciplinary research centers regarding the impact of environmental factors on women's health and disease prevention; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McINNIS (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H. Con. Res. 351. Concurrent resolution recognizing Heroes Plaza in the City of Pueblo, Colorado, as honoring recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 520. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2457) to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McINTOSH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. ISTOOK):

H. Res. 521. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in international negotiations, including United Nations conferences, the United States should defend fundamental human rights to family, conscience, and life; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. SOUDER):

H. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of responsible fatherhood; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 82: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 229: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 266: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 460: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 534: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 865: Mr. HOBSON.
H.R. 914: Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 1020: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. KING, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1102: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1159: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 1228: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1322: Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1334: Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 1345: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1366: Mr. DELAY, Mr. McINTOSH, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1388: Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1450: Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FILNER, Mr. JOHN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 1510: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1622: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1731: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2120: Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 2250: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 2259: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2270: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2706: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2870: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2883: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2892: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2929: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2953: Ms. DUNN and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 3008: Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 3125: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 3131: Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 3132: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 3248: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 3249: Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 3250: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3440: Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3514: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 3518: Mr. ROGAN.
H.R. 3573: Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 3650: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3669: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. CALLAHAN.
H.R. 3677: Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 3678: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3700: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BACA, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 3842: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. HILL of Montana.
H.R. 3872: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3875: Mr. SHAW, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCINNIS, and Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 3911: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 4001: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4049: Mr. ENGLISH and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 4094: Ms. LEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 4106: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4143: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 4168: Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 4170: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4232: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4250: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 4259: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. EWING, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 4273: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 4288: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4290: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 4333: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4357: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4366: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4383: Ms. DUNN and Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 4384: Mr. BOYD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 4395: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4434: Mr. WYNN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 4447: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 4448: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 4449: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 4450: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 4451: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 4481: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 4490: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4514: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4536: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4547: Mr. GOODE, Mr. EWING, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 4552: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 4559: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 4566: Mr. NEY and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 4592: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4607: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 319: Mr. LANTOS.
H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. LEACH and Mr. WEYGAND.
H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H. Con. Res. 345: Mr. DREIER.
H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 259: Mr. BACA and Mr. GOODLING.
H. Res. 347: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 398: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. KING.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 9 by Mr. MINGE on House Resolution 478: Sander M. Levin.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Insert before the short title the following new sections:

SEC. ____. (a) RESTRICTIONS ON ROADLESS INITIATIVE.—During the period described in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to implement the environmental impact statement and proposed rule issued by the Forest Service known as the ''Roadless Initiative'', as it applies to both inventoried roadless areas and any other unroaded areas considered within the scope of the Roadless Initiative;

(2) to impose any additional national restrictions on the construction or reconstruction of forest roads of any size or definition; or

(3) to impose or enforce any change in permissive access to National Forest System lands for forest management or public use, beyond such land use and road management decisions as are made with full public participation as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

(b) DURATION.—The restrictions imposed by subsection (a) apply during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to Congress that—

(1) all pertinent unroaded areas considered under the Roadless Initiative have been properly mapped, analyzed, and displayed for adequate public review;

(2) site-specific resource concerns within each area mapped pursuant to paragraph (1) have been identified; and

(3) site-specific economic effects related to such areas have been analyzed and displayed.

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close, decommission, abandon, obliterate, or block any road on National Forest System lands or easement or right-of-way administered by the Forest Service until the Forest Service has developed and published in the Federal Register—

(1) a schedule, staffing plan, and budget for completion of the road analyses for National Forest System lands, as described in the Draft Road Management Policy dated March 2, 2000; and

(2) a description of how these analyses will be completed in a comprehensive and systematic manner to assure reasonable continued public access to National Forest System lands.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 2: 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—

(1) to implement the environmental impact statement and proposed rule issued by the Forest Service known as the ''Roadless Initiative'';

(2) to impose any additional national restrictions on the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of forest roads of any size or definition; or

(3) to impose or enforce any change in permissive access to National Forest System lands for forest management or public use, beyond such land use and road management decisions as are made with full public participation as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

SEC. 502. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close, decommission, abandon, obliterate, or block any road on National Forest System lands or easement or right-of-way administered by the Forest Service.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 3: 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—

(1) to implement the environmental impact statement and proposed rule issued by the Forest Service known as the ''Roadless Initiative'';

(2) to impose any additional national restrictions on the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of forest roads of any size or definition; or

(3) to impose or enforce any change in permissive access to National Forest System lands for forest management or public use, beyond such land use and road management decisions as are made with full public participation as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 4: 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—

(1) to implement the environmental assessment and proposed rules issued by the Forest Service known as the ''Road Management and Transportation Strategy'';

(2) to impose any additional national restrictions on the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of forest roads of any size or definition;

(3) to impose or enforce any change in permissive access to National Forest System lands for forest management or public use, beyond such land use and road management decisions as are made with full public participation as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); or

(4) to close, decommission, abandon, obliterate, or block any road on National Forest System lands or easement or right-of-way administered by the Forest Service, as might be prescribed by these rules.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 5: 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 implement the environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the notice of intent published by the Forest Service in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 (64 Fed. Reg. 56306), and issued May 11, 2000, and the proposed rules regarding the protection of remaining roadless areas within the National Forest System (known as the ''Roadless Initiative'').

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 6: 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 implement the environmental assessment dated February 16, 2000, and the proposed rules published by the Forest Service in the Federal Register on March 3, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 11680) to revise regulations concerning the development, use, maintenance, and management of the National Forest transportation system (known as the ''Road Management and Transportation Strategy'').

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 7: 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—

(1) to implement the environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the notice of intent published by the Forest Service in the Federal Register on October 19, 1999 (64 Fed. Reg. 56306), and issued May 11, 2000, and the proposed rules regarding the protection of remaining roadless areas within the National Forest System (known as the ''Roadless Initiative'');

(2) to implement the environmental assessment dated February 16, 2000, and the proposed rules published by the Forest Service in the Federal Register on March 3, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 11680) to revise regulations concerning the development, use, maintenance, and management of the National Forest transportation system (known as the ''Road Management and Transportation Strategy'');

(3) to impose any additional national restrictions on the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of forest roads of any size or definition;

(4) to close, decommission, abandon, obliterate, or block any road on National Forest System lands or easement or right-of-way administered by the Forest Service, as might be prescribed by these rules; or

(5) to impose or enforce any change in permissive access to National Forest System lands for forest management or public use, beyond such land use and road management decisions as are made with full public participation as required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.).

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement section 2.18 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, in the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore unit of the National Park System.

H.R. 4578

OFFERED BY: MR. STUPAK

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement section 2.18 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, in the following units of the National Park System:

(1) The Herbert Hoover and Perry's Victory National Historic Sites.

(2) The Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

(3) The Cedar Breaks, Dinosaur, and Grand Portage National Monuments.

(4) The Acadia, Black Canyon of Gunnison, Crater Lake, Grand Teton, Mount Ranier, North Cascades, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia and Kings Canyon, Theodore Roosevelt, Yellowstone, and Zion National Parks.

(5) The Bighorn Canyon, Curecanti, Delaware Water Gap, Lake Chelan, and Ross Lake National Recreation Areas.

(6) The Appalachian National Scenic Trail and the Saint Croix National Scenic River.

(7) The Blue Ridge and John D. Rockefellar, Jr., Parkways.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO STEVE OSBORNE—2000 SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to congratulate Steve Osborne on being selected as the 2000 Small Business Person of the Year for the Colorado District of the U.S. Small Business Administration. His hard work, dedication and business savvy have propelled Steve and his business—Building Specialities—to new heights.

Steve and his organization have not had an easy road to success. After a very promising and profitable inception, the company began losing money. An external audit was performed and it was revealed to Steve that an employee was embezzling money. Amid this adversity, Steve never put his head down in defeat. Rather, he put his shoulder to the plow and revamped his company.

Today, that turn-around is complete as Building Specialities is expected to reach nearly $5 million in gross sales this year. Much of this renewed success is attributable to Steve's efforts and energies. Steve has taken a proactive approach to his business philosophy and continues to draw from his experience of hard knocks. He is a model citizen and a firm believer in never giving up.

I am encouraged by Steve's accomplishments and his success story. He is the embodiment of the entrepreneurial spirit that makes America's economy the strongest in the world. Because of entrepreneurs of Steve's caliber, America can look forward to many decades of continued prosperity.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say congratulations to Steve on winning this prestigious award. We are all very proud of you.

HONORING FINER WOMANHOOD AWARDEES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Lambda Rho Zeta Chapter of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc., located in Pontiac, Michigan. For many years, the sisters of Zeta Phi Beta have emphasized family leadership and civic pride. Each year, at their Finer Womanhood Scholarship Luncheon, they award scholarships to college bound students, and also recognize those who have made a significant impact on the City of Pontiac. On June 10, the Chapter will gather for their seventeenth annual luncheon, where they will honor Ms. Cynthia Thomas Walker as Woman of the Year, and Mrs. Dorothy Jones Herron and her family as Family of the Year.

Cynthia Thomas Walker has truly shown herself to be more than deserving of the distinction of Woman of the Year. She is currently the Administrator of 50th District Court in Pontiac. She is the first African-American and the first female to hold this position. Originally from Chicago, Cynthia came to Pontiac in 1985, where she worked for UAW–GM Legal Services and was an instructor for the American Institute for Paralegal Studies before becoming a Deputy City Attorney in 1993. The following year, she became City Attorney and continued that role until last year, when she was promoted to her current position. Cynthia is a member of the State Bar of Michigan, the Southeast Michigan Court Administrators Association, and the NAACP. She is also the proud mother of a twelve-year-old son, Clifton.

This year's Family of the Year is the family of Dorothy Herron Jones of Pontiac. A product of the Pontiac School District, Mrs. Herron graduated from Pontiac Central High School, and went on to the Jones School of Nursing in Ann Arbor, and St. Joseph Mercy School of Nursing in Detroit. She began her medical career at Pontiac General Hospital as an LPN and later an RN. In 1971, she became a staff nurse at General Motors Truck and Coach. She rose through the ranks to her current position as Associate Administrator for GM Corporate Health Services, working with facilities in eight states, including Michigan. She is a member of several nurses' associations, the American Occupational Health Association, and the NAACP. Mrs. Herron has raised two wonderful sons. Dr. Michael Herron is an emergency room physician at Chesatee Hospital in Dahlonega, GA and Georgia Baptist Hospital in Warm Springs, GA. Darryl Herron has recently completed a two-year assignment in the Asian Pacific as Regional Manager of the Audit Staff for General Motors. He is currently the Manager of Capital Appropriations at GM Powertrain Global Headquarters in Pontiac. Mrs. Herron is also proud of her grandchildren, David and Destiny.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of several civic and fraternal organizations, I understand how important these groups can be to improve the community climate. I am proud of the hard work the Lambda Rho Zeta Chapter of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority has done for the City of Pontiac, and I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in applauding them and their award recipients.

HONORING DAVID S. THOMPSON

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I honor David S. Thompson, the past President of Northern California Small Business Financial Development Corporation.

Mr. Thompson has made a major contribution to hundreds of economically disadvantaged small business enterprises throughout the greater San Francisco Bay Area. This contribution has resulted in over $19 million of loan capital provided to this important segment of our regional economy that otherwise would not have occurred without his leadership and oversight.

In addition to providing solid direction and guidance to this non-profit public benefit corporation, Mr. Thompson has excelled in forging genuine strategic alliances with community-based organizations and financial institutions in a positive effort to maintain the flow of capital to minorities, women and the truly economic-disadvantaged of our local small business population.

As Executive Director of the City of Richmond's Redevelopment Agency, Mr. Thompson has contributed substantially to the economic revival of his own community for nearly twenty years.

Additional positions he has held with the City of Richmond over the years include Project Manager for the Marina Bay Development and the City's Business Assistance Officer. The Redevelopment Agency is a department within the Community and Economic Development Division which administers the City's community, economic and housing development programs including Redevelopment, Community Development Block Grants, HOME and Youth Build.

Mr. Thompson is active with a variety of nonprofit organizations in the Bay Area, involved in small business development financial and management assistance including the Northern California Community Loan Fund, Bay Area Small Business Development Corporation and West Contra Costa Business Development Center.

It is with great pride and honor to recognize the overall contributions made by David S. Thompson to the State of California's Small Business Loan Guaranty Program and to the hundreds of small business persons who have benefitted from this commitment of time and energy.

RSS BOMBS CHRISTIAN WOMEN'S PRAYER MEETING

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 Newsroom.org reported that a May 21 bomb blast that injured 30 Christians during a prayer meeting was apparently carried out by the RSS, the pro-Fascist, militant Hindu fundamentalist organization that is the parent organization of the BJP, the party that leads India's government.

According to the Newsroom report, which was brought to me by the President of the Council of Khalistan, Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, the bomb exploded during a meeting of the Women's Club, a Christian group. An extensive investigation by the All-India Christian Conference showed that the Sangh Parivar, a branch of the RSS, was responsible for the incident despite police claims that it came about as a result of strife within the Christian community. The Catholic Bishops' Conference has written to the Indian government demanding action.

This bombing is the latest in a string of violent attacks on Christians and other religious minorities. According to the article, "the community is being threatened with anonymous letters and telephone calls ordering citizens to stop Christian prayers." Anti-Christian slogans have been painted on walls all over town.

In the light of incidents like this against Christians, Sikhs, Muslims, and other minorities, the United States must act. Our aid to India, one of the largest recipients of American aid, must be stopped until all people's rights are respected. India should be declared a terrorist state and punished accordingly. Congress should call for a free and fair plebiscite under international supervision to allow the Christians, Sikhs, and other minority nations under Indian rule to enjoy self-determination, as a democracy should.

I would like to place the article from Newsroom into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read it and see the reality of religious freedom in India.

CHRISTIANS IN INDIA CLAIM BOMBING IS PART OF HATE CAMPAIGN

NEW DELHI, India, 30 May 2000 (Newsroom)—A bomb blast that injured 30 people in the coastal state of Andhra Pradesh last week was part of a campaign of hate by Hindu extremists, leaders of a Christian organization claim.

The blast at a prayer meeting in the Women's Club at Machilipatnam on May 24 was not the result of strife within the community as police first said, according to a team assembled by the All India Christian Council (AICC). The AICC has presented its report to Andhra Pradesh, Chief Minister Nara Chandrababu Naidu, who said in a press release that he has directed police to review the investigation.

"We have already written to Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee about this," Father Dominic of the Catholic Bishop's Conference of India (CBCI) said. "With the report we hope the government will take it seriously."

The incident follows a series of attacks against Christian institutions, priests, and nuns in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, and Madhya Pradesh.

The AICC team—composed of an advocate, a pastor, and a community representative—said it found disturbing elements of a deliberate hate campaign by the Sangh Parivar, the extended family of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), a Hindu nationalist organization that is the ideological parent of India's governing Bharatiya Janata Party. Provocative statements and signs have been painted on the walls in the town, the AICC said.

The community is being threatened with anonymous letters and telephone calls ordering citizens to stop Christian prayers in the schools or face dire consequences, according to the AICC.

Police previously attributed the bombing to rivalry between two local pastors. After interviewing Christians belonging to both congregations, the AICC concluded that police were incorrect. Local police have since said that senior officers who made the earlier statements did so in haste.

"Going by the facts, evidence, and circumstances, in our opinion the cause of the blast is a handiwork of fundamentalists who conspired and executed a meticulous precision blast without leaving any evidence to the site," the AICC report said. The bomb was not an "ordinary (crude) one but it appears to be either a time bomb or a remote bomb," according to the report.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY GROSWOLD—DENVER & COLORADO TRAVEL INDUSTRY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to congratulate Jerry Groswold on being inducted into the Denver & Colorado Travel Industry Hall of Fame. He is one of only seven members to receive this distinction. He was inducted on April 1, 2000 at the Second Annual Denver's Salute to Tourism, an event which raised over $25,000 last year for Colorado students entering the hospitality and tourism field.

Mr. Groswold's roots have a long-standing history with tourism in Colorado. He got his feet wet as a water boy for early ski pioneers, building the first trails on the slopes in Winter Park, Colorado. In 1959, he joined the Winter Park Recreational Association and eventually served as chairman. After his tenure as chairman, he became Chief Executive Officer for the resort and held it for 22 years. Currently, Jerry is serving as Chairman of the Board for Club 20 in western Colorado.

Without Jerry's contribution, Winter Park would not be the ski community that it is today. His dedication and commitment helped to complete one of the largest ski expansions in Colorado's tourism history. I am proud to honor Jerry and thank him for his efforts to make Colorado's tourism industry a model for other states.

HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999, H.R. 1082

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999.

Why is it that we sit here in Congress and profess how far America has come? Why is it that we continuously stress how we have grown economically and socially? Is now not the time for America to grow morally? For those who fear to answer this question, I will answer for them. The time is now.

Over a year ago, the bipartisan Hate Crimes Prevention Act was introduced. This legislation will make it easier for federal authorities to assist in the prosecution of racial, religious and ethnic violence. This legislation has since been referred to the Subcommittee on Crime. My colleagues, why have we not done more? Instead of doing more to strengthen hate crimes legislation, members of society with no sense of remorse are killing those who they believe to be inferior to them.

I should not have to stand here and remind you of the brutal death of James Byrd, Jr. from my home state of Texas. But just to persuade those of you who continue to dismiss the ongoing atrocities of hate crimes that occur, I will. James Byrd, Jr. was beaten shamelessly by two white supremacists and then chained to a pickup truck. These two men then dragged him to his death. You have all heard this before and still action by Congress remains to be seen.

My colleagues, I come to you today urging that we take action now. Has the prosperity of America become so great for some that we simply dismiss senseless acts of hate crime? The answer is no. We cannot allow another minute to pass before we enact the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. As Members of Congress and leaders, we must realize that now is the time to take action.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MONROE E. WALL AND DR. MANSUKH C. WANI

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, two men who have devoted their lives to finding safer, more efficacious treatments for one of the world's most deadly diseases are being honored tonight.

Dr. Monroe E. Wall and Dr. Mansukh C. Wani of the Research Triangle Institute in North Carolina will receive the prestigious Charles F. Kettering Prize, an award given by the General Motors Cancer Research Foundation to the scientists who have made the most outstanding recent contribution to the diagnosis or treatment of cancer.

Drs. Wall and Wani, who have collaborated for more than 38 years in their work, discovered two vital chemotherapeutic compounds,

Taxol and Camptothecin, which serve as prototypes for a variety of new therapies that effectively treat cancer.

The findings are rare discoveries. Taxol, which has been heralded as one of the most important anti-cancer compounds of the past thirty years, was one of only two compounds out of 100,000 which were approved for clinical use by the National Cancer Institute between 1960–1981. Because of the work by Drs. Wall and Wani, Taxol now serves as one of the most productive treatments for breast, ovarian, and lung cancer and even Kaposi's sarcoma, a cancer associated with AIDS.

Drs. Wall and Wani have long been regarded as two of the premier members of their field. Dr. Wall, who earned his B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. from Rutgers University, has been the recipient of two honorary doctorates and has been recognized for his work by the American Society of Pharmacognosy, the American Association of Cancer Research, and the American Chemical Society.

Dr. Wani, a native of India, has also received awards on numerous occasions for his contributions, including being honored with the Bruce F. Cain Memorial Award from the American Association for Cancer Research, the City of Medicine Award, and the NC1 Award of Recognition. He earned his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Bombay and Ph.D. in chemistry from Indiana University.

Drs. Wall and Wani, aged 83 and 75 respectively, still work actively in the fight against cancer. According to Dr. Wani, they continue their work because "there is always a need to find something better and less toxic." They truly embody the spirit of inventiveness that is required for finding the cure for cancer. North Carolinians take great pride in the contributions of these outstanding scientists and in their richly deserved recognition.

TRIBUTE TO THE MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to pay tribute to the troopers of the Missouri State Highway Patrol. These men and women, who are directed by the Governor and Superintendent Weldon L. Wilhoit, deserve our gratitude for their contributions to the citizens of Missouri.

You see the Missouri State Highway Patrol's distinctive blue uniforms throughout the state on a daily basis. The men and women of the Patrol can be found tirelessly working on behalf of the residents of the State of Missouri. You may see them testifying in courtrooms throughout the state or working with county sheriffs and local police departments. You may witness their lecturing students on the benefits of highway safety and other important matters. On Missouri's highways, you may see troopers deliver new babies or change motorists' tires, and elsewhere in the state, members of the Patrol may be combating the trade and production of illegal narcotics.

In addition to these very important responsibilities to the citizens of the "Show Me State," the Missouri State Highway Patrol specializes in providing protection for Missouri's governor and managing the law enforcement needs of Missouri's gaming industry. The Patrol also maintains Drivers Examination Stations throughout the state and provides detailed analysis of crime and accident scenes through the use of their Crime Laboratory Unit, Aircraft Unit, and Traffic Division.

Although the troopers prefer calm and peaceful experiences while on duty, their jobs as law enforcement officers sometimes turn deadly when confrontation occurs with the violent criminal element. Each trooper is fully aware that her/his life may be on the line as 21 troopers have died defending the values of Missouri society. Vigilance is always a prerequisite for a trooper initiating a car stop or interrupting a crime in progress. So that no one will forget the supreme sacrifice that troopers have paid, a large picture of each trooper killed in the line of duty hangs in the Missouri State Highway Patrol General Headquarters Building in Jefferson City. These pictures are a solemn reminder that the law enforcement profession is fraught with danger.

Mr. Speaker, the troopers of the Missouri State Highway Patrol exemplify the highest tradition of duty and service to the protection of the citizens of Missouri. I am certain that all Members of the House will join me in expressing appreciation for their dedication.

HONORING REVEREND W.G. AND MARY TERRY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to rise before you today to speak on the behalf of two people who have made Christian Education their life's work. Each year, the Wolverine State Congress of Christian Education honors individuals for their commitment to Christian Education. On June 7, they will recognize the efforts of Reverend Dr. W.G. Terry, and his wife Mary.

W.G. Terry was born in Linden, Texas, and later moved to Henderson, Texas, early in his childhood. After graduating from high school in Henderson, Reverend Terry went on to obtain degrees from American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, TN; Arkansas Baptist College in Little Rock, AK; and Bishop College in Marshall, TX. It was in Little Rock that Reverend Terry also received his Doctorate of Divinity. Over the years, he has been directed by the Lord to pastorates in Little Rock; Mineola, TX; Dyersburg, TN; Jackson, TN; and finally New Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Flint, MI, where he has been the Pastor for the last 39 years. As Pastor, Reverend Terry operates as a spiritual leader, counselor, confidant, and community leader, among many other roles. He helped build the First Baptist Church in Jackson, Tennessee, and helped organize the Mississippi Valley Association School of Ministers. He purchased the New Zion building and added educational facilities. He has been recognized for distinction by American Baptist Theological Seminary, and by the Jackson NAACP as Father of the Year.

Reverend Terry has held many leadership positions in groups such as the Mississippi Valley District Congress, the Interracial Ministers' Alliance, and the Wolverine Baptist State Convention. After serving as the President of the Great Lakes Baptist Conference for 26 years, he was granted Emeritus status. He also serves as an instructor for the Flint Baptist Ministers' Alliance and the National Baptist Congress.

On November 2, 1945, W.G. Terry married Mary Hollins in Henderson, Texas. Mrs. Terry was born in Longview, Texas, and completed her schooling in Henderson. She attended Fisk University and Tennessee State College in Nashville, before receiving a degree from Arkansas Baptist College. Mary became a teacher in Texas and Tennessee, and was also a Vacation Bible School instructor for the East Texas District Baptist Congress. Along with her husband, she helped found the Tennessee Baptist Youth Encampment.

Mrs. Terry currently serves as Co-Director of Christian Education at New Zion Missionary Baptist Church. She also serves as an Instructor of Minister's Wives for the Great Lakes Baptist Congress and the Wolverine State Baptist Congress. She has been Program Director of the National Baptist Minister's Wives for more than 40 years. In addition, she and her husband have raised a wonderful daughter, and have two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher and seminarian, I am very proud of the work that Reverend W.G. and Mrs. Mary Terry have done to improve our academic and spiritual well being. It is because of people like them that the Flint community is a better place in which to live. I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in congratulating their achievements.

CELEBRATION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF LA PEÑA CULTURAL CENTER, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the establishment of La Peña a Cultural Center in Berkeley, California.

La Peña Cultural Center is a nationally and internationally respected multi-cultural community arts institution working for social change while presenting culturally specific art from diverse sectors of the community.

For the past quarter century, La Peña has raised the social and cultural consciousness of our community through projects that bring people together to work on transforming our future. La Peña mission is the belief that artists and cultural workers contribute to positive social change by creating understanding among people, by stimulating discussion and by presenting a powerful vision of the future.

Throughout the year, La Peña presents many educational programs that increase understanding of different cultures and encourages the development of all disciplines that keep alive our cultural roots and diverse heritages. La Peña also operates a multi-purpose

center that serves as a gathering place to support the Center's mission, as well as support the work of community organizations that are active in social justice.

To ensure La Peña's long term continuity and growth, the Center is launching an Endowment Campaign to raise $500,000 over the next three years. This capital base will generate an unencumbered income of $30,000 annually to support the Center's needs. As this capital base grows, funds generated by The Endowment will enable La Peña's many programs to thrive.

I proudly join people throughout the Bay Area in recognizing this momentous occasion of celebrating 25 years of extraordinary service by La Peña Cultural Center.

FREEDOM FOR THE SIKHS OF KHALISTAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the Council of Khalistan recently issued an open letter about the deplorable situation in Punjab, the Sikh homeland which declared its independence on October 7, 1987, as Khalistan.

The Sikhs are under attack from a militant Hindu organization called the RSS. The RSS was formed during World War II in support of the Fascists. It is the parent organization of the ruling BJP and many other organizations also come under its umbrella. Its agenda is to promote fundamentalist Hindu nationalism. Two members of the ruling BJP, which is a part of the RSS, were quoted in the newspapers as saying that everyone who lives in India should be Hindu or subservient to Hinduism.

Now the RSS is trying to form a satellite organization called the Rashtriya Sikh Sangat which is designed to subsume Sikhs under Hinduism and wipe out their religion. Since the ruling party is part of the RSS, it is implicitly part of this effort to eliminate the Sikh religion. As people who believe in freedom of religion, this assault on anyone's freedom of religion ought to concern all of us.

The recent massacre of 35 Sikhs in Chatti Singhpora is just another chapter in this campaign. Two recent investigations have proven that the Indian government was responsible for that massacre. There are still 50,000 Sikhs political prisoners rotting in Indian jails without charge or trial. The Indian government has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs. Punjab is a police state. The only way to end this campaign against the Sikhs is to support self-determination and freedom for Punjab, Khalistan.

Mr. Speaker, there are measures the United States can take to promote freedom for Khalistan and throughout South Asia. I urge the President to declare India a terrorist nation. We can cut off American aid and trade to India until all people there enjoy their basic human rights. And in accord with American principles, we must declare our support for self-determination for the people of Khalistan, the people of Kashmir, the people of Nagaland, and the other peoples and nations of South Asia. This can be achieved by allowing the people to vote in a free and fair plebiscite under international supervision on the question of independence. Such a plebiscite is similar to the periodic votes in Puerto Rico and Quebec on their political futures. This is how democratic nations do it and it is how great powers do it. If India wants to be taken seriously as a member of the family of democratic nations, it must allow self-determination and human rights for all peoples and nations within its artificial borders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place the Council of Khalistan's open letter on the situation in Punjab into the RECORD.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN, GURU GOBIND SINGH, THE TENTH MASTER,

Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

A SOVEREIGN KHALISTAN IS THE ONLY SOLUTION

ALL SIKH INSTITUTIONS AND PRESENT LEADERSHIP IN PUNJAB ARE UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTROL

Khalsa Ji: The militant Hindu fundamentalists of the RSS are now attacking the Sikh Nation. They are trying to insinuate themselves into the Sikh Nation by forming the ''Rashtriya Sikh Sangat.'' They are trying to bring Sikhs under the Hindu umbrella by any means necessary. The Sikh Nation must stay alert and fight back against these efforts.

The only way to stop these efforts is political power. Without political power, nations perish. If we cannot reclaim our lost sovereignty, the RSS will succeed in its efforts to wipe out the Sikh Nation and the Sikh religion. Every day, we pray ''Raj Kare Ga Khalsa.'' Do we mean it? A true Sikh cannot lie to Guru. If we mean what we say, we must do everything we can to establish Khalsa Raj.

The turmoil of the Akal Takht and the SGPC, and the other problems of the Sikh Nation are the result of the fact that we have lost the sovereignty that the Guru gave us. These problems have come about because the entire Sikh leadership and the Sikh institutions in Punjab are under Indian government control. We can only solve these problems by liberating our homeland, Khalistan.

Why are there still 50,000 Sikhs rotting in Indian jails without charge or trial? Why have the Sikh leaders in Punjab been silent about the murders of over 250,000 Sikhs at the hands of the Indian government? There is an Akali government and there are other Akali parties like Mann's Akali Dal. Why can't they start a Shantmai Morcha to free those political prisoners? Why can't they demand that Amnesty International be allowed into Punjab to conduct an independent human-rights investigation?

The government previously sent Professor Manjit Singh to destroy the Khalistan movement abroad. Now it has sent Simranjit Singh Mann. No Sikh leader who speaks for Khalistan will be allowed to leave the country and come here. There is moral degeneration of the Sikh character due to the lack of political power.

Four years ago, the Sikh leadership passed the Amritsar Declaration. It said that if India did not grant Punjab complete autonomy within six months, they would start a peaceful agitation for Khalistan. Four years later, Mann still supports the Amritsar Declaration. He still says that there should be a federation with India controlling defense, foreign affairs, and finances. These are the things that define your political status. The other Sikh leaders in Punjab have backed away from even that position. On February 12 at the celebration of Sant Bhindranwale's birthday, Mann opposed the speakers who spoke for Khalistan, saying that they spoke only for themselves and that Bhindranwale supported secularism.

The proposal for a federated India still keeps Hindustan in control. That is why Mann made it. At the Sikh Day parade, U.S. Congressman Major Owens raised slogans of ''Khalistan Zindabad,'' yet Mann would not even use the word Khalistan. He has long posed as a Khalistani. Even last year at the 300th anniversary celebration, he raised slogans of ''Khalistan Zindabad'' but now he has changed his stand. He, too, is clearly under government control. There is only one solution: a sovereign, free, and independent Khalistan, as declared on October 7, 1987. Only in a free Khalistan can Sikhs live in freedom, dignity, prosperity, and peace.

The Sikh Nation will not achieve its legitimate aspirations with any of the current political parties in Punjab. None of these parties will bring us a free Khalistan. Whether the Akalis, Congress, or the Akali Dal Mann is elected, elections under the Indian constitution will not free Khalistan and they will not end the slavery of the Sikh Nation and the corruption in the Punjab government. Badal made three promises to get elected: that he would release all political prisoners, that he would punish guilty police officers, and that he would appoint a commission to look into the excesses by the Indian government against the Sikh Nation. He could not even keep these modest promises. Instead, he put the heat on the People's Commission and shut it down.

The massacre of 35 Sikhs in Chatti Singhpora shows that without sovereignty, the Indian oppression of the Sikh Nation will continue. An investigation by the Ludhiana-based International Human Rights Organization, led by D.S. Gill, showed that the Indian government was responsible for the massacre. A recent report by the Justice Ajit Singh Bains, chairman of the Punjab Human Rights Organization, Sardar Inderjit Singh Jaijee, convenor of the Movement Against State Repression, and General Kartar Singh Gill, also found that the government counterinsurgency forces were responsible. This atrocity underlines the need for a sovereign, independent Khalistan.

Punjab is a police state. None of the political parties will bring us Khalistan. The Sikh Nation needs new leadership and a new party that are committed to liberating Khalistan. We need a Khalsa Raj Party. The Khalsa Raj Party should be committed to self-determination. It should demand freedom for Khalistan and any peaceful, democratic, nonviolent means should be used to achieve this goal, whether it is a plebiscite or any other democratic means.

The only way to escape Indian slavery is to liberate Khalistan. New Sikh leadership emerge to free the Sikh Nation. They should raise the slogan ''India Quit Khalistan'' and start a Shantmai Morcha until we achieve freedom. We have now seen how the Indian government controls Sikh institutions and the entire Sikh leadership in Punjab.

Unless the Sikh Nation brings back the Sikh spirit and fight for truth and justice, the Khalsa Panth will not prosper. Remember the Guru Ka Bag Morcha and the Jaito Morcha. We did it then and we can do it now. Only in a free Khalistan can the Sikh religion flourish. Only in a free Khalistan will Sikhs be able to live in freedom and dignity.

Only then can the Sikh Nation finally enjoy the glow of freedom that was promised to us so many years ago.

Khalsa Ji, the onus is on us. The time is now. We must start a Khalsa Raj Party and begin a Shantmai Morcha to liberate Khalistan. We must reclaim our lost sovereignty. New, young leadership which has dedication and the spirit of sacrifice must emerge. Support only these new leaders who are honest, dedicated, fearless, and committed to freedom for Khalistan. India is on the verge of disintegration. Kashmir is going to be free from Indian control. Let us make use of this opportunity to free Khalistan.

Sincerely,

DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,
President, Council of Khalistan.

TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX REPEAL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 3916, the Telephone Excise Tax Repeal Act. This tax is a regressive tax that now collects over $5 billion each year from local and long distance phone calls. The working families of this country deserve lower taxes and this tax repeal will benefit them the most. This tax cut is also an issue that people care about. I wish to express my appreciation to Robert Fuchs, a constituent from the 10th District of Ohio, for bringing this issue to my attention. This tax cut is fair and is long overdue.

The taxation of Americans is necessary to pay for the service of our government. The difficult question is how to structure these taxes. Regressive taxes, which levy taxes regardless of one's ability to pay, are not fair. The telephone tax is a regressive and unfair tax. Progressive taxes, which levy taxes proportional to one's ability to pay, are much fairer. The income tax is a type of progressive tax. I believe that the current budget surplus is large enough to consider repealing other regressive taxes that harrn lower-income Americans. As such, I remain committed to creating a more fair tax system.

TRIBUITE TO LARRY WILKINSON—EXTRAORDINARY LIBRARY ADVOCATE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize Larry Wilkinson for receiving the Extraordinary Library Advocate of the 20th Century award that is presented by the ALA/ALTA National Advocacy Honor Role. This award recognizes individuals who encourage and promote library services at both the state and national levels. Larry was one of five individuals chosen for this award.

Some of Larry's accomplishments, with regards to his library service, include initiating the inception of two public libraries in the State of Colorado. Perhaps his greatest achievement was the restoration of a former jailhouse into the current library in the town of Telluride. Today, Larry volunteers one day a week to continue his public passion and also serves on the Colorado Council of Library Development.

The many contributions that Larry has made have markedly improved the publics' access to information, especially in the Telluride area. Before Larry's involvement and the creation of the library, residents would have to travel to the city of Montrose in order to obtain access to literary materials. Thanks to Larry, that is no longer the case.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay tribute to Larry's efforts and to thank him for his work to provide access to information that is only available in public libraries. Larry is exceedingly worthy of this prestigious award and deserves the praise of this body.

WELLTON-MOHAWK TRANSFER ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2000

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today at the end of this long journey to fully support this legislation which transfers the title of the Gila Project/Wellton Mohawk Division facilities from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District.

I want to thank the Gentleman from Alaska, Chairman YOUNG, the Gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER, the Chairman of the Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power, Chairman DOOLITTLE, and the Ranking Member of that Subcommittee, Mr. DOOLEY, for their help in getting this legislation through the Subcommittee, through the full Resources Committee, and now on the Floor of the House.

I also want to thank my colleagues from Arizona for their help. Congressmen STUMP, HAYWORTH, and KOLBE joined me in introducing the legislation, and Congressman SHADEGG quickly joined them in seeing the wisdom of co-sponsorship. And in the other body, both Senators from Arizona joined to introduce the bill we are considering today.

The Gila project in Western Arizona was originally authorized for construction by President Roosevelt in June, 1937. Construction for the Wellton-Mohawk Division was started in August, 1949, and water from the Colorado River was turned onto the Wellton-Mohawk fields for the first time in May, 1952. The project was completed by June, 1957 and the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District fully repaid its project costs and was given its certificate of discharge on November 27, 1991. In 1998, the District and the Bureau of Reclamation signed a Memorandum of Agreement that covers the details of the transfer of title.

This bill, S. 356, which is virtually identical to the bill I introduced, H.R. 841, simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to carry out all provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement covering the transfer of title, including the authority to convey lands as required. It also requires the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Energy to continue to provide water and power as provided under existing contracts.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, this has been a long road, but we are finally ending the legislative journey. This is simple legislation which will help shrink the role of the Federal government and shift the responsibilities for ownership into the hands of local entities. In short, passage of this legislation will ensure a smoother and more efficient operation, which in turn will better serve the American taxpayer and the citizens of Southwest Arizona.

I ask that my colleagues support passage of S. 356 and I look forward to watching the President sign it into law.

TEXAS' CHILD HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Texas' Child Health Insurance Program.

Today, our children should not have to fight to get the health care coverage they deserve. I am sad to say, in Texas they do. A child born in the year 2000 is far more likely to grow up healthy and to reach adulthood than a child born in 1900 was. Over the past 100 years, our nation's scientific, technological, and financial resources have built the most advanced health care system in the world. But the doors of the health care system are not open to everyone.

Millions of children have inadequate medical care. Ensuring that every child in our nation receives the best possible health care must be a top priority for the nation. Unfortunately, not all children have benefited equally from the medical, public health, and public policy achievements of the 20th century. To a large extent, health status is still determined by race, language, culture, geography, and economics. In general, children in low-income communities get sick more often from preventable acute and infectious illnesses such as measles, conjunctivitis, and ear infections. Low-income children and teens are also more likely to suffer from chronic medical conditions such as diabetes and asthma, the leading cause of school absences. In fact, the sharpest increases in asthma rates are among urban minority children.

Despite the tremendous advances in medical technology and public health, millions of children have less of a chance to grow up healthy and strong because of unequal access to health care. Children without health insurance or a regular source of health care are most likely to seek care from emergency rooms and clinics, which have long waits to see a provider, limited follow-up, and little or

no health education about preventive strategies or ways to manage chronic illness. Compared with insured children, uninsured children are up to eight times less likely to have a regular source of care, four times more likely to delay seeking care, nearly three times less likely to have seen a provider in the past year, and five times more likely to use the emergency room as a regular place of care. There is no question that insurance is key to maintaining health.

Imagine one hundred children from Texas standing in front of you. Fifty-four of these children are insured through Private/Employer-based programs. Twenty-two are covered through Medicaid. Twenty-four are uninsured. This equals to about 1.4 million of the 6 million children in Texas without health insurance.

Now imagine one hundred children from all over the country standing in front of you. Sixty-four of these children are insured through Private/Employer-based programs. Twenty-one are covered through Medicaid. Fifteen are uninsured.

Why is it that Texas' percentage of uninsured children is higher than the national's average? The reason is due to a Texas government that chooses not to take advantage of government funding that will allow many children to be insured. As a matter of fact, Texas can expand its Medicaid coverage to the age of eighteen and cover those whose income is up to 300% of the Federal Poverty Level. Presently, Texas only covers children up to the age of eighteen and to those whose income is 100% of the Federal Poverty Level with Title XXI funds. If Texas expands Title XXI eligibility to only 200% Federal Poverty Level, like it has the choice to, then an additional 483,000 uninsured children would be eligible for insurance coverage. Over half of all states have expanded coverage to 200% or beyond.

Most states have expanded health insurance coverage to children using Title XXI funds. This coverage is provided through Medicaid expansions and/or separate insurance programs. Ten states offer Medicaid to those with an income up to 150% Federal Poverty Level. Texas falls within this category. Texas falls at the bottom. Our children fall at the bottom.

This should simply not be the case. The Texas government must not only strive to improve its average compared to the national average, but it must also strive to ensure all of its children adequate health care. The opportunity for Texas to make change is now. The Texas leadership must now show compassion to its future and provide a means for them to live healthy lives.

HONORING GAIL NOLIN

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, it gives me great pleasure to rise before you today on the behalf of the Waterford, Michigan School District, who will be honoring one of their own. On June 14, members of the school district, as well as family and friends, will gather to honor the career of Ms. Gail Nolin, who is retiring after 34 glorious years.

In 1966, Gail Nolin began her career with Waterford Schools, teaching third, fourth, and fifth grades at Cooley Elementary School. Gail's tenure at Cooley lasted 18 years. Gail brought with her many unique and creative opportunities for her students to learn, including painting a large map of Michigan in the school parking lot, and constructing a large rocket ship. Many times, she incorporated art and music in her lessons, giving her students early exposure to fine arts and a well-rounded curriculum. She later moved up to teach upper elementary, where she involved parents in presenting technology to students, and helped pilot the district's first elementary computer network, acting as systems operator with Gladys Baker.

In 1991, Gail began a new role within the District, that of Technology Consultant. She diligently worked along with Dick Elsholz and Randy Gross to implement a program that would allow third grade to fifth grade teachers to integrate computer technology into their curriculum. She served as a member of the Institutional Technology Planning Committee, and co-chaired the first elementary technology plan.

Gail not only had an accomplished academic career, but a political career that has spanned nearly three decades.

A member of the Waterford Education Association, Michigan Education Association, and National Education Association, Gail has always remained a member in good standing and a role model for her peers. She has served the WEA as a member of its Human Rights Commission and Negotiations Committee, as well as other leadership roles with the union. As a member of the MEA, Gail has been an executive officer since 1985, and also sits on the Staff Retirement Board and Legislative Committee. She has operated as the MEA representative to the NEA on several occasions.

Gail's strong belief in our democratic system has allowed her an audience with not only members of Congress, but senators, Cabinet members, and several presidents, on issues such as Title I and equal rights. Gail was invited to the White House by President Carter to participate in discussions regarding the drafting of women into the military.

These experiences also led her to a stint as an assistant to Congressman Bob Carr, and the opportunity in 1993, where President Clinton met and bowled with her eighth grade students.

Mr. Speaker, Gail Nolin is my educational colleague and my friend. For many years, I have benefitted from her insight, as has the entire Waterford community over the course of the last 34 years. She has always been a fighter for education, for she believes that a strong educational background is the basis toward improving the quality of life. I ask my colleagues to please join me in congratulating Gail Nolin on her retirement, and wishing her the very best in her future endeavors.

HONORING MR. MICHAEL HARVEY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize an exceptional man, Michael Harvey. In May, Mr. Harvey traveled to Washington D.C. to receive the ''Star of Life'' award, the highest honor presented to paramedics. Mr. Harvey received the award because of his dedicated service to his community and his fellow man as a paramedic. Mr. Harvey embodies the goals that this award stands for and we all can learn from the proud example he has set.

As you know Mr. Speaker, paramedics work tirelessly and selflessly to serve their fellow man. Mr. Harvey and his fellow paramedics are expected to perform in difficult—even perilous—situations on a daily basis. Mr. Harvey's service and sacrifice in his field clearly merit both the ''Star of Life'' award and the respect and admiration of this great body.

It is obvious why Mr. Harvey was chosen as the recipient of the ''Star of Life'' award. I think that we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his service to the State of Colorado. Due to Mr. Harvey's dedication, it is clear that Colorado is a better and safer place in which to live.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you and congratulations to Mike Harvey on this outstanding accomplishment. Your community, state and nation are all very proud of you, Mike. Keep up the good work.

SALUTE TO URSULA SHERMAN BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I salute, congratulate, and honor Ursula Sherman.

Ms. Sherman has been a founding and active Board member of Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS) for more than 29 years.

Ms. Sherman came to California in 1938 after her family spent five years in Paris as refugees from Nazi Germany. She learned the importance of volunteerism as an undergraduate at the University of Wisconsin and during her year as a researcher at the Nuremberg trials, where she fully grasped the concept that there but for the grace of God go I.

Ms. Sherman became an advocate for youth as a children's librarian and University of California at Berkeley visiting lecturer. In her ''other'' vocation as a community activist organizer, she worked hard at integrating Berkeley schools in the late sixties. She and members of the Jewish Community organized the Hillel Streetwork project, which later became Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency or BOSS. This organization continues to serve the homeless and mentally-disabled populations in the East Bay, thanks to her leadership 29 years ago.

In addition to her work in BOSS, Ms. Sherman is also a past or current board member

of such organizations as The Jewish Music Festival, The Traveling Jewish Theater, the American Jewish Congress of Northern California and the Berkeley Public Library Foundation.

In honor of Ms. Sherman's many contributions to our community, BOSS is hosting a Tea Ceremony in her honor at the Rose Garden Inn in Berkeley, California. Proceeds from this event will benefit BOSS's 21st Century Charitable Fund which is dedicated to ending poverty and homelessness in our community.

I proudly join the friends and colleagues of Ursula Sherman in recognizing her community leadership and activism, as well as celebrating her many years of extraordinary service to the people and organizations of the East Bay.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS FERNANDEZ

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lois Fernandez, president and co-founder of Odunde, a cultural organization that for 25 years has sponsored the Odunde Festival, one of Philadelphia's brightest cultural attractions and one of the largest African American festivals in the United States.

Odunde, which among the Yoruba of Nigeria means Happy New Year, is the greeting that first meets the more than 300,000 people who attend the Odunde festival. The festival transforms a 10-block area in the First Congressional District into a veritable West African marketplace complete with African, African American and Caribbean vendors selling crafts, clothing and food.

Those attending the festival can also take part in a traditional Yoruba ceremony that pays respect to Oshun, a Yoruba deity. The festival also offers a broad assortment of performances by musicians, dancers, singers and poets.

Ms. Fernandez has enriched our community by providing sorely needed education regarding the rich culture and history of Africa and the Africans of the diaspora.

For a quarter of a century Ms. Fernandez has been a formidable force for social change in our city and she has provided us with an invaluable cultural legacy.

HATE CRIMES

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, sitting on a bench, riding on a bus, or even walking down the street, a hate crime can occur anytime or any place. Hate crimes are acts of pure unadulterated evil, wronging someone because they are different. People should not and cannot live in fear because of their race, color, religion or sexual orientation; it is time that we take the strongest course of action to prevent these crimes.

Over the past decade the number of hate crimes has risen rapidly, consummating with 1999's ''summer of hate.'' If taking anything positive from this infamous period is possible it is, that we have not done enough to prevent such crimes. Committing a hate crime is the most serious of offenses. It is our duty to make the punishment severe enough to deter even the most prejudicial person from considering a crime of this size. We in Congress have the ability and the opportunity to prevent the possible consequences of bias from occurring.

Today, as we commemorate the second anniversary of James Byrd's tragic death, we must pledge upon ourselves to do everything in our power to reduce the number of hate crimes. No one should ever fall victim to a hate crime, or any other crime for that matter, and we must renew and maintain our focus of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act (H.R. 1082), to ensure that crimes cease.

IN HONOR OF UPSTANDING CITIZENS PHIL VARGAS, JOE VARGAS, KEN VARGAS, LUCY VARGAS PROUSE, JOSE VARGAS, LETICIA VARGAS ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a family of upstanding citizens. These men and women are being recognized for giving their lives in service to their country and their communities. Each one of them has demonstrated excellence in their fields and they continue to accumulate awards of merit and outstanding performance. These remarkable members of the Vargas family make their homes in Orange County, California.

Officer Phil Vargas, 31, was bom and graduated from high school in Anaheim, California. He joined the U.S. Marines and participated in Desert Storm. As a result of his actions, he received many awards and recognitions, including the Good Conduct Medal and the Kuwait Liberation Medal. Later, he joined the Anaheim Police Department where he has received various commendations in his role as a police officer including ''Rookie of the Year.''

Ken Vargas, 39, has lived in Orange County most of his life. He initially joined the Orange County Probation Department as a juvenile counselor. Today he is the manager of the Santa Ana Detention Facility, which has been recognized nationally for its efficient, humane, economical and practical methods of incarceration. In addition to his exemplary administrative skills, Mr. Vargas has served as an instructor at the Correctional Basic Academy and speaks at seminars all over the nation.

Sgt. Joe Vargas, 43, has served as a police officer for many years in Orange County. His career began at age 14 when he joined the Stanton Police Department Explorer Program. Today he is a Sergeant with the Anaheim Police Department and its Public Information Officer. Among his numerous merits are Police Officer of the Year and founder of several police organizations. He teaches a karate class to children every Friday.

Sgt. Lucy Vargas Prouse, 53, came to the United States as a child and has since become a proud U.S. citizen. She first joined the Riverside Sheriff's Department as a Correctional Deputy. She later was promoted to Correctional Sergeant and currently is a Supervisor at the Banning Correctional Facility. Her accolades include the Gold Star Award and recognition from the California Board of Corrections.

Officer Jose Vargas, 64, was born in Mexico and came to the United States as a teenager. As a young man he worked as a garbage truck driver while studying English at night. At age 30 he received his high school diploma. Three years later he became an American citizen and a police officer. He is now the Hispanic Affairs Officer for the Santa Ana Police Department. His hard work and dedication have earned him hundreds of commendations, including being selected as ''One of the 10 Best Cops in the USA'' by Parade Magazine.

Leticia Vargas, also born in Mexico, is a dynamic community activist who advocates for women, minorities and low-income residents. Her broad range of service includes seats on the Sheriff's Advisory Council and the District Attorney Hispanic Commission. In addition, she teaches young women about the rights and responsibilities of citizens and has worked with the Mexican American Arts Council developing programs to extend access of the arts to low income residents. She has served on several boards of directors such as the Legal Aid Society of Orange County, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Homeless Issues Task Force.

Each of these members of the Vargas family has answered the call of civic duty in a manner that is inspirational and worthy of recognition. They have achieved extraordinary feats even though many of them came from humble and modest beginnings. The Vargas family serves as a role model of dedication to community and country. I ask you to join with me today in commemorating this deserving family for the service which they have unselfishly given and continue to give.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ARMED SERVICES YMCA NATIONAL VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR DR. VIRGINIA M. MAHAN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Virginia M. Mahan of Waynesville, Missouri, was named Armed Services YMCA National Volunteer of the Year during the Thirteenth Annual Recognition Luncheon held on Thursday, May 11, 2000.

Dr. Mahan has been a volunteer for the Fort Leonard Wood Armed Services YMCA, where she is on the Board of Management and is a past Chairperson, since 1984. Among her many contributions, Dr. Mahan created a spin-off of Uncle Sam in the character of ''Aunt

Samantha.'' She is recognized in the Fort Leonard Wood area by her patriotic red, white and blue outfit. She appears frequently at community events, grand openings, birthday parties, and other events to raise money for the Armed Services YMCA.

Prior to her present involvement with the military, Dr. Mahan served as an officer in the United States Air Force. She also was the Deputy Public Affairs Officer and Community Relations Officer at Fort Leonard Wood for thirteen years. Additionally, she has been a teacher, civil servant and special education consultant. Dr. Mahan earned her doctorate in education from the University of Cincinnati in 1980. Currently, she is co-owner of a retail antique store and serves as an adjunct instructor at Drury University in Springfield, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Mahan is dedicated to the Pulaski County Armed Services YMCA and generously volunteers her time to ensure that members of our nation's Armed Forces—especially young enlisted members—enjoy a better quality of life. I know that all the Members of the House will join me in showing our appreciation for her commitment to our troops.

CONGRESSWOMAN LOIS CAPPS HONORED AS DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to my very distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOIS CAPPS, on her recognition as the Distinguished Alumni Award recipient this year at the University of California, Santa Barbara. LOIS CAPPS represents a large Congressional district that includes Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties.

Lois received a Master's Degree from UCSB in 1990, at a time when the prospects ever serving in Congress would have seemed very remote. A loving wife of a University Professor, our beloved former colleague Walter Capps, and mother of three wonderful children, LOIS earned her Master's degree from the School of Education in early childhood behavior. This degree improved her skills and leadership as a nurse in the Santa Barbara School District, as an instructor in early childhood development at the Santa Barbara Community College, and as the Director of Santa Barbara County's Teenage Pregnancy and Parenting Project and the Parent and Child Enrichment Center.

The past ten years since she received her Master's Degree at UCSB have seen many changes in her life. LOIS has earned the respect of her constituents and her colleagues here in Congress with her hard work, dedication to the family and childhood issues that are so important to her, and strength in times of unfathomable tragedy.

As a member of the House, LOIS has served as a member of the Science and International Relations Committees before assuming her current position on the Commerce Committee, where she serves on the Health and the Environment and Finance and Hazardous Material Subcommittees. LOIS has made her mark in legislation where she is a vigorous advocate for the Patient's Bill of Rights, Medicare reform, mental health, environment, high technology, and telecommunications issues.

LOIS' recognition by the UCSB Alumni Association is altogether appropriate. She was a member of the University community as a spouse, student, and now as a distinguished alumnus and Congressional representative. She loves the UCSB campus, and the campus community of faculty, administrators, and students return that affection many thousand-fold.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be proud of this recognition LOIS CAPPS has received in her district. She continues to bring distinction to our institution and our state, and is an inspiration to all whose lives she has touched.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREATER FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BART GORDON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the 100th year of existence of the Greater First Baptist Church of Lewisburg, Tennessee. The congregation will celebrate the church's 100th anniversary on Sunday, June 25, 2000.

The church was first erected in 1900 as a one-room building heated with wood and coal. In 1959 the church underwent a much-needed expansion and renovation project under the guidance of the Rev. W.P. Johnson, who was called to pastor the church in September 1941. Johnson's son, the Rev. Herbert Johnson, took over as pastor of Greater First Baptist Church in September 1997. The elder Johnson now serves as the church's pastor emeritus.

The church has served its community and congregation well for an entire century, a time during which our nation struggled through much change and innovation. Through those many years, though, Greater First Baptist Church never faltered in its commitment to bring the Lord's word to the people.

Lewisburg is a much stronger community because of the work of the church and its congregation. I congratulate the congregation's perseverance and am sure the church will be just as strong during its next 100 years of service.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE ELMER W. ROGOZINSKI

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Elmer W. Rogozinski, who passed away on June 5, 2000.

Elmer Rogozinski was born on May 14, 1918 to James and Martha Rogozinski and was the oldest of their five children. Elmer Rogozinski graduated from East Tech High School, and then studied at the Cooper School of Art. During World War II, Elmer Rogozinski served for four years with the 9th Air Force as a radio operator. He married Kay Sot in 1947, and together they had two daughters, Diane and Janice.

Elmer Rogozinski was an active member of St. John Cantius church since 1947. He was a Mass server and committeeman, as well as a member of the St. John Cantius Mom's & Dad's Club. In 1958 he joined the 4th Degree Bishop O'Reilly of the Knights of Columbus as a member of the Color Corp. Since 1961, he served as the scribe for the Knights of Columbus Trinity Council paper, the Recorder. In 1963, Elmer Rogozinski was the Trinity Council Knight of the Year, and in 1984 he was the 4th Degree Bishop O'Reilly Knight of the Year.

Elmer Rogozinski was a man who enjoyed the little things in life. He bowled in the Trinity Council bowling league since the 1960s. Elmer loved to go bike riding and play baseball with his four grandchildren. He enjoyed packing food bags at the Tremont Hunger Center and teaching art classes during the summer to young children at St. John Cantius.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in paying tribute to Elmer W. Rogozinski, a great man whose loving and giving nature are an example to us all.

SECURITY INTERESTS IN COPYRIGHTS FINANCING ACT

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, this statement was to be included in the Congressional Record with the introduction of H.R. 4351, the ''Security Interests in Copyrights Financing Act'' which was introduced on the floor on May 2, 2000.

I was pleased to introduce the ''Security Interests in Copyrights Financing Act'' with the distinguished representative from Virginia, Mr. Boucher.

This simple bill is focusing on curing a major source of legal uncertainty regarding the ability of owners of valuable copyrights to leverage that value as a source of working capital. Resolving this in a timely manner is becoming very important, and should not wait on years of further court decisions—at the end of which Congressional clarification would probably still be required.

Intellectual Property (IP), including copyrights, is becoming an ever-larger portion of the Nation's total wealth, and new methodologies for objectively valuing these assets are coming into the marketplace. Once it can be valued in a standardized manner, IP can secure a loan as well as any tangible property.

At the same time, other trends make resolving this uncertainty a pressing issue.

First, most bankruptcy experts expect a coming wave of ''dot-com'' filings as some Internet related firms find that their business model is terminally flawed. The only valuable asset that most of these firms have is intellectual property, and it would be best for all parties in interest if the issue of whether or not

their copyrighted or copyrightable IP had been secured under a UCC filing was clearly resolved, and not a matter of litigation in a variety of circuits. The value of these assets can wither quickly if they are not being utilized in the fast-moving technology sector, but that is just what will happen if ownership is contested through long court battles. That will be to the detriment of all parties in interest to these insolvency proceedings.

Second, some of these firms can avoid insolvency, even in an emerging era of tightened equity financing, if they can borrow against their copyright assets: but their ability to do so is clouded by the current legal uncertainty.

Finally, many firms may find that a developing market for IP-secured loans offers an attractive alternative to equity financing, both in regards to total borrowing costs as well as to retention of ownership in valuable assets.

Until a decade ago, it was the general legal view that copyrights, like other intellectual property, were within the general intangibles category under the Uniform Commercial Code, and could be secured as loan collateral through a UCC–I filing with the Secretary of State in which a borrower resided. However, several 9th Circuit bankruptcy court decisions have put this whole area under a cloud. The 1990 Peregrine Entertainment decision held that the Copyright Act preempts all state law, including the UCC. Then, in 1997, the Avalon Software decision held that a security interest in copyrightable material, even if it had not been registered with the Copyright Office, could only be secured by a Copyright Office filing. Even within the 9th Circuit, the law has become more unsettled with the 1999 World Power decision, in which a different bankruptcy judge held that a loan could be secured in copyrightable but unregistered material through a UCC filing, directly contradicting the Avalon decision. However, even the World Power decision offers little comfort to lenders, since their lien would be lost if the material's owner registered it with the Copyright Office.

There are many reasons why utilizing the copyright registration system is inappropriate and ill suited to the perfection of a security interest. The fundamental reason, of course, is that the UCC and the Copyright Act address disparate and largely incompatible goals. But there are many other practical reasons, including:

- A UCC filing quickly provides notice to other parties that a security interest has been taken in the material, whereas it can take months before the Copyright Office provides such public notice to third parties.
- A UCC filing is easy for others to locate, as it filed under the debtor's name in their state of doing business; whereas copyright filings are listed under the name or number of the registered work and are consequently difficult for lenders to locate.
- Commercial law has long incorporated the concept of a "blanket lien" so that, for example, a lender that, through a single UCC filing, has secured a lien on version 1.0 of software will see that lien carry over to a subsequent version that enjoys marketplace success. Copyright law, however, requires a separate registration for each version and, consequently, a separate filing by a lender on each separate copyright.
- Borrowers may wish to obtain credit against material so that it can be developed to a state in which it is ready to be copyrighted and then marketed. Or they may wish to avoid registration so that, for example, they do not have to reveal a significant portion of software source code. Yet, since a lender can only register a lien with the Copyright Office against material that has already been copyrighted, their access to debt financing will be cut off in these scenarios.

Mr. Speaker, last year my esteemed colleague, Rep. Coble, held a hearing in his Courts and Intellectual Property Subcommittee on a predecessor, draft version of the bill that I have introduced. Certain objections were raised against that earlier version, primarily on the grounds that it could have been interpreted to allow state law to prevail over the Copyright Act in certain instances. This new proposal has been narrowed and perfected to avoid such a result. Under H.R. 4351, the UCC will only govern a priority contest between a UCC security interest and a lien creditor. That is, creditors who have perfected a security interest in copyright material via a UCC filing will prevail over lien creditors or a trustee in bankruptcy, but will remain subordinate to the rights of other transferees of interests in copyrights under the Copyright Act. This will return the system to its pre-Peregrine state and provide the same means of securing interests in copyrights that currently exists for patents and trademarks.

The wisdom of this carefully targeted approach was attested to at last year's hearing. For example, Marybeth Peters, the Register of Copyrights, testified that "It may make sense to recognize perfection of security interests in copyrights at the state level for the limited purpose of allocating rights among lien creditors."

Mr. Speaker, while this is a simple bill, it addresses the complex intersection of Federal copyright and bankruptcy law, as well as state commercial law. It also affects both the entire secured lending industry, both bank and nonbank, as well as those industries with substantial copyright interests, including the software and motion picture industries. My purpose in introducing this bill is to stimulate a productive dialogue that, hopefully, will lead to a near-term resolution of this matter.

I know that other groups, including a task force of the American Bar Association, have proposed to address this issue in the context of far more complex, comprehensive, and controversial legislation that would substantially revamp the Federal intellectual property laws and alter their relationship to state commercial law. I do not know if such an ambitious project is required, but I certainly know that it is not the kind of undertaking that can be accomplished in this Congress, and perhaps not even in the next.

My goal is simple: To avoid years of needless litigation while resolving a problem that prevents owners of copyright material from leveraging its value as a source of financing. It is my hope that, working with my colleagues and all the affected industries, we can reach quick agreement on a means of achieving that goal.

HONORING THE FAST PITCHING GIRL'S SOFTBALL TEAM, THE GAINSVILLE GATORS FROM NORTH CENTRAL, FLORIDA

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House a great achievement by the Gainesville Gators, a girls fast pitch softball team from North Central Florida. The weekend of May 27th and 28th, the Gainesville Gators won the "Commotion by the Ocean" National Softball Association Tournament. This victory qualifies the Gainesville Gators for this year's National Softball Association National Tournament. I would like to congratulate the Gators and all of the other teams that provided such fierce competition in this tournament.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Barry Adams, wrote an article describing the Gainesville Gators' win, which I will make part of the record at this point.

THE GAINESVILLE GATORS RIDE THE WAVE TO A WIN IN THE COMMOTION BY THE OCEAN NSA TOURNAMENT.

The weekend of May 27 and 28th saw the start of the summers first fastpitch softball tournaments. The winner from this tournament would qualify for this years National Softball Association National tournament. The day started out at 9:00 a.m. on Saturday, with the first game between the Gainesville Gators traveling Softball Team and the North Florida Beach All-Stars. The game was won by the Gainesville Gators 3-2. The next game would pit the Gainesville Gators against the Noreasters, the local host for this tournament, and started at 12:00 p.m. This game was won by the Noreasters 4-3.

This now had the Gainesville Gators at 1-1 for the tournament. The third game started at 4:30 p.m. between the Gainesville Gators and Tsumani, who the previous week won their first tournament. The Gainesville Gators would prevail with the score being 5-2. The Gainesville Gators record was now 2-1 and would seed them as number 3 for the Sunday tournament Championship games. Sunday started early for the Gainesville Gators, the first game would be at 9:00 a.m. and would pit the team against the NF Beach All-stars, whom the Gainesville Gators had defeated in their first game. In this action the Gainesville Gators again prevailed by defeating the All- stars and would advance to the second game of the day. In this type of tournament if you lose you go home, so the mood of the team was to win one game at a time. Their toughest competition would be the next game. This would pit the Gainesville Gators against the undefeated Jax Attack team and the number one seed in the tournament, based on the previous days performance. This would be the second game of the day for the Gainesville Gators and the first for Jax Attack. In getting to the number one seed the Jax Attack had allowed less than 4 total runs in their previous 3 games.

This would be a challenge for the Gainesville Gators. They accepted the challenge in defeating the Jax Attack 5-2 and would advance to the Championship Game between them and the Noreasters, the home team and the only team to defeat the Gainesville

Gators during the tournament. The game was played with the results being in favor of the Gainesville Gators who would win 6-5 and in doing so assure themselves the Tournament Champions and an automatic bid to the NSA National Tournament. The Gainesville Gators had outstanding pitching by, Cassandra Sparks, Miranda Lovvorn, Annie Voyles and Kerri Stroh. The infield was stingy in giving up hits, with third base being covered by Jessica Howell and Shanna Gearner, Shortstop by Dana Osborne, and Montie Adams, Second base was bolstered by Jena Rowland and Cassandra Sparks, with First base being covered by Annie Voyles and Rekeesha Duncan. The outfielders provided many great plays and kept the Gainesville Gators in most of the games with their fielding. Right field was staffed by Alicia Gray, Melissa Fairbrother, Center field was covered by Melissa Fairbrother and Tiffany Goode, Left Field was covered by Montie Adams and Shanna Gearner. Catching was handled by Tiffany Goode, Alicia Gray and Annie Voyles. The coaching Staff, Head Coach Teresa Kraus, Assistant Coach David Sparks and Kelly Stroh were proud of the accomplishments of the team with the playing, hitting and overall skills displayed over the weekend.

Rekeesha Duncan became the power during two of the games, with a fence clearing home run that sealed the victory over the number 1 seed, Jax Attack and a hit to the fence in the Championship game.

All the players were successful in getting hits at critical times and stealing bases. Overall the team provided the hitting and fielding at the critical times. The Gainesville Gators finished the tournament with a record of 5-1. The team consists of girls from all over the surrounding areas of Gainesville. They run from Lawtey, Lulu, Starke, Gainesville, Bronson, Inglis, Williston, Archer, Providence and Lake Butler, Florida.

The team Coaches: Head Coach, Teresa Kraus; Asst Coach, David Sparks; and Asst Coach, Kelly Stroh.

Players:

Montie Adams, Redeesha Duncan, Melissa Fairbrother, Alicia Gray, Shanna Gearner, Tiffany Goode, Jessica Howell, Miranda Lovvorn, Dana Osborne, Jena Rowland, Cassandra Sparks, Kerry Stroh, and Annie Voyles

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM G. MOLL

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to William G. Moll, a good friend, who will receive the 2000 Silver Medal Award from the American Advertising Federation on June 13, 2000. Bill has been selected for this prestigious award for his outstanding contributions to the advertising industry. Bill's accomplishments have advanced the standards for creative excellence and social concern.

Bill graduated from Southeast Missouri State University, where he received a Bachelor of Science in Education. He went on to earn his Master of Arts from the University of Texas at Austin, where he studied Communications and Education.

Since 1992, Bill has been President and General Manager of W-KRC-TV, Cincinnati. I've had the opportunity to work with him through the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, where he has been a leader in developing one of the most aggressive anti-drug local media campaigns in the country. From 1989-1992, Bill was the President and General Manager at WINBC-TV, New York. From 1987-1989, he was President and Chief Executive Officer at the Television Bureau of Advertising, the television industry's marketing trade association. Bill also served at Harte-Hanks Communication, Inc. as President and CEO; State Mutual Broadcasting Co., Inc. as Vice President and General Manager; and as Station Manager at Southwest Texas Educational Television Corporation. He began his broadcast work as a radio announcer in 1954. From 1958-1961, he worked as a television news anchor and morning show host.

Bill is very active in the community. In addition to his work with the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, he continues to dedicate time as Chairman of the Board of the Dan Beard Council of the Boy Scouts of America; as a Member of the Board of Directors for the National Conference for Community and Justice; as Chair of the Advisory Panel for the University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music, Electronic Media Division; as President of the Board for the Neediest Kids of All; and as a Member of the Board for the Cincinnati Arts Association. Bill has also helped to support Big Brothers and Big Sisters; Scouting for Food and Clothing; Family Cancer Care; and the United Negro College Fund, among others.

Bill and his wife, Marilyn Lewis Moll, have two sons and two grandchildren. All of us in the Cincinnati area appreciate Bill's contributions to our community, and we congratulate him on receiving the 2000 Silver Medal Award.

HONORING THE MAKE-A-WISH FOUNDATION

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, in today I salute an organization that has been making wishes come true for two decades. This year marks the 20th Anniversary of the Make-A-Wish Foundation, an organization that fulfills the wishes of children fighting life-threatening illnesses. This organization's sole purpose is to bring happiness to children who confront harsh realities.

Eighty-thousand children worldwide have had their wishes fulfilled by the Make-A-Wish Foundation. In Maryland alone, more than 1,200 children have had wishes fulfilled. This organization understands the fragility of life, and the wishes they grant are a true gesture of humanity.

I think fondly of the way they helped one of my own constituents. Chris Palmer of Cheverly, Maryland was diagnosed with Sickle Cell Anemia as a baby. The Make-A-Wish Foundation of the Mid-Atlantic, fulfilled a wish for Chris in November, 1998. 1, along with Chris and his family are very grateful to the Make-A-Wish Foundation for all they have given him.

I am proud of Chris Palmer's courageous fight with his illness. I commend the Make-A-Wish Foundation's devotion in bringing happiness to children like him. I also salute the many volunteers and donors who support and make up the backbone of the Make-A-Wish Foundation.

I invite those interested in learning more about the Foundation to contact them at 1–800–722–9474 or on the internet at www.wish.org.

DAY OF PORTUGAL

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a very important community in the 18th Congressional District. On Saturday, June 9, 2000, the Portuguese community will celebrate the Day of Portugal in Hilmar, California.

The Central Valley of California has long been a home for many from the Azores region of Portugal. Our communities have been enriched by the contributions of the Portuguese community. In honor of this distinguished celebration, three mayors from Portugal will be in attendance to participate in honor of the Portuguese culture. The mayors—Jorge Manuel Perira Rodrigues, President-Camara Municipal da Madalena; Manuel Joaquim Neves da Costa, President-Camara Municipal das Roque do Pico; and Eng. Claudio Gomes Lopes, President-Camara Municipal das Lajes do Pico—have traveled to the Central Valley of California for this celebration.

Many families have immigrated from Pico to the Merced County area over the years. Many have achieved prominent status in the areas of business, education, and politics. These families have maintained close ties to Pico and the Azores.

I consider it an honor and privilege to recognize the Day of Portugal and the special guests who have traveled so far to share it with our community.

HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in calling for the prompt scheduling of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

It is unconscionable that two years to the day since the shocking murder of James Byrd, Jr., we still have not been able to consider legislation that will help us better prosecute and, more importantly, help prevent the commission of hate crimes. Sadly, since the senseless murder of Mr. Byrd, the news has continued to be filled with stories of terrible crimes being committed against people just because of who they are—the murder of Matthew Shepard, a gay college student, the murder of a Filipino-American postal worker, Joseph Illeto, and the wounding of children and

others at a Los Angeles Jewish community center, and less than two months ago in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania the murder of five people including an African American man, a Jewish woman, two Asian Americans and an Indian man. And these are just the incidents that made the headlines. We never even hear about the thousands of other hate crimes that, for whatever reason, go uncovered by the media or are not reported to law enforcement officials.

As elected leaders, it is incumbent upon us to set an example not just in expressing our outrage about these crimes, but by putting new teeth into our anti-hate crime law enforcement activities. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act would ensure that hate crime protections are extended to all Americans and would provide resources to local law enforcement agencies who must investigate and prosecute hate crimes in their communities. We must take this important step to send the message that no one should have to live in fear simply for being who they are.

In fact, we came very close the past two years to getting the Hate Crimes Protection Act enacted but could not in the face of Republican Leadership opposition. So, once again, I call upon them to drop their opposition and allow Hate Crimes Protection Act supporters to have the opportunity to make their case on the House floor and pass this critical legislation. Continued inaction is a disgrace to the memory of all hate crimes victims and to their families. It is also a disgrace upon us and who we are as a people.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF WEST POINT LAKE AND DAM IN TROUP COUNTY, GEORGIA

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor today to recognize the West Point Dam and Lake Project in West Point, Georgia. On June 17, 2000, the U.S. Corps of Engineers will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the West Point Dam and Lake Project.

Construction of the West Point Dam and Lake Project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, for the purposes of flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation, fish and wildlife development and downstream navigation. Later, water quality was added as an authorized project purpose. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers began construction of the project in December 1965. Impoundment of the lake began in October of 1974, and the project was dedicated with a formal ceremony held at the dam on June 7, 1975.

West Point Project continues to provide substantial benefits to the region. It protects residences and businesses along the Chattahoochee River downstream from flooding, and provides low-cost electric power during periods of peak demand. It also provides a water source for downstream navigation along the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint Rivers Waterway.

There are over 10,000 acres of intensively managed wildlife habitat on the lake, as well as 38 public recreational areas for the outdoor enthusiast. The lake hosts an average of over 2 million visitors each year who come to enjoy multiple recreational opportunities such as camping, boating, picnicking, fishing, hunting, and more. It provides an enhanced quality of life to those who live on or near its shoreline.

West Point Project's 25-year history of public service is worthy of commemoration. It has been a pleasure to work closely with the citizens and authorities who keep West Point Lake and Dam Project in excellent condition.

The true spirit of public service and cooperation at West Point Lake is exemplified by the West Point Lake Task Force, chaired by Ken Manning and co-chaired by Dr. Art Holbrook and Dr. Harry McGinnis. The Task Force provides a vital, credible, and active avenue for constituents of the Seventh District to bring matters of concern to the attention of the Corps of Engineers. This group has also served our community by providing beneficial information to help as we strive to understand the complexities of this most valuable natural resource.

The cooperative spirit in which the Corps of Engineers works with our Task Force and with the local government, is exemplified by Eddie Sosebee in LaGrange, Colonel David Norwood in Mobile, Alabama, and Dr. Joseph Westphal, Assistant Secretary of the Army, in Washington, D.C.

HONORING THEODORE AND MAXINE ALBERS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to honor Theodore and Maxine Albers for being recognized by the Mesa County Civic Forum for their lifetime of contributions to Mesa County. The Civic Forum's mission is to promote citizen influence regarding the important issues affecting Mesa County's quality of life through better understanding, objective, non-partisan dialogue, and support for citizen action. Without question, Theodore and Maxine have upheld this mission to its fullest extent and are distinguished role models that every citizen should seek to emulate.

Theodore and Maxine have a longstanding record of reaching out to the Grand Junction community. They have played an active role in numerous community organizations throughout their years as residents in the area. Together, they have worked in both the public and private sectors of the local economy and, most notably, have been extremely influential in the field of education, particularly at Mesa State College. In 1992, Mesa State College honored the couple by giving them the Distinguished Service Award, naming Albers Hall in their honor and forming the Albers Scholarship Fund as part of the Mesa State College Foundation.

The former President of Mesa State College from 1970–74, Theodore currently sits on the Mesa State College Board of Trustees and is an active member in such organizations as Club 20 and the Lions Club. Maxine served with great distinction as a Mesa County Commissioner from 1974–1988 and today is a member of the Women's Foundation of the Colorado Advisory Council and the Mesa County Republican Women. These are but a hand-full of the literally dozens of community causes to which the Albers have dedicated their time and energies.

Mr. Speaker, the active role that the Albers have played in Grand Junction has contributed immeasurably to the betterment of our community. The Civic Forum plays a crucial role in the community and Theodore and Maxine Albers embody the ideals of service and sacrifice that this distinguished organization promotes.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the Albers eminently deserve the thanks and praise of this body. Colorado is clearly a better place for having known these outstanding Americans.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOUGLAS ISCOVITZ

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Mr. Douglas Iscovitz, of Weston, Florida. I am very pleased to say that Douglas was recently named the Florida Principal of the Year by the Florida Association of Secondary Administrators and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The selection process for this distinction is an arduous one. After having been nominated for the award, the first-round finalists must submit paper-work detailing school accomplishments; the principal's track record of dealing with students, staff, and the school; the principal's ability to solve academic and social problems; community involvement; and positive school climate. After closely examining his work, it is clear that Douglas' accomplishments exemplify the tenets espoused by the Florida Principal of the Year award.

As the Principal of Indian Ridge Middle School, Douglas has founded new programs and encouraged students to excel in existing growth fostering programs. In this sense he has taken a very active role in his school. His most meritorious program is the "Write On America!" project, a project in which students write to prominent people who have made significant contributions to the greatness of our nation. Requesting an autographed photo, inspiring messages, and words of advice, the "Write on America!" program has proven itself to be a wonderful way to teach Indian Ridge Middle School students about history and writing. It is clear that Douglas' efforts have made a lasting impression on those in the school and in the community as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Douglas Iscovitz for his extraordinary achievements and exemplary effort in bettering the Indian Ridge Middle School. It is truly an honor to be named the Florida Principal of the Year, and it is an honor for the residents of South

Florida to be able to call him one of our own. Indeed, Douglas has made a remarkable impact on the students at Indian Ridge Middle School. His accomplishments are something that both he and the entire state of Florida can be proud of.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF SONAM ZOKSANG SEEK TO PRESERVE TIBETAN CULTURE AND IDENTITY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago in the Cannon Rotunda, we had the pleasure of viewing a magnificent exhibit of the photographs of Sonam Zoksang, a Tibetan photographer who has sought to use his photographic art and his considerable skill to preserve Tibetan culture and identity.

Sonam Zoksang was born in the small Tibetan village of Kyirong, but his parents fled to India just a month after he was born. He made the first visit to the country of his birth in 1993 when he was 33 years old. As a result of that visit, he made it his goal to capture the devastation that his people have experienced on film for all the world to see. Since that first visit to Tibet in 1993, he has been compelled to return each year.

Mr. Speaker, over the last seven years, Mr. Zoksang has seen the situation in Tibet worsen dramatically. The Chinese government has given incentives to non-Tibetan Han Chinese to encourage them to move into Tibet, and increasingly this has made Tibetans a minority in their own land. The growth in Chinese immigrants has increased Sonam's greatest concern for the future of Tibet—the children. He states that in ''addition to all the problems they have in common with Tibetans in general, there is little or no educational opportunity for them in Tibet. Every year hundreds of Tibetan children risk their lives to escape to India, crossing the Himalayas on foot in the frigid winter to taste the air of freedom.''

In explaining his photographs, Sonam Zoksang said: ''I feel very strongly that many young Tibetans have no hope, no dreams, and no future to live for. No Tibetans seem to be truly happy with their situation, and moreover, they feel threatened with their very extinction.'' In an effort to preserve the culture of the Tibetan people, Sonam Zoksang has risked his life to document the changes taking place inside Tibet. The Chinese would refuse him a visa to enter the Country, so he has had to risk his life and his freedom in order to record through his photographs the traditional culture and the rapid and systematic way in which it is being destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Sonam Zoksang for his outstanding photographs and the great contribution which his work has made to preserve Tibetan culture and to strengthen the identity of the Tibetan people.

TRIBUTE TO HILLTOP—50 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Hilltop Community Resources Inc., an organization that provides a range of invaluable services to the residents of Mesa County who are in need of special assistance and care, as they celebrate their 50th birthday. In recognition of this tremendous landmark and Hilltop's considerable efforts to improve life for those who are less fortunate, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this tremendous organization.

Hilltop originated as the Mesa County Society for Crippled Children and Adults in 1950, offering outpatient services for people with disabilities. In the time since, Hilltop has incorporated a number of helpful services to assist its patients with their ailments and needs. Hilltop creates independent living communities that provide care and comfort for their citizens and offer the Elder Care/Assisted Living program that ensures elderly residents the opportunity to stay active in their daily lifestyle with the assistance of the Hilltop staff. In all, Hilltop can be credited with helping over 12,000 Mesa County residents a year.

One notable person who has had a dramatic impact on the success of Hilltop is its current Chief Executive Officer, Sally Schaefer. Sally has been the driving force behind Hilltop's dedicated effort to put forth a helping hand to needy citizens in the Grand Valley for nearly two decades. She has initiated numerous outreach programs and, most notably, created a 158-unit retirement and assisted living facility. Ms. Schaefer's care and compassion for those in need of assistance is evident in the effort she has put forth during her career at Hilltop. Her hard work and dedication are emblematic of the role that Hilltop plays in the Grand Junction community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful privilege and honor to salute the 50th anniversary of Hilltop Community Resources Inc. I am proud to represent a district that has an organization of this stature within its boundaries. The invaluable services that Hilltop provides bring joy and dignity to the lives of the less fortunate, offering them hope and putting a smile on their face.

TRIBUTE TO DUSTY BUSS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to commend Dusty Buss for his efforts that helped save the life of 7-year-old Tia Creasy. Dusty, a 16-year-old sophomore at Brown County High School in Mt. Sterling, IL, was dropping his sister off at school as Cathy Creasy was dropping off her daughter, Tia, in front of him.

As Cathy drove away she was unaware that Tia's jacket was caught in the door causing her to begin dragging her daughter alongside the car. On seeing this Dusty got out of his car and was able to get in front of Cathy's car before serious injuries could occur.

Dusty did a very honorable and courageous act. I am very proud of his Good Samaritan attitude, which makes him a hero to us all.

IN HONOR OF THE WOOD FAMILY, THE TOWN OF HARRISON, NJ FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great family—a great American family. The Wood family is being honored as the family of the year by the Town of Harrison, New Jersey, and I am very proud to honor them for their contribution to their community.

The Harrison Family of the year has its roots in the Martin family originally from Brooklyn, NY and the Wood family originally from Newark. Robert and Rachel Martin's family has lived in the Town of Harrison since 1910, and William and Esther Wood's family since 1919.

After Robert and Rachel's daughter, Margaret, met William and Esther's son, Harold, in 1938, they were married, and began a family.

Harold and Margaret Wood had eight girls and four boys. Of their twelve children, five still live in Harrison. Harrison is currently home to five of Margaret's children, seven grandchildren, and nine great grandchildren. In all, Margaret has thirty-two grandchildren and forty great grandchildren.

The Wood children have an enduring love for this country, a love instilled in them by their father, Harold Wood who, having served in the Navy in WWII, understood the power and value of community and patriotism. He lived in Harrison all his life until his death in 1996.

For the pride they show in America, and for the contributions they have made to the Town of Harrison, New Jersey, I honor and praise the Wood family.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Wood family for being the Town of Harrison's family of the year.

RECOGNIZING GUAM POLICE DEPARTMENT'S POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR AND CIVILIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to recognize Guam Police Department's Police Officer of the Year and Civilian of the Year. These awards are presented annually to the top employees of the Guam Police Department (GPD). Police

Officer III John A. Bagaforo was named Police Officer of the Year while Ms. Karen Guerrero was honored as Civilian of the Year.

Officer John A. Bagaforo is a 1980 graduate of Pearl City High School in Hawaii. He moved to Guam in 1989 with the intention of joining the Guam Police Department. He commenced service as a police recruit in October 1990, and graduated in May 1991. He was initially assigned as a patrol officer with the Northern Precinct Command—later being selected to be part of the Northern Precinct task force to counteract gang activity. This is in addition to his duties with the precinct's patrol operations.

John was moved to the Central Precinct Command in 1992, where he was assigned to the task force on robbery suppression. Later that year, he was transferred to the Juvenile Investigation Section with a collateral assignment to the Department of Education Task Force. He was reassigned to patrol duty in 1994 and served in this capacity until 1996, when he was transferred to the GPD Drug Task Force which operated under the auspices of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). As a member of this task force, John facilitated contact with confidential informants, identified drug targets, formulated operational plans, authored search warrants, conducted drug buys, secured evidence, effectuated arrests and testified as an expert witness in both federal and local courts. In 1997, he was deputized and received his DEA credentials as a sworn Task Force Agent. John currently serves as a shift supervisor for the Tamuning/Tumon Precinct Command, a position he has held since November 1999.

GPD's Civilian of the Year, Karen E. Guerrero. Karen has worked in different capacities within GPD's administrative divisions since March 1985.

Initially assigned to the general maintenance section of the department's Support Division, she was placed in charge of building, equipment and vehicle maintenance. In 1992, she was transferred to the Operations Division. As a secretary for the division, Karen took on further administrative and record keeping responsibilities. She provided assistance with office correspondence, reports, training and budget matters. From April 1992, until March 1999, Karen worked for the legal section under the Chiefs Office. During the seven years she worked in this section, she performed a host of clerical and administrative duties. She also played a crucial role in office support, procurement and record keeping.

Karen, on different occasions, also worked at the payroll section and the Records & ID section of GPD's Administration Division. While with these sections, she worked with payroll and personnel matters. Having been with the Records & ID section since March, 1999, she has been involved in procedural development, staffing and the facilitation of public services on a supervisory level.

Karen is a graduate of John F. Kennedy High School in Tumon, Guam. She took part in the business administration program while attending the Western Pacific Business College and was a recipient of the Pedro "Doc" Sanchez Scholarship at the University of Guam where she majored in Public Administration.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I congratulate John and Karen for having been named as GPD's Police Officer and Civilian of the Year. Through their diligence and dedication to their duties at the Guam Police Department, John and Karen have made great contributions towards the safety and protection of our island's residents. I urge them to keep up the good work!

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE: THE ALZHEIMER'S CLINICAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation for the language contained in the Committee Report accompanying this bill which addresses Alzheimer's Disease.

Furthermore, I would like to commend Chairman PORTER and Ranking Member OBEY for considering my April 12th testimony before the Subcommittee where I spoke on behalf of the 126 members of the Bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease along with my co-chair Rep. CHRIS SMITH (R–NJ). Together we encouraged the Subcommittee to urge the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to increase its research for Alzheimer's by $100 million and to implement and fully fund a new program, originally adopted into the House Budget Resolution, the Alzheimer's Clinical Research and Training Awards Program.

This worthy program will train physician-scientists to focus on clinical research and to translate the excellent basic research in Alzheimer's Disease to the clinic. Ultimately this program provides an opportunity for the National Institute on Aging (NIA) to "enhance efforts to train, and educate health care professionals to improve diagnosis, treatment and prevention of Alzheimer's Disease" as the House Report language accompanying this bill urges.

I would note that the Senate Committee report accompanying the Labor-HHS Education Appropriations bill provides additional clarification of the intent of Congress with respect to how the NIA should improve the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of Alzheimer's Disease. The Senate Committee Report states the following with respect to the specific steps we expect to be taken to educate and train physician/scientists:

"The Committee believes that an important step in fighting Alzheimer's Disease is the encouragement of clinical research and training, which will complement the many excellent research efforts currently funded through the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Institute on Aging (NIA), and in the private sector. The creation of Alzheimer's Clinical Research and training Awards program to train physicians to recognize and treat Alzheimer's Disease, and to dedicate their careers to improving care for Alzheimer's patients by bridging the gap that exists between basic and clinical research is critical. The awards program will foster physician dedication to a career in research, diagnosis, and treatment of Alzheimer's Disease by awarding junior and midlevel physicians who have demonstrated the potential for a lifelong commitment to researching and treating Alzheimer's, with a I year stipend to train as an Alzheimer's physician/scientist. The awards program will be administered through the NIA, and should provide support for institutions focused primarily on Alzheimer's research but linked to a clinical treatment facility. The awards program will complement the Alzheimer's Disease Research Centers (currently funded through NIA) or similar institutions that are State or privately funded. The awards program will encourage institutions implementing the program to specialize in training physician/scientists, ultimately becoming physician training centers."

Alzheimer's disease is on track to become the epidemic of the 21st Century, currently 4 million Americans are afflicted and by 2050 it is estimated that this number will increase to 14 million. With these astonishing statistics we must act today to head off the health care crisis of tomorrow. The Alzheimer's Clinical Research and Training Awards envisioned by both the House and Senate bills represent an important step in meeting the challenge.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 2000, I was unable to be present and to cast votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 234, "yea" on rollcall vote 235, "yea" on rollcall 236, and "yea" on rollcall vote 237.

IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM (BILL) H. HAMANN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform the House of the death of Bill Hamann, former resident of Lexington, Missouri. He was 87.

Bill, a son of the late William G. and Mary Curtis Hamann, was born in Henrietta, Missouri, on October 12, 1912. His dedication to football began on the Richmond High School football team and continued at Graceland Junior College in Lamoni, Iowa, where he also lettered in basketball. His greatest satisfaction as a player was playing center for the Missouri University Tigers under coach Don Faurot, A special influence in his life.

After graduation, Bill coached football at Odessa High School for two years before joining the United States Navy during World War II. He served in the Navy until November 1945, making lieutenant before he returned to Missouri University to complete his master's degree.

In 1946, Bill moved to Lexington and began coaching football in earnest at Lexington High

School. In his first year, he led the team to their first undefeated season in Lexington history. He was head football coach for 22 years, winning four more Missouri River Valley Conference (MRVC) championships. Bill also served as Athletic Director, basketball coach and track coach during this time. He was head basketball coach for six years and assistant basketball coach for ten years, winning one MRVC championship. Bill also had great success as a track coach, winning State meets twice and numerous District and MRVC championships. He was one of a select few Missouri coaches who won championships in three major sports for one school. Bill retired from coaching football in 1968, but continued to coach track until 1972. In addition to coaching, he taught driver's education, physical education and history. He retired from teaching in 1979 after 32 years at Lexington High School.

Bill was one of the first coaches named to the Missouri High School Hall of Fame in 1992, and as Hall of Fame Coach for Track in 1993. He is one of only two coaches named in more than one Hall of Fame in all of Missouri.

Bill also served as President of the MRVC, was twice honored as Coach of the Year at the Kansas City Area Night of Sports, and was named a life member of the West Central Coaches Association. He received the Distinguished Service Award from the Missouri Athletic Administration. Bill was President of the Lafayette County Teachers and a member of Phi Delta Kappa at Central Missouri State University. He was a former president and member of the Lexington Retired Teachers. Additionally, Bill was a member of the Lions Club, Kiwanis Club, and very active in the Lexington Historical Society. He was a member of the United Methodist Church of Lexington and served as Chairman of the Church Board.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Hamann will be greatly missed by all who knew him. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his wife of 58 years, Betty; his daughter, Sally; his two sons, James and John; his two brothers, Herbert and Charles, and four grandchildren.

CELEBRATION OF LOU TREBAR ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate Mr. Lou Trebar. On Wednesday May 3, 2000, this Cleveland polka legend celebrated his 80th birthday with 1,500 of his closest friends. Gathered at the Slovenian National Home, thousands of polka fans and eighteen polka bands payed tribute to this local artist by giving him ''the greatest day of [his] life.''

Throughout Lou's life, he has made significant contributions to Cleveland's culturally diverse community. This Slovenian neighborhood native has enhanced Northeast Ohio's culture, and has added to the quality that makes Cleveland a polka city. Lou has a lifetime of dedication to promoting Cleveland-Style polkas and waltzes and to preserving the rich Slovenian heritage from which Cleveland evolved.

This ''Waltz King'' is a true dean of Cleveland-style music. He was a pioneer in adapting Slovenian folk music into America's musical mainstream as the first Cleveland-style bandleader to create a multi-part harmony with all types of instruments. His vision and talent have greatly decorated the heritage of the Cleveland area.

I salute Lou for these many artistic accomplishments, and I join in with his many fans who wish him a happy 80th birthday.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, since the President asked Congress to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China, the members of this body—indeed, all of the American people—have been forced to consider broad questions about our relationship with China, about our values as a free people and about our fundamental best interests as they relate to the economy and to national security. These are very serious questions; and I—like many of my colleagues, I am sure—have invested a great deal of time in study, discussions and prayer about them.

Make no mistake—I understand the value of international trade, and I am a believer in developing trade opportunities to enhance our economic future. I recognize the realities of the global economy that exist today; and there is no doubt in my mind that trade is the key to the future for the United States, for China and for every other nation as well. My record reflects my belief in free and fair trade policies, including trade with China. I supported NAFTA, GATT, fast track and the Africa Trade bill this body just recently passed. Opening markets benefits both countries—the U.S. gains new destinations to export goods, and China gains investment from foreign companies.

But what I cannot support is relinquishing our annual review of China's progress towards free market reform and a democratic society. I cannot, in good conscience, award China PNTR when there are serious national security concerns involving China and Taiwan's volatile relationship as well as China's role in producing and disseminating weapons of mass destruction. When China's record of compliance with past agreements leaves much to be desired. And when China's progress in economic power and technological development has overlooked progress on human rights and religious freedom. Therefore, I am not convinced that the best interests of this nation and of the people of my state are served by rewarding China with unconditional permanent normal trade relations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to extending PNTR to China at this time.

Rather than granting PNTR, I believe a more prudent and responsible approach is to continue an annual review of China's trade status. In the past, as a supporter of free trade, I have favored granting normal trade relations to China on an annual basis. In this way, we have better opportunities to move that country toward a more democratic, free market system, while maintaining a trade relationship that certainly can be beneficial to the people of both nations. I see this annual review as an effective way to influence the Chinese government to reform its policies toward religious minorities, workers, and proponents of democracy.

But granting permanent status to China is a significantly different issue. Such a move would, in a sense, take China ''off probation'' and remove the incentive to make progress on those issues of particular concern to the United States. In my opinion, the question this PNTR vote poses is not on the merits of free trade but rather whether the U.S. should relinquish our influence on trade with China permanently.

NATIONAL SECURITY

My first concern about our relationship with China relates to national security. The prospects for peace and prosperity in Asia depend heavily on China's role as a responsible member of the international community. Perhaps our country's most important national security challenge is to build a constructive and stable bilateral relationship with China. The prospects for peace and prosperity in Asia depend heavily on China's role as a responsible member of the international community. In my opinion, a policy of engagement must be built on a foundation of strength and resolve that rewards responsible Chinese behavior and confronts provocative activities that undermine U.S. interests and promote greater risks of military and diplomatic confrontation.

Should we reward China with PNTR status given recent highly provocative actions on the part of the Chinese government? Our country would be sending exactly the wrong message if we were to support China's WTO membership with PNTR at a time when the Chinese have chosen to adopt a far more aggressive stance toward Taiwan, a stance that they know could lead to a serious military confrontation with the U.S.

China's recent provocative actions and continued demand for Taiwan to acknowledge its ''one China'' policy or expect military actions is troubling. Should we reward China for these actions? I believe we would be sending exactly the wrong message if we were to grant China PNTR at a time when the Chinese have chosen to adopt a far more aggressive stance toward Taiwan. I was pleased to see Mr. Chen's presidential inauguration in Taipai take place without incident this past weekend. However, Beijing's silent response leaves much to the imagination.

This comes on top of growing skepticism expressed by our intelligence community—skepticism about whether the Chinese intend to live up to their international commitments to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, especially in the areas of short- and medium-range missiles and chemical weapons technology. Despite Chinese promises to abide by various arms control pacts, including

the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Director of Central Intelligence recently reported that China remains a ''key supplier'' of technology inconsistent with proliferation goals—particularly missile and chemical technology to Pakistan, Iran and North Korea.

We must make it clear to the Chinese that we will extend a hand of friendship in good faith, but we will not turn a blind eye to its irresponsible or dangerous actions. It is not in our national security interest to condone and reward grossly irresponsible conduct by a country that wishes to become a leader in the international community.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

As a member of the House International Relations Committee, I am keenly interested in and aware of our role in international affairs. I have traveled to China and am amazed at what is going on there. China is clearly on the move and I have no doubt that they will eventually rival only the United States as a world superpower. However, the most recent State Department report on human rights practices in China reveals that the situation continues to grow worse. We cannot, and should not, overlook what our own government recognizes as abhorrent conditions in China.

As China progresses rapidly in terms of economic power, technological development and international affairs, its progress on human rights is sorely lacking. In terms of political freedom, democratic institutions and the guarantee of basic rights, China simply does not meet any reasonable standard that the United States or any nation with a mature, democratic heritage would consider acceptable. If America stands for anything, it stands for personal freedom and inalienable rights for all people. Our values cannot be divorced from any votes or from any considerations, including those related to trade. I am afraid that granting PNTR sends China the message that we approve of their political system as it stands today. And that is simply not the case.

The number of documented cases of religious persecution in China alarms me. As a firm believer in supporting religious freedom and author of the International Religious Freedom Act, I believe we must take a stand against human rights violations and persecution of people for simply expressing their religious beliefs. The Commission on Religious Freedom, established by the International Religious Freedom Act, released earlier this month a report which notes a marked deterioration in China's religious freedom during this past year. Make no mistake, the crackdown on religious expression in China has reached alarming and brutal proportions. China has enacted laws which have been used to persecute many religious groups of differing faiths. Unregistered groups, including home churches, have been raided and buildings destroyed. Individuals have been fined, arrested, tortured and some even killed. China continues to harass, detain, beat and torture members of religious groups, including Catholics, Protestants and Tibetan Buddhists. Tens of thousands of members of the spiritual movement Falun Gong have been detained and forced to sign statements disavowing their beliefs. An unknown number of those who refused remain detained; others are in prison or serving ''re-education through labor'' sentences. To torture and persecute people for simply expressing their personal beliefs is unconscionable.

Although I believe that economic reform can lead to political reform and a greater respect for individual freedoms, there is a distinct risk that China may choose to abide by the WTO's rules while continuing to flagrantly ignore human rights standards. It's true that the WTO could be a catalyst for creating a modern legal system. However, there's no guarantee that the system will protect basic rights. For that to happen, there has to be a sustained effort to press for creation of a truly independent judiciary. Such sustained pressure can be most effective through an annual renewal process of trade agreements.

WORKER RIGHTS AND LABOR CONCERNS

The right for workers to organize and bargain collectively is not only discouraged in China, it is punished by imprisonment or worse. Forced labor camps continue to exist in China; and these camps provide no compensation for work under deplorable conditions. Since it is well established that China's labor practices do not meet U.S. or international standards for protecting worker rights, how can we, in good conscience, reward China for its abysmal labor practices by granting PNTR?

One of my particular concerns is the effect granting PNTR and opening China to U.S. companies will have on industries such as the textile industry. Without real labor standards and protections in place, PNTR could cripple our own apparel and textile markets, placing American jobs at risk and endangering American workers and their families. China is a formidable player in the world apparel and textile market. As of 1999, it was the world's largest producer of cotton, manmade fibers and silk as well as of apparel products. It has the largest production capacity for textile products in the world and has, in recent years, improved the efficiency of its textile industry and increased the quality and value of its apparel output. China has the potential to be a major threat to the apparel and textile industries in the U.S. and the workers in those industries. I reject the option of granting PNTR status to China today and see dedicated employees out of work tomorrow because of an influx of cheap Chinese textiles.

China's lack of PNTR status allows us annual reviews of the human rights and labor record in China. Granting PNTR to China will mean losing this annual review and any subsequent leverage to force China's compliance with international standards. An annual review will retain the ability of Congress to examine China's willingness and ability to keep its commitments. It will give China incentive to improve its record with regard to workers' rights and human rights and give it an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

A RECORD OF NONCOMPLIANCE

To some degree, the Chinese government has avoided full compliance with many of the trade agreements it has made with the United States. While our trade deficit with China continues to grow, China has broken its agreements with us on opening markets, stopping the piracy of intellectual property, and ending the export of goods produced in the forced labor camps. The statements of China's negotiators on PNTR lead me to believe that we cannot count on a total, good-faith compliance with this agreement, either.

This pattern of non-compliance, or of only partial compliance, bolsters significantly the argument against PNTR and in favor of the annual renewals that have been granted in the past. Just as ending our trade relationship with China altogether would be a foolish and self-destructive for the United States, losing our annual review and any subsequent leverage to move China ever-closer to compliance with international standards and agreements with us would be destructive to our economic interests.

In any number of areas—agricultural commodities, meat and poultry, telecommunications, petroleum, insurance-related services, and others—American interests are best served when we can revisit compliance issues regularly. With PNTR, our opportunities to monitor and influence compliance are severely limited, if not eliminated, while an annual review will retain the ability of Congress to examine China's willingness and ability to keep its commitments.

CONCLUSION

A ''no'' vote on PNTR will not mean an end to America's trade relationship with China. The U.S. and China will continue to have a binding trade relationship under international law, governed by the 1979 trade agreement between our two countries and several subsequent bilateral deals. The ''most favored nation'' provisions of those agreements require that China afford to the United States any trade and non-trade economic benefits that China grants to our competitors. It is true that the U.S. would not be able to file complaints against China through the WTO dispute resolution process. However, we will retain the right to use our own laws to sanction China—by withholding or limiting access to the U.S. market—for unfair trade practices.

Furthermore, if the U.S. and China are not tied through the WTO, we will be able to use our trade laws to redress abuses of human rights and worker rights. The U.S. would be prohibited from taking such actions if China and the U.S. have a WTO relationship. So China's lack of PNTR status allows us annual reviews of China's progress, thus giving China an incentive to improve its record with regard to workers' rights and human rights and give that nation an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

There is no doubt in my mind that trade is the key to the future. Opening markets benefit everyone—the U.S. gains new destinations to export goods and China gains investment from foreign companies. In my opinion, the question this PNTR vote poses is not on the merits of free trade but rather whether the U.S. should relinquish our influence on trade with China permanently. International trade—and the benefits it affords—are a fact. Likewise, it should also not be disputed as to whether the United States should attempt to influence Chinese behavior in areas of human and workers' rights, weapons proliferation and compliance with international commitments. Clearly we should. Thus, my concern lies with whether we should take China off the one-year renewal

process. Given current conditions in China and recent actions by the Chinese government, I am not convinced that relinquishing this leveraging tool is in our best national interest at this time.

It is for all of these reasons that I must oppose permanent normal trade relations at this time. I am not convinced that It is in the best interest of Tennesseans and our country to reward China with unconditional permanent normal trade relations when it is clear they do not meet our standards for human and worker rights and could threaten our national security. Clearly trade must continue and we must pledge ourselves to work with the Chinese reformers to move their country towards free market democracy. However, until significant improvements are made in these areas, I cannot in good faith vote to grant PNTR.

I look forward to the day when China fully joins the international community in a commitment to democratic values, human rights, and trade that is truly free and fair. Until that time, we have a duty to use whatever tools we have available to us to influence China to take that path. My vote against PNTR for China is one such tool, and I utilize it in good conscience and with a conviction that it will benefit both the Chinese and American people.

TRIBUTE TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE S.P.H.E.R.E.S. PROJECT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend John Link, Amy Rahe, Carmen Reiner, and Adam Wieties. These four middle school students from Carlinville Middle School in Carlinville, IL, are tackling tough community issues as participants in the Bayer/NSF Award for Community Innovation.

Their project is Saving Prairies and Helping Environmental Regions Expand Successfully—S.P.H.E.R.E.S. Through this project they have successfully strengthened local support to create a preserve where native prairie grasses and indigenous creatures could flourish and students could study and experience the prairie habitat.

I want to take this opportunity to thank these students who at such a young age have made it their responsibility to preserve our environment. I am proud of them and look forward to all else they may accomplish.

IN HONOR OF HELEN STEINEL'S RETIREMENT AFTER 30 YEARS IN EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Helen Steinel on her retirement after 30 years in education.

Helen Steinel began her illustrious career in education as a teacher. She taught at Holy Family, St. Joseph's, St. Joseph and Michael, and Mother Seton elementary schools, all schools in Union City, NJ. For the last several years, Helen has been the principal of Mother Seton School, where she is a mentor to her faculty, and where she has educated teachers as well as children in her work with student teachers.

For 30 years, Helen has dedicated herself to the education of children, and for 30 years, she has touched the lives of students and teachers in a way that her years of dedication cannot measure. Helen understands and imparts to others the knowledge that education is a profound tool for understanding the world and a necessary instrument in realizing one's full potential as a human being.

It is said that teaching another something of value takes compassion, understanding, and patience; and absent these virtues, the simple process of imparting knowledge can become strained and cumbersome, leaving both teacher and pupil estranged, unable to truly learn from each other. In honoring Helen today, I honor the virtues that allow teachers to become great educators.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me as I honor Helen Steinel, a great woman and educator I respect and admire.

TRIBUTE TO AKIRA INOUE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, Each year, the Guam Chamber of Commerce selects the ''Small Business Person of the Year'' from a pool of individuals and business partners who either own and operate or bear principal responsibility for small business establishments on Guam. The chamber takes into account staying power, sales growth, growth in payroll, innovativeness in product or service, response to adversity, and civic contributions. This year the honor was bestowed upon local businessman, Akira Inoue.

Having held assignments in Australia, New Guinea, Saipan and other neighboring islands, Akira chose to settle on Guam, an island he deemed to be the ideal hub for Japanese oriented businesses. On September 1, 1968, he established Nanbo Guam, Ltd. Initially engaged in the importation and wholesale of general merchandise from Japan, Nanbo Guam started underwriting insurance in June of 1969.

With neither experience nor training in the insurance business, Akira assumed the function of general agent for The Tokio Marine and Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., of Japan. The company enjoyed a steady growth and, with it, the trust and support of the Guam community. When Typhoon Pamela devastated the island of Guam in 1976, Nanbo Guam's efforts to provide prompt settlements did not go unnoticed. Along with their good reputation came new applicants and increased premium sales. Akira credits this as the basis of Nanbo Guam's success.

Through the years, Nanbo Guam has developed and grown steadily. In 1977, the company began handling life insurance as the general agent for Pacific Guardian Life, Honolulu. In 1978, they established the Sun Rise, Inc., and opened the Japan Food Supermarket. In the 1980's, Nanbo Guam engaged in real estate ventures and revived their import business by establishing the Nanbo Trading Company. In the 1990's, they broadened the scope of their insurance business by concluding another general agency agreement property and casualty insurance with the Nippon Fire and Marine Insurance Co., Ltd., of Japan and by securing a claims agency agreement from the United Services Automobile Association. Akira Inoue's business acumen, innovations and his capable direction is undoubtedly the driving force behind Nanbo Guam's success.

Outside of his business ventures, Akira additionally devotes personal time and resources to civic and community activities. As one of the founding members of the Japan Club of Guam, he served as its first vice-president in 1972. From 1973 through 1977, he served as the club's president. During his tenure, he was instrumental in raising donations for the Christmas Seal Fund Drive. He was also actively involved with the Vietnam Refugees Relief Drive in addition to serving on the Board of Governors of St. John's Episcopal School. Between 1987 and 1989, he was a member of the committee to establish a Japanese school on Guam. Serving once again as president of the Japan Club of Guam from 1992 through 1995, he worked towards the full payment of the construction loan for the Japanese school and organized a relief fund drive for the victims of the 1995 Kobe earthquake. Akira is also a distinguished member of the Rotary Club of Tumon Bay.

For over three decades, Guam's business community has reaped great benefits from Akira Inoue's efforts and dedication. I join his proud family—his wife, Machiko, his sons, Naoyuki and Tetsuji, and daughters, Sachiko and Yoshiko—who, together with the Guam Chamber of Commerce and the people of Guam, celebrate Akira Inoue's contributions and success. I commend and congratulate him for being chosen as this year's ''Small Business Person of the Year.''

TELECOMMUNICATIONS, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation requiring the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) study the issue of alleged potential health risks associated with wireless phones. This legislation builds upon a provision that I offered to legislation then-pending in the House Commerce Committee during the previous Congress. That underlying legislation ultimately was not enacted in the previous Congress and today I offer the wireless health study amendment as a standalone piece of legislation, entitled the ''Wireless Phone Health Risk Assessment Act of 2000.''

Mr. Speaker, when I first raised the issue of cellular phone safety at a House Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee

briefing I chaired in 1993, there were roughly 15 million people using such phones—today there are over 70 million users of wireless phones. In addition, the FDA, which coordinates Federal oversight of the wireless phone health issue, has previously indicated that a significant research effort over a sustained period of time is needed to provide the greater body of scientific information that scientists and regulators will need to more adequately assess any potential health risks.

It is my belief that because wireless phone companies receive their licenses to operate from the Federal Government, that the government has a responsibility to step up its efforts to address this issue. Indeed, having helped create the wireless revolution over the years by freeing up federally administered airwaves for these new services, I have simultaneously advocated that the government must also have a serious commitment to additional research in order to reassure consumers that any lingering concerns about whether these wireless devices pose a health risk are addressed.

This legislation authorizes $25 million over a 5-year period for the FDA to analyze health risks associated from radiofrequency emissions from wireless phones. I believe it is a modest but important allocation of a portion of total Federal research funds, an authorization that is specifically dedicated to scientifically assess wireless phone health risks.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OKEFENOKEE HERITAGE CENTER

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to honor the 25th Anniversary of the outstanding Okefenokee Heritage Center. It is an honor for the community to be gifted with this great facility for teaching and learning.

The Okefenokee Heritage Center has been an institution serving South Georgia for 25 great years. When the building was finished 1975, it added a world of learning for all ages in the community. This is why I pay tribute to the silver anniversary of this vital facility for Waycross and Ware County. I praise the tireless efforts that the people of Waycross have contributed for this great museum. I hope for continued success in the future and I thank them for their dedication and hard work.

I believe that the following editorial from the Waycross Journal Herald clearly depicts how important this Heritage Center is. I sincerely appreciate the hard work and support of people like Catherine Larkens, Current Director of the Center, Sonya Craven, President of the Board, to all the Board Members, Ware County Commissioner Chairman Roger Strickland, Mayor John Fluker, Dr. William Clark, III and Gus Karle. Most importantly, I want to recognize Mrs. Sue Clark. As a result of her determination and perseverance, today we celebrate 25 years of the Okefenokee Heritage Center and its significant contributions to our county.

[From the Waycross Journal-Herald, June 1, 2000]

OKEFENOKEE HERITAGE CENTER OBSERVES 25TH

Friends and supporters of the Okefenokee Heritage Center gathered yesterday at the center's Augusta Avenue site to commemorate 25 years of service to this community. It was a memorable, sun-splashed afternoon of short speeches and renewed acquaintances.

Mrs. Sue Clark, wife of well-known Waycross eye surgeon Dr. S. William Clark Jr., is credited with being the primary community figure who conceptualized, promoted and implemented the idea of building a heritage-themed museum in Waycross. It was her perseverance and organizational drive, together with the resources of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and several other key players, which helped to make today's heritage center a reality.

In his prepared remarks, former Rice Yard Superintendent A.A. ''Gus'' Karle commented Wednesday that he located the center's ''Okefenokee Chief'' steam engine at a South Carolina rock quarry and told Mrs. Clark about his find. He said she contacted the quarry's owners that same day and within days had marched into the Seaboard Coast Line's corporate offices at Jacksonville and arranged to have the locomotive transported to Waycross.

''I got a call from Seaboard CEO Prime Osborne. He mentioned this locomotive and said Sue Clark had just left his office,'' said Karle. Together with Seaboard's Henry Pigge, plans were soon put into motion to transport the 1912 vintage locomotive from South Carolina to Waycross in December 1973.

The locomotive is the showpiece among the Heritage Center's exhibits. It's a wonderful example of early 20th century technology spared from the salvager's torch and preserved for future generations by Sue Clark's vision.

The locomotive's steam whistle was operating Wednesday, harkening back to a day when the telegraph key was the fastest means of communication and belching, noisy steam locomotives rolled into Waycross from all directions, disgorging passengers and welcoming new ones on those ''magic carpets made of steel.''

It was America's ''Age of Innocence,'' a time before the horrors of World War II and national ascendency to superpower status. It was a time when this newspaper was located at the corner of Plant Avenue and Isabella Street (now Jack Williams Park), enabling the late Editor & Publisher Jack Williams Sr. to gaze out his office window at locomotive engineers and their passengers as they rounded the crossing enroute to the Waycross Rail Depot.

His son, the late Jack Williams Jr., said the building's glass windows would actually shake in their frames as these steel behemoths passed outside.

The old building is gone now, but a scaled-down reproduction rests beside the railroad track at the Heritage Center for future generations to enjoy.

What a wonderful facility our Heritage Center has truly become. The entire community owes a debt of gratitude to Sue Clark for her hard work and vision. Her ancestor, the late Dr. Daniel Lott (one of four founders of Waycross in 1871) would be justly proud of what she has accomplished.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT DR. TOM F. LUTHY, JR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a long and exceptional career in education is nearing an end. Dr. Tom F. Luthy, Jr., of Lebanon, Missouri, is retiring after more than 40 years of service to Lebanon Public Schools.

Tom began his teaching career as an 18-year-old college student in 1958 at the Blackfoot School. After that, he taught grades five through eight for two years at the two-room Bolles School before teaching for two years at the Lebanon High School. After a year of teaching at the newly built Glendale High School in Springfield, Tom returned to Lebanon as the school's firstever department chair in charge of the social studies program. He continued to teach history for 15 more years at the high school.

When the high school moved to its present location in 1976, Tom stayed as the assistant principal of Lebanon Junior High. Two years later, he became the principal and spent the next 17 years guiding the lives of the young people who attended his school. After that, he became the Lebanon R–111 Schools assistant superintendent for personnel and instruction. As an assistant superintendent for the past eight years, Tom has hired more teachers than are currently on the entire district staff. He also guided the district through its highly successful review under the Missouri School Improvement Plan in 1998.

Tom has had a great impact on education in the Lebanon area. Early in his career, he created the American Heritage program at the high school. He also was involved in the formation of the C–5 school and was instrumental in naming that school after Joel E. Barber, who was president of the school board at the Blackfoot School where he began his career. After retirement, Tom will still impact education by continuing his work with the statewide Goals 2000 project, which is developing a new physical education model for Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Luthy's passion for excellence in education has made a difference in the lives of students and teachers. I know all Members of Congress will join me in paying tribute to his outstanding service to the Lebanon education community.

HONORING THE LAKE ERIE NATURE AND SCIENCE CENTER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate the Golden anniversary of the Lake Erie Nature and Science Center. For 50 years, this asset of Greater Cleveland has provided the community with invaluable educational opportunities, wildlife resources, and a natural preservation of a beautiful environment.

Among the many accomplishments the Center is responsible for are wildlife rehabilitation, education for youth and teens, wildlife gardens, a preserved nature facility, and a planetarium. By providing the community with these assets the Center continues to encourage a living connection between people, science, and wildlife in order to create a better commitment to the welfare of our natural world.

As the Center has grown throughout the years, the community it serves has benefitted greatly from its existence. Thousands of children have been exposed to the world of science through observing living displays and participating in hands-on experiences. Today, the museum has become a tool for the old and young, as families utilize its programs all year round.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in thanking and honoring the Lake Erie Nature and Science Center for the 50 years of contribution it has made to science and wildlife and for the 50 years it has been a service to its community.

TENNESSEE SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 720

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a copy of Tennessee Senate Joint Resolution 720 which urges the U.S. Congress to vote against Permanent Normal Trade Relations. The Joint Resolution was introduced by the late Senator Pete Springer and Senator Roscoe Dixon.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 720

A Resolution to urge Congress to vote against any proposal to grant permanent normal trade relations status to the People's Republic of China and to urge the President and Congress to oppose China's membership in the World Trade Organization.

Whereas, the People's Republic of China has taken steps to become a member of the World Trade Organization, a position that would give China recognition and status as an equal, legitimate partner with other countries in world trade; and

Whereas, since 1992, China has entered into four bilateral trade agreements with the United States in which China has agreed to give U.S. businesses better access to its markets and not to discriminate against U. S. products; and

Whereas, China has violated the provisions of each of these agreements including the 1992 Memoranda of Understanding on Prison Labor and Market Access, the 1994 Bilateral Agreement on Textiles, and the 1996 Bilateral Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights; and

Whereas, China's record on human rights is poor; those who attempt to engage in legitimate political opposition are often imprisoned or harassed, and those holding political views that differ from those of the regime or profess religious views are oppressed; and

Whereas, China ignores the rights of its workers and imprisons those who seek to improve labor conditions in the country; and

Whereas, China's enormous military establishment and its injudicious use of threats and provocation make it a threat in the eyes of its neighbors; and

Whereas, advocates of China's membership in the World Trade Organization promote the view that China's vast potential market would be further opened to trade; the more likely scenario is that China's exports of cheap textiles, pirated technology and other products produced by grossly underpaid labor will flood our markets at the expense of American wages, jobs and trade balance; and

Whereas, the record of the People's Republic of China in human rights and in failing to live up to trade agreements should not be validated by supporting its admission into the World Trade Organization; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the one hundred first general assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That the General Assembly respectfully requests that Congress vote against any proposal to grant permanent normal trade relations status to the The People's Republic of China, which is a precursor to the granting of World Trade Organization membership, and take all other actions within their power to deny membership in the World Trade Organization to the People's Republic of China. Be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to each member of the Tennessee Congressional Delegation.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CELEBRATES THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EDEN INSTITUTE

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the Eden Institute's 25th Anniversary. Over the last quarter of a century, the Eden Institute has made tremendous contributions to our community through its commitment to meeting the needs of individuals with autism.

Eden is a New Jersey-based nonprofit organization founded in 1975 to address the needs of the autistic community. Eden brought both parents and professionals together to assist in the development of a family-oriented, multifaceted program driven by a well trained, dedicated and nurturing staff. Eden was founded on the commitment to provide a cost-effective, community-based alternative to institutionalization and to offering training that would meet the changing needs of children and adults with autism.

Autism is a lifelong developmental disability that severely affects social behavior, communication and one's ability to learn, is the result of a neurological disorder that interferes with the functioning of the brain. Autism affects 15 of every 10,000 births and typically appears during the first three years of development.

Some of the services offered by Eden include the Eden Institute, a year-round educational program for children ages 3-21; Eden A.C.R.E.s, nine community-based group homes and three supported living apartments for adults; an employment center; year-round retreat opportunities, an early intervention program for infants and toddlers, and many, many more.

Although much has changed over the years, Eden's mission is the same—to provide a comprehensive continuum of services designed to enable children and adults with autism to lead fulfilling, productive and independent lives.

And they have been extremely successful. Through the work of Eden, parents are now able to more effectively engage their children at home; they have assisted hundreds of children and adults with autism to interact with their communities to the best of their abilities; and Eden has worked very hard to promote community awareness of the challenges associated with autism.

The Eden Institute is a great asset to both Central New Jersey and our nation. I urge all my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Eden's dedication to assisting citizens with autism achieve their full potential.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURAL RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1504, as amended was included in the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2559, the Agriculture Risk Protection Act of 2000 as title IV of this Act. As introduced, H.R. 1504 was referred primarily to the House Committee on Agriculture, and in addition, to the Committees on Judiciary, Resources, and Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker. To expedite consideration of H.R. 1504, and to allow it to be included in this conference report, the following letters were exchanged between the Committee on Agriculture and the other committees of jurisdiction waiving further consideration of the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2000.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to H.R. 1504, a bill that was primarily referred to the Committee on Agriculture and additionally to the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill modernizes and enhances the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to plant protection and quarantine.

Please find the enclosed copy of H.R. 1504, as amended, along with a side-by-side comparison showing current law. In order to allow the timely consideration by the entire House of Representatives during the remaining period in the 106th Congress, I am requesting that you waive your Committee's referral of H.R. 1504.

I understand that such an action is not intended to waive your Committee's jurisdiction over this subject matter or any similar legislation now or in the future and look forward to working with you on matters of shared interest.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2000.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMBEST: I am writing concerning the Conference Report to H.R. 2559 (Report), the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 1999, which includes an amendment to H.R. 1504, the Plant Protection Act, offered by Mr. Canady. Section 413 of the Report contains an item of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means. This Act is intended to consolidate existing laws relating to plant safety.

Specifically, section 413 of the Report, ''Notification and Holding Requirements Upon Arrival,'' would require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify promptly the Secretary of Agriculture of the arrival of any plant, plant product, biological control organism, plant pest, or noxious weed at a port of entry. This provision also requires the Secretary of the Treasury to hold those products until they are inspected and authorized for entry into or transit movement through the United States, or otherwise released by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Current section 156 of title 7 of the United States Code requires the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the Secretary of Agriculture of the arrival of any nursery stock at a port of entry. Section 413 repeals current section 156, and instead, requires such notification for all of the above referenced products, including nursery stock. The statutory requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury hold such shipments until released by the Secretary of Agriculture and the authority for the Secretary of Treasury to release a shipment from the port of entry without necessarily requiring an inspection are new. The U.S. Customs Service already follows similar procedures, and it is our understanding that section 413 does not change current law, with respect to such imports, but only enhances enforcement of the current laws relating to those imports.

Normally, the Committee on Ways and Means would meet to consider such legislation. In order to expedite consideration of H.R. 2559, I will not object to the inclusion of section 413 of the amendment, and, for this reason, it will not be necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means to meet to consider the legislation.

However, this action is being done with the understanding that it will not prejudice the jurisdictional prerogatives of the Committee on Ways and Means on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Record. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter. With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2000.

Hon. HENRY HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to H.R. 1504, a bill that was primarily referred to the Committee on Agriculture and additionally to the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill modernizes and enhances the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to plant protection and quarantine.

Please find the enclosed copy of H.R. 1504, as amended, along with a side-by-side comparison showing current law. In order to allow the timely consideration by the entire House of Representatives during the remaining period in the 106th Congress, I am requesting that you waive your Committee's referral of H.R. 1504.

I understand that such an action is not intended to waive your Committee's jurisdiction over this subject matter or any similar legislation now or in the future and look forward to working with you on matters of shared interest.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2000.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to H.R. 1504, ''The Plant Protection Act'', which was referred to your committee and to this committee for such matters within our respective Rule X jurisdictions.

Since the bill was referred to this committee, there is no question that there are provisions of the bill which fall within our jurisdiction. It is my understanding that due to the exigencies of time, and the leadership's desire to process this legislation in the near future you are requesting this committee waive its consideration of the bill.

Pursuant to your request, I am willing to waive this committee's further consideration of the bill, recognizing that this will not affect our subject matter jurisdiction over this matter, and that I will insist on Members of our committee being named conferees should this bill go to conference.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2000.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to H.R. 1504, a bill that was primarily referred to the Committee on Agriculture and additionally to the Committee on Resources. This bill modernizes and enhances the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to plant protection and quarantine.

Please find the enclosed copy of H.R. 1504, as amended, along with a side-by-side comparison showing current law. In order to allow the timely consideration by the entire House of Representatives during the remaining period in the 106th Congress, I am requesting that you waive your Committee's referral of H.R. 1504.

I understand that such an action is not intended to waive your Committee's jurisdiction over this subject matter or any similar legislation now or in the future and look forward to working with you on matters of shared interest.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2000.

Hon. LARRY COMBEST,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1504, the Plant Protection Act, authored by our colleague Congressman Canady. This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Agriculture and additionally referred to the Committee on Resources, among others.

After reviewing the amendments to the bill, I have no objection to it going forward and will not object to the Committee on Resources being discharged from further consideration of the measure. As you note in your letter, this action is not intended to waive jurisdiction over this or similar provisions. I would also ask you to support the Committee on Resources request to be represented on any conference on this bill, or a similar measure, if one should become necessary. Finally, I ask that you include our exchange of letters on H.R. 1504 in the Committee on Agriculture's report on the bill or in the official file on the bill.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to help expedite consideration of this bill. I appreciate your cooperation and that of John Goldberg of your staff, and look forward to working together on other matters of mutual interest in the future.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

GARRETT A. MORGAN TECHNOLOGY AND TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM POETRY CONTEST

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the eight Regional winners from my Congressional district of the Garrett A. Morgan Technology and Transportation Futures Program Poetry Contest. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate the following talented students for their exceptional submissions—Emily Erkkinen, Kerri McCarthy, Jack Bavaro, Krista Duchnowski, Caroline Flannagan, and Luke Nickerson of Clinton, Massachusetts; Mackenzie Bernier of E.S. Brown School in Swansea Massachusetts; and Timothy Leger of Thacher Elementary School in Attleboro Massachusetts.

The Futures Program is named for Garrett Augustus Morgan, one of the country's finest

innovators in public protection and public safety. In 1923 he patented the nation's first traffic signal, which was used throughout North America before being replaced by our current system. Seven years earlier Mr. Morgan had made national news for using a gas mask that he had developed to enable him to go into a tunnel under Lake Erie to rescue several trapped men. In his honor, the Program was created to better prepare America's students—with math, science, and technology skills—for entering the transportation workforce in the 21st century.

Following are the winning poems. I'm sure all of my colleagues join me in congratulating all of this year's participants.

Region 1: ME, MA, NH, RI, CT, VT

1st Place: Emily Erkkinen Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA

An Airplane can fly very high. I would like to fly an airplane. Right through the clouds I would go. Pilots drive the airplane. Lots of birds fly along. A great way of transportation. Now the airplane has landed. End of the ride, let's go home.

2nd Place: Kerri McCarthy Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA 01510

How that hot air balloon floats up in the sky Oh look, there's another and another and one more oh my That one has purple all over the tie And Look! I see a purple line I think I see a blue one too Round and round the higher it floats Balloons float up in the air And all of them spread everywhere Look at the purple one Look at the blue Oh how pretty they look don't you think they do? Oh no one just popped what are we going to do! Now I'm off bye, bye, I do miss you too!

3rd Place: Jack Bavaro Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA 01510

Hot Air balloons don't go very far They're even slower than a car. But they can glide in the sky. Just like a bird flying high.

Region 1: ME, MA, NH, RI, CT, VT (Grades 4–6)

1st Place: Mackenzie Bernier E. S. Brown School Swansea, MA 02777

''TRANSPORTATION''

What makes transportation really neat, Is that we no longer have to use our feet. We can ride a bike, or drive a car, We can take a plane to go very far. We can hop on a bus to get out of the rain, We can catch a subway, or take a train. There are ferry boats and cruise lines too, And trolley cars for me and you. There are great big trucks for moving freight, And limos for that special date. Who knows, someday very soon, There might be transportation to the moon!!

2nd Place: Timothy Leger, Thacher Elementary School Attleboro, MA 02703

''TRANSPORT''

Trains transfer trucks to Turkey. Cars carry crackers to Colorado. Submarines ship snowboards somewhere. Dump-trucks deliver dirt to Denver. Helicopters haul huge hats. Canoes carry cats to California. Boats bring bicycles back.

3rd Place: Krista Duchnowski Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA 01510

No boats, planes, cars? Walking on your own two feet? Not in this day and age. Walk to school? Carry my books? Take the bus I say. Dream of crossing the ocean? Never see France? Let's fly my friend. Paddle to the islands? Take a raft? Hey dude, fire up the motor! Run across the country? Get tired and SWEAT? Chugga, chugga, take the train! Walk, run, paddle, WORK? Do it yourself? Transportation does it for me!

Region 1: ME, MA, NH, RI, CT, VT (Grades 7–8)

1st Place: Caroline Flannagan Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA 01510

Cavemen used the feet they had Until the idea of a wheel we had Ships allowed us to sail the seas Making men's dreams realities The car was invented as time went by Orville and Wilbur soon did fly Rockets and spaceships were shot into space Bringing man to a whole new place Transportation keeps us on the go In the future we don't know.

3rd Place: Luke Nickerson Clinton Middle School Clinton, MA 01510

Henry Ford, and the Wright Brothers were men with vision, Just like the man who invented the television. This Country uses modes of transportation like planes, autos, and trains To go to work so that we can invent more, and use our brains. Now that we have reached a destination, Aren't you proud of this great nation? For the resources and modes of transportation, Just think, in 1969 of Armstrong and space exploration. We need to stop, and think of where we are going, If flight is in your plans, try a 747 Boeing.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MEIER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Charles Meier of Okawville, IL. Charles was recently inducted into the Illinois Jaycees Recruiters Hall of Fame.

He was inducted for his successful efforts to recruit many new members into the club during his 21 years as a Jaycee. His recruitment efforts have brought in new members from an area that extends from Steeleville and Waterloo to Interstate 64.

I want to congratulate Charles on receiving such a prestigious honor. I wish him the best as he continues to serve.

IN HONOR OF THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF BAYONNE ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Concerned Citizens of Bayonne (CCB) on its 30th anniversary.

Founded in 1970 by Frank P. Perrucci, CCB was established as an instrument for concerned citizens to take action on a variety of national and state issues. CCB is a perfect example of the influence that a civic organization can have on our political system. This organization levels the playing field, providing ordinary citizens with the opportunity to affect the political process, reducing the disproportionate influence of special interest groups.

The CCB supports several community organizations and charities: the Bayonne Hospital Cancer Treatment Center; the Windmill Alliance; Deborah Hospital, the Bayonne PAL; Bayonne Little League; Bayonne Babe Ruth Baseball; the Bayonne Family YMCA Day Care Center; and Bayonne for the Battleship New Jersey, Inc.

CCB actively supports fines and jail terms for ocean dumping, opposes self service gas stations in New Jersey, and has opposed extreme wrestling exhibitions in Bayonne.

Committed to helping its community, CCB is a strong advocate for senior citizens, conducts activities for the veterans at the East Orange V.A. Hospital, and has been a participant in Toys for Tots for the past thirty years.

In 1990, on its 20th anniversary, CCB established the Frank P. Perrucci Scholarship Award, and in 1995, on its 25th anniversary, established the Frank P. Perrucci Civic Achievement Award to recognize extraordinary individuals who have volunteered their time and efforts for important causes.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Concerned Citizens of Bayonne for its commitment and active participation in our political system and for its contributions to our community. I especially want to thank Frank Perrucci, his wife Jean Perrucci, and CCB President Joanne Kosakowski.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF GUAM WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC (WERI)

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the University of Guam Water and Environmental Research Institute of the Western Pacific (WERI) on their twenty-fifth anniversary. WERI is the only regional water research institute dedicated to the needs of Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), and the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM).

Formally established in June of 1975, WERI has since sought solutions to technical problems associated with the location, production, distribution, and management of freshwater resources—an extremely essential function for the island communities it serves. One of fifty-five water research institutes authorized by Congress in the U.S. through the Water Research Act of 1964, WERI has expanded from a one-person operation in 1975 to a staff today of fifteen people conducting research, training, and information dissemination for Guam and the Western Pacific. They have continually strived to foster and promote research, training, technical assistance, outreach, awareness, information sharing and dissemination.

Partially funded by the federal government, WERI provides a wide array of services to the University of Guam and the people of the Pacific insular region for a fraction of what independent consultants would charge. Their research program covers all the costs for materials, equipment, supplies, computers, audio

visual, and field trip expenses required by 17 graduate and 4 undergraduate courses at the University of Guam. In addition, WERI conducts a number of professional training workshops throughout the region each year. During the past three years, their faculty has published over 65 reviewed journal articles, abstracts, and technical reports while carrying on 33 separate funded research and training projects. This is in addition to their regular university teaching and service commitments.

Constructed through a matching federal grant, the WERI analytical laboratory is totally self-sustaining. As the knowledge base created by WERI is actively sought by various government agencies and offices on Guam, it generates a significant portion of its operating expenses. The governor's office, the Guam Legislature, various local commissions, the private sector, the media and the local community constantly rely on WERI's technological expertise. Consequently, the 24th and 25th Guam Legislatures set up two annual special appropriations for them to manage long term water monitoring and data collection on the island. Their reputation is such that the United States Geological Survey continues to rate WERI as one of the top water institutes among the state and Territorial institute programs.

I extend my congratulations to the individuals who have contributed to the valuable progress and success of WERI. The dedicated people who deserve credit include WERI director, Dr. Galt Siegrist; faculty members Drs. Shahram Khosrowpanah, Leroy Heitz, Gary Denton John Jenson, and Mark Lander; Charles Guard of the research faculty; laboratory manager Harold Wood; laboratory assistants Crispina Herreria and Lucrina Concepcion; staff hydrogeologist John Jocson; and staff members Norma Blas and Dolores Santos.

WERI has made valuable contributions to the people of Guam and the Pacific region. Their work for the past twenty five years, has led to better planning, more efficient allocation and protection of our valuable water resources. On behalf of the people of Guam, I commend and congratulate the faculty and staff of the University of Guam Water and Environmental Research Institute of the Western Pacific for their excellence and join in celebrating their 25th anniversary.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a legislative proposal by Vice President GORE that would outlaw the practice of purchasing or selling Social Security numbers.

Last year, a man named Liam Youens was stalking a 21-year old New Hampshire woman named Amy Boyer. Youens reportedly purchased Amy Boyer's Social Security number from an Internet Web site for $45. Using this information, he was able to track her down, a process that he chillingly detailed on an Internet Web site that he named after his target. Finally, last October; this demented stalker fatally shot Amy Boyer in front of the dental office where she worked. Afterwards, he turned the gun on himself.

This terrible tragedy underscores the fact that while the Social Security number was originally intended to be used only for the purposes of collecting Social Security taxes and administering the program's benefits, it has over the years evolved into a ubiquitous national personal identification number which is subject to misuse and abuse. The unregulated sale and purchase of these numbers is a significant factor in a growing range of illegal activities, including fraud, identity theft, and tragically, stalkings and now, even murders.

Today, if you open up a bank account, apply for a loan, buy insurance, get a credit card, sign up for telephone service or electric or gas utility service, you are almost invariably asked to provide a merchant with your Social Security number. Over the years, this number has become a key to verifying a person's identity. As a result, it has become increasingly clear that there are growing and serious privacy risks are being created by unrestricted commerce in Social Security numbers, and resulting abuses of this number, that require immediate legislative action.

The risks and abuses associated with misuse of the Social Security number are only being magnified by the rapid growth of electronic commerce. Right now, only $5 billion of the $860 billion in annual retail sales currently occur over the Internet. But that figure will continue to grow exponentially in the future. So, the question we must ask is how are we going to adjust our laws to deal with this new medium? How will we animate the New Economy with our old values—such as our cherished right to privacy?

Today, the real privacy challenge we are facing isn't Big Brother; it's Big Browser. When it comes to your financial records, there are very few protections against a financial services firm from disclosing every check you've ever written, every credit card charge you've ever made, the medical exam you got before you received insurance. And as you surf the Web, there are no rules in place to prevent various web sites from collecting information about what sites you are viewing and how long you are viewing them. If you buy anything over the Internet, that information can be linked up to other personal identifiers to create disturbingly detailed digital dossiers that can profile your lifestyle, your interests, your hobbies, or your habits. I have sponsored or cosponsored separate legislation, H.R. 1057, H.R. 3320, H.R. 3321, and H.R. 4380, which are aimed at addressing these broader privacy problems.

But we also know that the Social Security number is an critically important personal identifier that many online and offline businesses wish to obtain about consumers. Consumers who value their family's privacy, however, have a compelling interest in not allowing this number to be used to tie together bits and pieces of information in various databases into an integrated electronic profile of their interests and behavior that can be zapped around the world in a nanosecond to anyone who is willing to pay the price.

If you do a simple Internet search in which you enter the words "Social Security Numbers," you will turn up links to dozens of web sites that offer to provide you, for a fee, with social security numbers for other citizens, or to link a social security number that you might have with a name, address and telephone number. Where are the data-mining firms and private detective agencies that offer these services obtaining these numbers? In all likelihood, they are accessing information from the databases of credit bureaus, financial services companies or other commercial firms.

If someone actually obtains a Social Security number from one of these sites, they have a critically important piece of information that can be used to locate the individual, get access to information about the individual's personal finances, or engage in a variety of illegal activities. By bringing a halt to unregulated commerce in Social Security numbers, the bill I am introducing today will help reduce the incidence of pretexting crimes, identity thefts and other frauds or crimes involving misuse of a person's Social Security number.

We need to take this action now if we are going to fully protect the public's right to privacy by preventing sales of Social Security numbers. That is why I am pleased today to be joining with the Senator from California (Ms. FEINSTEIN) in introducing Vice President GORE's legislative proposal to outlaw this practice. Our bill would make it a civil and criminal offense for a person to sell or purchase Social Security numbers. Under the bill, the FTC would be given rulemaking authority to restrict the sale of Social Security numbers, determine appropriate exemptions, and to enforce civil compliance with the bill's restrictions. The bill would also authorize the states to enforce compliance, and provide for appropriate criminal penalties.

I look forward to working with the Vice President, who has been a leader in pressing for tougher privacy protections, as well as Senator FEINSTEIN, and my House colleagues to enact this important privacy protection proposal into law.

CONCERN REGARDING THIRTEEN IRANIAN JEWS ON TRIAL

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I express my grave concern regarding the thirteen Iranian Jews currently on trial in Iran.

These individuals were arrested over a year ago for spying on behalf of Israel and the United States. During that time, the suspects were held without access to lawyers or their relatives. There was no credible evidence to support the allegation, much less their continued incarceration while awaiting trial. This treatment is unacceptable.

The trial is now underway, but closed to all individuals who may help exonerate the defendants. The trial judge serves as investigator, prosecutor and judge with no accountability for his actions. The evidence consists of confessions that were coerced and taped by

the Iranian government, as well as a few telephone calls to friends and relatives alleged to be members of Israel's secret police. Like the McCarthy witch hunts of the 1950's, these individuals have been deemed guilty simply by virtue of their associations. This trial flies in the face of international standards ensuring fair, impartial, and even-handed judicial decisions.

Today, I have joined a number of my colleagues to shine light on this undemocratic process by cosponsoring H. Con. Res. 307. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Administration should condemn the arrest and prosecution of the thirteen Iranian Jews. The resolution reminds Iran that the treatment of these individuals will serve as a benchmark in determining future U.S. and Iranian relations.

I am pleased to see Iran has made progress to moderate its society over the last two years. We need to encourage an open dialog between our people. However, this trial serves as an important reminder that Iran still has a long way to go before it is accepted back into the international community.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY RECOGNIZES GARRETT YOUNG FOR HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a young scientist, Garrett Young, a 17 year-old homeschooled student from Branchburg. Garrett has achieved success on the state, national, and international levels. He has recently been recognized as a top winner at the International Science and Engineering Fair (ISEF) sponsored by Intel Corporation. This is the world's largest pre-college science competition that recognizes the world's brightest high school students coming from 40 countries for their scientific achievements.

At the international level, he took first place in the category of physics at the ISEF. He also won the Glenn T. Seaborg Nobel Prize Visit Award. The Nobel Prize Visit Award was awarded to the top two individual winners at the Fair and whom they believe will be future Nobel Prize Winners. His project was ''Isolating Plasma Species Initiating Internal Electrostatic Fields for Plasma Heating,'' where Garrett found a way to increase the temperature of plasma in an efficient way.

At the national level, he won ''Operation Cherry Blossom.'' This is a trip to Japan that is awarded by the U.S. Army to the top two individual projects of the entire ISEF competition. Garrett was awarded first place by the U.S. Naval Research Labs and the U.S. Air Force. He also received the second place Vacuum Technology Award awarded by the American Vacuum Society.

At the state level, Garrett won the Senior Division ISEF trip. He also received the Space Science Award, presented by NASA for his project studying space science, and the Metric Award given by the U.S. Metric Society for the best use of the metric system. In addition, he was awarded a medallion by Yale University as the most outstanding junior student in Science and Engineering.

All of his specialized contributions to science are a result of his creative ability and meticulous thought. Mr. Young is truly a remarkable student with a prosperous future ahead of him. Today I honor Garrett's extraordinary accomplishments.

FY2001 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, last night the House of Representatives passed the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Appropriations Bill. I voted in favor of that legislation because I largely support the priorities reflected in the bill by Chairman LEWIS, Ranking Member MURTHA and the Defense Appropriations subcommittee.

Today, the Budget Committee is conducting a hearing on my legislation, H.R. 3221, the Corporate Welfare Commission Act. Under the bill, a Commission would be created to root out unnecessary and wasteful subsidies, and report their recommendations to the House and Senate. Their recommendations would receive expedited floor consideration to ensure that members of Congress were put on record on these wasteful programs.

One program which is often mentioned as one of the most egregious examples of wasteful spending, and which was mentioned today by the witnesses, is the subsidy the government gives to encourage defense mergers. The program was created in 1993 and was intended to save taxpayers billions of dollars by allowing defense contractors to charge the costs of mergers to government contracts. A recent study by the Department of Defense reflects significant cost savings for the government under this program but an independent study by the General Accounting Office could not verify DoD's claims. According to the GAO study, the government spent approximately $850 million on just the seven largest defense contractor mergers.

I think this program deserves closer scrutiny. While I don't question the nature of these mergers which have to be approved by the Department of Defense; I do question the policy of having the U.S. taxpayers pay at least a portion of the cost for such mergers. I urge the eventual conferees on the Department of Defense Authorization and Appropriations bills to consider a change in this policy.

THE NICARAGUAN ''PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT OF 2000''

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the ''Property Protection Act of 2000'' with a notable list of co-sponsors. This bill will have the effect of removing the waiver for Nicaragua contained under section 527(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995. Under current law, the President may waive mandatory sanctions prescribed to castigate a government that has not resolved outstanding property claims made by American citizens. In the case of Nicaragua, the President has every year since enactment chosen to exercise this waiver.

I have been reluctant to seek this change to our law. It is the inaction of the Nicaraguan government in resolving a number of longstanding property claims by American citizens that compels us to take this action.

The Sandinista regime, which ruled Nicaragua from 1979 to 1990, confiscated the property of thousands of Nicaraguan families and a number of American citizens. That was wrong. The United States Congress has long been on record pressing for the rights of U.S. citizens who were expropriated to be fairly compensated.

The Nicaraguan government points out that it settled over 400 property cases last year. But these numbers do not tell the whole story. In fact, many of these cases involve individuals who have simply given up hope of recovering their properties and resigned themselves to accepting Nicaraguan government bonds worth a fraction of their face value on world bond markets.

There are also a number of cases that have languished unresolved for years. These include cases where the government of Nicaragua has been ordered by its own court system to make payments to Americans who had their property illegally confiscated. Another group of cases that have languished involve Public Sector National Corporations (CORNAP). The missing ingredient in resolving these cases is political will. In both instances, the rule of law can only be served if the government of Nicaragua lives up to its obligations.

This bill will bring real pressure to bear by restricting U.S. bilateral assistance and U.S. support for multilateral assistance to the government of Nicaragua. The bill contains important exemptions for humanitarian and disaster relief assistance to avoid penalizing the people of Nicaragua. The bill also would allow vital counter-narcotics assistance to continue to flow to protect our nation from illicit drugs.

The Property Protection Act of 2000, when enacted, will require the President to identify the 50 most urgent pending property claims by American citizens against the government of Nicaragua and to suspend assistance to the government of Nicaragua until these cases are resolved. This is not too much to ask. Our government has been very patient, but, regrettably, our patience seems to have been misinterpreted by the government of Nicaragua as a lack of interest.

This bill will insure that the government of Nicaragua, and other states around the world, will understand that our citizens cannot have their property stolen with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I ask that the full text of H.R. 4602 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H.R. 4602

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 ''Property Protection Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AGAINST EXPROPRIATIONS OF PROPERTY BY NICARAGUA.

(a) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 527(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act for fiscal year 2001 or 2002 may only be provided to the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua if the President first makes a certification under subsection (d) for the fiscal year involved.

(2) EXCEPTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961'' shall not include—

(A) assistance under chapter 1 or chapter 10 of part I of such Act for child survival, basic education, assistance to combat tropical and other diseases, and related activities;

(B) assistance under section 481 of such Act (relating to international narcotics control assistance); and

(C) assistance under chapter 9 of part I of such Act (relating to international disaster assistance).

(b) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each multilateral development bank and international financial institution to which the United States is a member to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan or other utilization of the funds of such bank or institution for the benefit of the Republic of Nicaragua for fiscal year 2001 or 2002 unless the President first makes a certification under subsection (d) for the fiscal year involved.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to assistance that is directed specifically to programs which serve the basic human needs of the citizens of Nicaragua.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of this Act (whichever occurs later), and not later than September 1, 2001, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a detailed report listing the 50 most urgent property claims by United States citizens against the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua which shall include, but not be limited to, all property claims in which Nicaraguan courts have ruled in favor of United States citizens, and property claims by United States citizens involving Public Sector National Corporations (CORNAP).

(d) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification to the Congress that the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua has returned the nationalized or expropriated property of each United States citizen who has a formally-documented claim against the Government of Nicaragua listed in the report under subsection (c), or has provided adequate and effective compensation in convertible foreign exchange or other mutually acceptable compensation equivalent to the full value of the nationalized or expropriated property of each United States citizen who has a formally-documented claim against the Government of Nicaragua listed in the report under subsection (c).

HONORING BALL STATE PRESIDENT JOHN E. WORTHEN—A GREAT EDUCATOR

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the House of Representatives to honor a leader in education in Indiana and the nation. In the heart of my district in East Central Indiana lies Ball State University, one of the premier institutions of higher education in the Midwest. For the last sixteen years Ball State has been under the capable guidance of University President John E. Worthen. Sadly, he is leaving the university this year.

Mr. Speaker, greatness is setting bold goals and then having the will to accomplish them. John Worthen brought vision and greatness when he came to the university in 1984 and has spent the last sixteen years putting his vision into practice. Ball State, Indiana, and the nation are the better for his efforts. At the start of his administration, President Worthen focused on broad goals. He aimed for excellence in all things. The university has reached beyond its grasp to accomplish his vision. His plan was anchored in the premise that learning should be a lifelong pursuit. Under his leadership, Ball State's central mission has been to arm students with the skills, knowledge, and enthusiasm to continue learning after they leave the university.

John Worthen always looked to the future of education, not its past. He viewed technology as a fundamental component of that mission, and he directed Ball State's resources toward acquiring that technology. Ball State established courses and workshops to train faculty aid staff to use the new technologies and started the Center for Teaching Technology to help faculty use this new tool to enhance their instruction. During the past ten years, Ball State has spent eighty million dollars on renovations that have added computer labs, put Internet access in every residence hall room, and wired every classroom to an interactive fiberoptic multimedia network. The university now has a student-to-computer ratio of thirteen-to-one, one of the lowest in the country. This year Yahoo! Internet Life magazine ranked Ball State among the top twenty in its annual survey of ''most wired'' universities. These technological capabilities have also made Ball State a national leader in distance education.

President Worthen's education and training gave him a solid background for the challenge of running a university. A Midwesterner, he earned a bachelor of science degree in psychology at Northwestern University in 1954 and received his master's degree in student personnel administration from Columbia University in 1955. He served four years in the Navy as a carrier pilot and education and legal officer. He attained the rank of lieutenant. He earned an Ed. D. at Harvard University in 1964 in counseling psychology and administration in higher education. John Worthen began his career in education as the dean of men at American University in Washington, D.C., then moved to the University of Delaware where he taught education courses and accepted various administrative responsibilities. In 1979, he became president of Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Ball State University invited him to become its eleventh president in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of my colleagues join me in saluting a real educator, John E. Worthen. Under his leadership, Ball State has flourished. In almost the most important fields of education—social sciences, science, and technology—President Worthen has made Ball State a leader in Indiana and across the nation and both are better off for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored to work along side John Worthen. I will miss the benefit of his counsel and wisdom. I wish he and his wife Sandra much happiness as they move on to new challenges.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 7, 2000, 1 was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 241. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on Roll Number 241.

On Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 242. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on Roll Number 242.

On Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 243. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on Roll Number 243.

On Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 244. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on Roll Number 244.

On Wednesday, June 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on Roll Number 245. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on Roll Number 245.

TRIBUTE TO KENZAL THOMAS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to commend young Kenzal Thomas, a Casey Middle School student in Mt. Vernon, IL, for his honesty. Recently after finding a dollar in the bathroom of a Mt. Vernon restaurant, Kenzal began asking everyone in the restaurant if they had lost the bill—including City Councilman Dave Keen.

As a result, Councilman Keen, along with other city officials, honored Kenzal with a framed certificate touting his integrity.

It is a pleasure for me to join in recognizing Kenzal. His honesty is a trait for which we can

all be proud of and look to as an example of doing what is right.

IN HONOR OF MONUMENTAL BAPTIST CHURCH, CELEBRATING ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Monumental Baptist Church. For 100 years, Monumental has been a sanctuary for fostering Christian ideals and values.

Monumental Baptist Church was established in 1900, in a store front in New Jersey. From its humble beginnings as a small congregation, Monumental has experienced significant growth, establishing a foundation for a prosperous future.

Reverend William Edwards was Monumental's first pastor, followed by Reverend C.H. Garelick, and Reverend William S. Smith, who, in 1905, was able to secure a new site for the church, at 116 Lafayette Street.

Reverend Smith served his church and community with dedication. After forty years as pastor and community leader, he passed away. Under Monumental's next pastor, Reverend William Fitzgerald, a mortgage was liquidated and the church received a new roof.

On the first Sunday of December 1944, Reverend Ercel F. Webb came to serve as pastor of Monumental Baptist Church. For 42 years, Reverend Webb dedicated himself to providing his congregation with spiritual guidance as well as strong leadership. During Reverend Webb's service, financial support to local and national organizations increased significantly. The United Negro College fund received substantial contributions, allowing the church to realize its goal of helping to provide young African-Americans access to a quality education.

Following Reverend Webb's retirement in 1986, Reverend Willard W.C. Ashley served until 1996. The current pastor is Reverend Joseph L. Jones.

Today, Monumental Baptist Church is 100 years old. I ask my colleagues to honor the church and its congregation for their century of dedication to God.

ELIMINATE THE DEATH TAX

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I express my strong support for the elimination of the death tax. When a person dies in this country, an outrageous tax of 37 to 55 percent is levied against the deceased's estate. The last thing that a family in mourning should have to worry about is losing the family business or farm—a life's work—to satisfy the IRS.

Only in America can one be given a certificate at birth, a license at marriage, and a bill at death. This tax is contrary to the freedom and free-market principles on which this nation was founded.

There is no question that Americans deserve to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. It is our duty to provide responsible, targeted tax relief in this time of budgetary surplus. Since my first day in Congress, we have debated what to do with the surplus. Some said tax cuts. I have strongly supported paying down the debt by 2013 or earlier. But if we pass responsible, targeted tax cuts, we can accomplish both. It is essential for Congress to repeal the unfair death tax so that family businesses and family farms can be passed down from generation to generation.

Owning a family business is the culmination of the American Dream. Let's restore the dream and repeal the death tax. We owe it to America's families, small business owners and farmers.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This legislation has placed great emphasis on expanding quality of life initiatives, addressing readiness shortfalls, and enhancing modernization programs. I am particularly supportive of the procurement budget in this legislation for the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) or Hummer.

The Congress and especially the Appropriations Committee have strongly supported sustained Hummer production. The hard-working people of Indiana's Third Congressional district have responded by providing a vehicle that has met, and in many cases, exceeded the needs of our brave troops in the field. The Hummer's superior quality allowed three U.S. Army soldiers to walk away unharmed from their vehicle after it drove over and exploded an antitank mine in Bosnia.

Moreover, both the Army and the Marine Corps have identified the Hummer among their unfunded modernization priorities. This defense appropriations bill meets those priorities by increasing the budget by $40 million, thereby allowing the Army and the Marines to buy 3,400 Hummers to replace their aging fleet and provide technology insertion. This will go a long way toward protecting our brave men and women in uniform deployed in Kosovo and Bosnia.

I am enthused by the growing capabilities of the Hummer. Earlier this year, I visited the Hummer plant and saw a prototype of the commercial "Hummer 11" which is being developed by a joint effort between AM General and General Motors. The Hummer's expansion into the commercial marketplace will result in the sharing of leading technologies for commercial and military vehicles while maintaining a highly skilled technological workforce in Indiana who I am very proud to represent.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my gratitude to the members of the Appropriations Committee who have reported a defense appropriations bill that will ensure continued Hummer production. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM DAVIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4444, the PNTR (Permanent Normal Trade Relations) for China Bill, which will open up new markets for our businesses here in the United States. This bill is about breaking down trade barriers abroad and expanding opportunities for American workers. This legislation recognizes the reality of today's global economy and equips our country with the tools necessary to maintain America's leadership throughout the world.

International trade is critical to our nation's continued economic expansion. Over I I million jobs in the United States can be attributed to exports. The simple fact that 96% of the world's consumers live outside of our borders is irrefutable evidence that in order to grow our economy, we must grow our exports.

In the WTO agreement, the U.S. has won unprecedented concessions from the Chinese that break down barriers to our goods, services, technology products, automobiles and financial services. Our farmers, who have been economically hurting, will be able to sell their agricultural products in China like never before. In Florida, our citrus and fertilizer industry will benefit immensely.

In terms of forcing changes in China, this is also a matter of national security. Once China is admitted into the WTO, they will be subject to the rule of law, which will be enforced by more than 130 countries. As we enter the 21st Century, China is on the verge of expanding its regional dominance. I believe it is apparent that the world's most populous nation is simply too influential to ignore. Thus, I believe that our engagement, rather than disengagement, is essential. I think we have a better chance of encouraging reforms with more U.S. citizens bringing our culture, ideas, and freedoms to China rather than isolating them from the rest of the world.

With regard to China's cross straits relations, the Taiwan question continues to heighten tensions in the region. Passage of PNTR would allow our country to continue to play a constructive role in diffusing that potentially destabilizing situation. Even Taiwan's leaders recognize the importance of passing PNTR and China's accession to the WTO. Recently,

the newly elected President of Taiwan, Chen Shui-bian, stated that, "We would welcome the normalization of U.S.-China trade relations . . . We look forward to both the People's Republic of China's and Taiwan's accession to the WTO."

We must respect and address many of the opposing arguments. Opponents argue that we as a nation must send a strong message to China and in many respects I agree. Let there be no mistake about it, forcing China to comply with their commitments will not be an easy task. China must know that we will be vigilant in our efforts to combat human rights abuses, that we will not tolerate acts of aggression towards its neighbors. That is why I commend my colleagues Sandy Levin and Doug Bereuter for all their hard work crafting legislation that will enable our country to closely monitor China's human rights record and compliance with its WTO commitments.

In addition, opponents of PNTR argue that only big business will benefit. I disagree. Today more than ever, U.S. businesses are functioning in a global economy, and thanks to the Information Age and the growth of e-commerce, even the smallest of America's businesses are engaging in and thriving from their interactions in international markets. In fact, a rapidly growing number of small and medium sized companies have already expanded their business to take advantage of the opportunities available in China's marketplace.

In 1997, 82 percent of all U.S. exporters to China were small and medium sized businesses. That same year, in my home state of Florida, companies with less than 100 employees accounted for 52 percent of all businesses exporting from Florida to China. Furthermore, small and medium sized companies combined accounted for 67 percent of all firms exporting from Florida to China. These figures continue.

China's business cannot begin to keep up with the rapidly growing demand of one-fifth of the world's population, leaving international companies an amazing economic opportunity should China open its trade gates. America's strong economy and its wealth of innovative and motivated small and medium sized businesses poises us to be a leader in meeting the product demand of the Chinese.

The benefits of increased trade with China both for our nation and the State of Florida are tremendous. Unless we pass PNTR, our businesses and workers will be forced to sit on the sideline and watch our global competitors take advantage of the agreement we negotiated. The effect would be to exclude many of Florida's farmers, insurers, and manufacturers of microchips, chemicals, computers, and software who would benefit from this entirely new level of access. These industries employ thousands of Floridians and have the potential to employ thousands more, but only if we can continue our strong export growth.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that increased global competition will put some industries at risk and that with the overwhelming number of winners there will be some losers. We will have to work hard to ensure every American worker can participate in our global economy.

A vote against PNTR will not create a single new job in America, clean up the environment in China, release a single prisoner, nor improve the standard of living for Chinese workers. It will only signal a retreat from the global economy and a surrendering of our nation's leadership in the international arena.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is critical for the United States. Refusal to pass PNTR would put American workers at a disadvantage. Furthermore, this legislation represents our nation's commitment to remaining engaged, and a rededication to ensuring expanded economic opportunities for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on PNTR.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, today I rise for women across the country as Co-Vice Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues and for the women of California and Los Angeles, in particular, to praise the work of Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member MURTHA for ensuring critical funding is provided for the Department of Defense Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program.

California, as one of the most populous states has a corresponding high degree of breast cancer deaths and in 1990, over 25 percent of these deaths occurred in the Los Angeles area alone. Nationally, an estimated 2.6 million women—one in eight women—are currently living with breast cancer.

As the leading cause of cancer deaths among women aged 40-59, it is second only to lung cancer in the number of cancer deaths. It is estimated that 40,800 women will die of breast cancer this year. African American women currently have the shortest life expectancy. The need for research to reduce the number of deaths among all women and stop this disparity in life expectancy between Caucasian women and women of color is unequivocal.

The most significant risk factors for breast cancer are simply being female and growing older. The majority of women with breast cancer have no known significant family history or other known risk factors. In fact, only 5–10% of breast cancers are due to heredity. Therefore, research that is conducted by the Defense Department as well as by the National Institutes of Health is imperative for all women.

Thanks to the bipartisan leadership and dedication of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the breast cancer research program continues to grow and provide innovative ways of fighting this disease. On behalf of the women of California and women across the country, I thank Chairman Lewis and Ranking Member MURTHA for their commitment to this issue.

SEEING FIRSTHAND NEW JERSEY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report on a visit I made in April of this year to two of the U.S. Army's installations, one in California and the other in Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, the upper Mojave Desert is a long way from Morristown. Frankly, when you think of southern California and the desert, you conjure up thoughts of oppressive heat, scorching sun and scorpions underfoot.

During the Congressional Easter "recess," I spent several days visiting Fort Irwin, home of the National Training Center and the U.S. Army's premier field combat training facility. There is nothing like it anywhere in the world, according to what I heard and saw during my visit.

For almost two years now, I have had added to my assignment on the House Appropriations Committee, a seat on the Subcommittee on Defense, which includes budget jurisdiction over all of our nation's branches of the Armed Services and our national intelligence agencies.

Whenever possible, I try to visit military installations, bases and especially our young troops in the field. After all, these young men and women need to know that Members of Congress appreciate what they do and that we are committed to their safety, proper training, and the acquisition of the best equipment and technology available.

I saw firsthand the battlefield realism that the National Training Center provides. That location in the desert combines the scope, scale, and intensity of effort that past and future wars have provided.

Take for example, the Persian Gulf War. On the morning of February 24, 1991, combat-ready U.S. military forces launched the land phase of the Persian Gulf War with the objective of removing Iraqi forces from the Republic of Kuwait. One hundred hours later, they accomplished their objective.

The majority of U.S. soldiers contributing to this victory received their combat field training at the National Training Center at Fort Irwin. Their success on the battlefields of Iraq and Kuwait confirmed that authentic, real-time combat training leads to decisive victory.

It is also at Fort Irwin that our New Jersey National Guard units, as well as active duty Army battalions from all across the world, train to be soldiers, improving their fighting skills without actual loss of life or loss of equipment.

As fate would have it, I did meet with some members of the New Jersey National Guard's 1–114th Infantry Battalion as they got ready to fight in a mock battle with the regular stationed force. It was very cold out there and I even got caught in a blinding sandstorm as the temperatures dropped down below freezing.

About 5500 U.S. soldiers are deployed to the National Training Center to engage in a strenuous 28 day training event called a "rotation" twelve times a year—you really have to admire these young men and women.

From the sands of the Mojave and the arduous training at Ft. Irwin, I visited the Yuma Proving Grounds in Yuma, Arizona. At this facility, the Army tests weapons and munitions. Much of the technology tested at Yuma, near the Mexican border, is researched and developed in our own backyard at Picatinny Arsenal in Rockaway Township.

I had the good fortune of witnessing a test of the Crusader, an advanced tank artillery system that, as I mentioned, is designed at Picatinny Arsenal. In fact, the Crusader is one of Picatinny's major projects.

The Crusader is the Army's future heavy artillery system and it will provide more reliable, more lethal firepower on the battlefield. The Crusader can fire faster, and more accurately than any existing tank or fighting vehicle in the Army's inventory. During tests at Yuma, the Crusader showed its stuff by successfully firing a round nearly 40 km!

I look forward to showing Defense Secretary William Cohen where Crusader research and development takes place when he visits Picatinny on May 26. 1 have pursued his visit for several years because I believe it is important for the Defense Secretary to see firsthand the amazing work being done by the talented men and women of Picatinny—work that is critical to America's national security. I am glad Secretary Cohen has accepted my invitation to visit Picatinny; it's the first time in Picatinny's long history that a Secretary of Defense will have visited.

Finally, back in Washington, last week my committee, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, gave its approval to our nation's military and intelligence programs for fiscal year 2001, including those critical programs at Picatinny and New Jersey's other military installations. You can be sure that I will continue working to strengthen our military.

Most especially, I will continue working to see to it that our young soldiers are properly paid, have decent housing, and child care, remembering that 65 percent of our all-volunteer force is married, many with children. After all, these young men and women and their sense of self-sacrifice and duty, continue to serve as an inspiration for all Americans.

BUILD IT RIGHT, AND THEY WILL COME

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have often heard the phrase "if you build it, they will come" from the movie Field of Dreams. We have learned, however, that when it comes to baseball parks, we need to get it right—that delicate balance between the old and new. The new ballpark in the City of Detroit was a vision of the Ilitch Family and John McHale, the owners and president of the Detroit Tigers respectively—and I am pleased to say they got it right. From the statues of Tiger greats in the outfield to the tiger gargoyles on the outside, the new Comerica Park is a gem. Mr. Speaker, I had the fortunate opportunity to attend the dedication of the new park and was deeply touched by President McHale's comments. I now submit his remarks for the RECORD.

MCHALE REMARKS FOR APRIL 8, 2000 RIBBON CUTTING CEREMONY

Reverend Clergy, Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends of our City, Friends of the Detroit Tigers, Good Morning.

Today marks for me a little more than five years since I first came to you, unknown, uncredentialed, clad only in the good will of the Ilitch family and your own charity to ask for your help for the Detroit Tigers.

Who knows what you must have thought and how many promises for how many projects that came to little had been put to you before. I look back then on my own impudence with humility and the improbability of our success with laughter. But it seemed to me then that the success of this adventure was possible only if built upon the rock which is the spirit of the people of the City of Detroit. However naively or imperfectly I tried to express this, you already knew if better than I.

(In my middle years, I came upon a wood. . . .) You welcomed us. You guided us. From validating our agreement and financial partnership with the City, to providing us with public fora, to assisting us in reaching the voters of the City and then Wayne County, this project was nurtured in the temples, mosques and churches of our community. And, as would a parent, you gently and firmly gave us to understand how we should do justice to the people of our community who helped us give life to this dream. I want to pause to remember my friend Morris Hood and to speak his name here with gratitude and affection. With me, Morris was not so gentle but was extremely firm concerning his expectations for this project. He loved the Tigers and I hope he is proud of his city today. From planning and hosting outreach meetings to recruiting skilled tradeswomen and tradesmen to commending to our attention new and established businesses, your communities of faith have helped us at every step.

Because our achievement has been so great, both symbolically and in terms of steel, bricks and concrete, it is tempting to consider today's celebration a conclusion. That would be a profound mistake. It is a point of passage, appropriate for brief rest, reflection and an occasion for celebration, but just a stop on the long journey for all of us toward our greater goals. It is not normally fashionable in the business of professional sports to concede, much less insist as we do today, that the partnerships of public and private support required to produce such beautiful buildings as Comerica Park ought to serve greater goods than our success in the standings and on the balance sheet. But of course this is so and this proposition has been joyfully embraced by the Ilitch family since the establishment of their entrepreneurial headquarters in this city in 1987 and at the Detroit Tigers since its acquisition by Mike Ilitch in 1992. And, as surely as we have been guided and inspired by a determination to restore our city to the material greatness known by our parents and grandparents, so must we work to make it St. Matthew's "city on a mountain" as renowned for its goodness, economic opportunity and economic justice as for the beauty of its buildings and the glory of its sports clubs. So do we work, with an eye and an ear toward the judgment of history.

What do we wish men and women to say of our efforts a hundred years from today? I hope that they will say we can know three things about the people who built this building.

First, that they loved their children. All ballparks are, by definition, places of communal recreation and celebration (subject to the occasional vagaries of on-field performance). Bart Giamatti told us:

"The gods are brought back when the people gather. . . . The acts of physical toil—lifting, throwing, bending, jumping, pushing, grasping, stretching, running, hoisting, the constantly repeated acts that for millennia have meant work and to bound them in time or by rules or boundaries in a green enclosure surrounded by an amphitheater or at least a gallery (thus combining garden and city, a place removed from care but in the real world) is to replicate the arena of humankinds' highest aspiration. . . . 'Winning' for player or spectator is not simply outscoring. It is a way of talking about betterment, about making oneself, one's fellows, one's city, one's adherents, more noble because of a temporary engagement of a higher human plane of existence."

This may be what grips a city as this one was gripped in 1968 and 1984 and will be again. This engagement is what stamps in our mind the characteristics of human spirit revealed in the heat of competition by our athletic heroes like Greenberg, Kaline and Horton. The certainty that in these metaphors we can teach important lessons of life: the need for patience, the need to struggle, the need to bear defeat without conceding to it and the need to view victory as a transitory gift, is what led our parents and grandparents to bring us to Navin Field, Briggs Stadium and Tiger Stadium and is what will lead us to bring our children and grandchildren to Comerica Park. Never has there been a sporting field built to echo the joy of children and adults at play. The stories and lessons of our shared history abound. In one sense, Comerica Park is literally the most magnificent playground ever built. In another, it is the illustrated story of one hundred years of a part of Detroit's history. In a third, its steel, concrete and bricks and its focus on the skyline will reinforce in young minds their parents' lessons of economic opportunity, the appropriate role of professional sports in a larger civic context and the importance of our city to our region, state and country.

Second, I hope that they will say that these builders loved their city.

All of us, together, began a quest to breath new life into the City of Detroit by building a ballpark, that is in ways subtle and obvious is of the City of Detroit. It is here, of course, bounded by the old city streets of Montcalm, Witherell, Adams and Brush, physically connected to Grand Circus Park, Harmonie Park and Brush Park. It represents over $300 million worth of affirmation in the future and vitality of downtown Detroit. It is made of materials that are almost sacramental to our City, brick, steel, glass and concrete. Its forms are echoes of the most beautiful in Detroit design from the last century. Its exterior is graced by bands and plaques of tile from the Pewabic Pottery on East Jefferson Avenue. Comerica Park has been planned to nurture the surrounding neighborhoods and to stimulate new growth. Already, complimentary projects have begun and more announced. Buildings unused for decades are being renovated and that most precious sign of urban vitality, new residential construction, is rising just to the north of us in Brush Park. Very soon we will be joined by our even larger neighbor, Ford Field, which will bring

many hundreds of thousands more of our metropolitan citizens downtown. This, in turn, will stimulate even more of the desirable development activity which we now see. Is all of this happening because of Comerica Park? Of course not, but much of it is. The good that we hoped for our city is coming to pass because of the commitments we made to each other and the work we began in 1995.

Third, I hope that 100 years from now the citizens of Detroit will look back upon us and say, ''They kept their word.'' We came to you in 1995 and 1996 and promised that if you would help us, we would ensure that at least 30% of the estimated $245 million price of this project would represent goods and services provided by minority, women-owned, small and local businesses. At last report, the total percentage of work performed by these businesses represented, 56%, nearly double our promise. This has meant over $133 million in work for these businesses who have performed so well in helping us complete this project on schedule and on budget. It is worth mentioning today that the first contract excavation work on this project performed on September 4, 1997 was done by Ferguson Enterprises, a minority business enterprise and the final Tiger statue swung into place was manufactured by Showmotion, Inc., a woman-owned business enterprise, appropriate bookends for the good work of the City the County, the City Council New Stadia Development Monitoring Task Force (chaired for 4 years by Reverend Wendell Anthony), the MMBDC, A3BC, the Minority Business Initiative, our project team IFG, the Smith Group, HOK and H–T–W and hundreds of individuals, without the work of each, these exemplary results could never have been possible. We are confident that beyond being sound construction decisions, these contractual relationships will provide a basis for future prosperity, contract capacity and public and industry recognition of these businesses and will help continue cycles of prosperity for these firms for many, many years.

They loved their children, they loved their city, they kept their word. It is to this judgment by the men and women of the year 2100 that we rededicate ourselves and our organization today and that we pledge as the tests of our judgments and actions for as long as we are given to continue the work of God and man that we began together at the birth of the dream which is today Comerica Park. Thank you.

CONGRATULATING BRENDA BUTLER HAMLETT

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to Brenda Butler Hamlett, who was recently selected as a 2000 Robert Wood Johnson Community Health Leader. Ms. Hamlett is one of only ten individuals from around the country to be recognized with this most distinguished award for community health leadership.

As a community development coordinator for the New England Organ Bank, Ms. Hamlett works tirelessly to raise awareness of the need for increased organ and tissue donations, especially among minority populations. Her programs work to educate minority families about the risk factors and lifestyle choices that can lead to the need for a transplant. She also works to encourage residents in the community to consider organ donation as a contribution they can make to save the lives of others.

Ms. Hamlett comes to her work from a very unique perspective. After battling heart disease for a number of years, she was forced to undergo a heart transplant in 1993. After her successful procedure, she agreed to be featured in the organ bank's advertising campaign on posters and public service announcements. In 1995 she joined the organ bank's staff full-time, putting her former experience as a community relations specialist and teacher to work.

Ms. Hamlett currently conducts much of her outreach in Boston-area schools, using poetry and workbooks that she has developed herself to teach young people about organ donation and end of-life issues. She also offers programs in community health centers and area churches. She often fields calls in the middle of the night from area hospitals to counsel families about donating organs and loved ones.

As a further recognition of her tremendous work, she was also recently elected president of the American Society of Minority Health Transplant Professionals, whose mission is to promote organ and tissue donation among minorities.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly my honor today to congratulate Brenda Butler Hamlett for this well deserved award. As extraordinary people do, Ms. Hamlett was able to transform an undoubtedly traumatic experience in her life into a tremendous dedication to improve the lives of those around her.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF DAVE WILDMAN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Mr. Dave Wildman in honor of his retirement from thirty years of work as an educator. For the past 18 years, Mr. Wildman has been the Principal of Silverado Middle School in Napa County, California where he has dutifully served the students of our community.

Mr. Wildman was born in Hazelwood, Indiana and later moved to California. He received his teaching credential from California State University, Hayward in Biology, Chemistry and the Physical Sciences. He began his teaching career in 1968 teaching Science at Silverado Middle School. In 1972, Mr. Wildman was promoted to the Dean of Boys—Vice Principal of the School. He served in this post until 1980 when he became the Principal of Ridgeview Junior High School in Napa County. In 1982, he returned to Silverado Middle School to become Principal, where he has served until his retirement this month.

Under the guidance of Mr. Wildman, Silverado Middle School has been the recipient of numerous academic merits and awards. In 1986, Silverado was granted its first Napa Distinguished Middle School award. In 1988, Silverado was selected as a Foundation School and as one of 100 network partnership schools by the California State Department of Education. Silverado later received a second Distinguished Middle School award by the California Department of Education in 1996.

As an individual Mr. Wildman has been recognized as an outstanding academic leader. In 1988, he was given a California Department of Education Commendation for middle school grade reform. In 1988, Mr. Wildman was also granted the Napa Valley Unified School District leadership award for distinguished management performance. He was the recipient of the Distinguished Leadership award from the California State Department of Education in 1991. And, in 1996, Mr. Wildman was awarded a California Distinguished Middle School Principal's award.

Dave Wildman is a dedicated family man. He and his wife Nancy have three children: Christine, Jeremy and Sarah.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Dave Wildman has been an exemplary educator and leader in the Napa Valley. As Mr. Wildman's Representative, I am both honored and pleased to know that there are dedicated people, such as he, who are leading our public schools. Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, it is proper that we honor Principal Dave Wildman for all of his achievements and his contribution to our community.

APPALACHIA TOUR

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share another story from my recent tour of Appalachia. I heard many stories of people who are hungry in the midst of our record-breaking economy. I wish that I didn't hear these stories and I wish they weren't true, but they are. One family told me of their trouble simply putting meals on the table.

Darryl and Martha are two ordinary people who find themselves requiring assistance from a local food pantry. Darryl just turned 70 and receives about $ 1,000 each month for his retirement. Martha has cancer and lost her parents and her brothers to the disease. She had surgery eight times in the past 10 years. In order to get to her medical appointments, Darryl and Martha must drive eighty miles round-trip. Even with Medicaid, their gas and $10 co-payments add up, so they swallowed their pride and applied for food stamps. After filling out an application that asked 700 questions, Darryl and Martha were congratulated on being entitled to $5 each in monthly benefits.

When an outreach worker spoke with Darryl and Martha, neither of them had eaten for three days. Three days. There was not a single can or box of food in their cupboards, after months of trying to stretch everything they had. Martha had watered down a can of tomato juice to last two weeks. She had added

extra water to cans of soup to try and make it last a second day. They once had chicken noodle soup with no chicken and noodles made from one egg and a little flour. Martha would often lie to her husband and say that she wasn't hungry so that he could eat. "We never asked for help," they said, until the doctor gave her two days to live if she did not start eating again. The food pantry helped them with a few bags of groceries, and for now, they say, "we don't have to add water to everything because we can eat again."

Mr. Speaker, people should rejoice for the big things in life, not just because they can eat a whole can of soup. We need to end the scourge of hunger in America. We have the solutions, all we need is the political and spiritual will to do it.

200TH BIRTHDAY OF THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD

HON. JOHN E. SUNUNU

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to pay tribute to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, the first publicly owned shipyard in our Nation, on the occasion of its 200th birthday. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard was established on June 12, 1800, on the Piscataqua River between New Hampshire and Maine as our first permanent shipyard devoted exclusively to the construction and repair of vessels for the United States Navy.

In 1814, the Washington, the first naval vessel to bear the name of our first president was built at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. By 1818, the Shipyard's work force had grown to 50 workers. Portsmouth constructed another 12 vessels for the United States Navy prior to the beginning of the Civil War earning recognition as the "Cradle of American Shipbuilding."

Although new ship construction slowed at Portsmouth after the end of the Civil War, the Shipyard continued to play an important role in our Nation's history. The U.S.S. *Constitution* was berthed at the Shipyard for some time, and during and after the Spanish-American War, over 1600 Spanish prisoners were quartered on its grounds. In 1905, the Treaty of Portsmouth, ending the Russo-Japanese War and earning President Theodore Roosevelt the Nobel Peace Prize, was signed at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

With the onset of World War I, the workforce was expanded to almost 5,000 and the Shipyard began its long and illustrious history of submarine construction, launching the first U.S. submarine built in a naval shipyard in 1917.

During World War II, the ranks of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard jumped to 24,000. Over 70 submarines were constructed at the Shipyard during the Second World War, with three launched on a single day, a record that no other public or private shipyard has ever equaled. In 1944, Portsmouth held the record for constructing the greatest number of submarines in one year, turning out 31.

After World War II, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard became the Navy's center for submarine design and development. The Shipyard built the research submarine, the U.S.S. *Albacore,* with its revolutionary 'tear-drop' shaped hull, which set the standard for all subsequent submarine designs world-wide. Today the U.S.S. *Albacore* rests at a site close to the Shipyard in Portsmouth, NH, as an historical and educational exhibit open to the public.

Another in a long line of "firsts" for the Shipyard occurred in 1968 when Portsmouth constructed the first full size very deep diving noncombatant submarine built in a naval shipyard. The Portsmouth Shipyard also launched the last submarine built in a public shipyard, the nuclear powered U.S.S. *Sand Lance,* in 1969.

As a tribute to its historical significance and its place in our heritage, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Today the civilian work force at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard stands at 3601, and it takes pride in its continuing role as the Navy's leading shipyard for submarine overhaul and repair. The Shipyard encompasses nearly 300 acres and over 300 buildings, has three dry docks, and capacity to berth six submarines.

As we embark on a new century and millennium, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has positioned itself to meet the demands of today's competitive business environment and offer its customer, the United States taxpayer, the best product for the best price. Responding to the challenges of the marketplace, the Shipyard is forging joint ventures with the private sector—leasing out unutilized or underutilized facilities and equipment—and partnering with Electric Boat. Today Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers and Electric Boat employees work side by side in the best interests of the Nation.

For two hundred years the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has served in the defense of our country, the Cradle of American Shipbuilding set in New England's Cradle of Democracy. Ever adapting to the changes that have taken our Nation from sails to atoms, the Shipyard continues to play a critical role in strengthening and maintaining our national security.

Mr. Speaker, this historic institution, a hallmark of our country's mighty naval strength, deserves the recognition of all Americans as it marks the occasion of its two hundredth birthday. I ask you to join me in thanking generations of Shipyard workers for their dedication and service to protecting our Nation's security interests at home and on the seas.

CONDEMNING LTTE TERRORISM

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as Co-chair of the Sri Lanka Caucus, I am increasingly concerned about the situation in that South Asian nation.

The democratic government of Sri Lanka has been under attack for more than 25 years, the subject of an especially vicious campaign by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). The LTTE purports to represent the interests of the minority Tamils and seeks an independent homeland in the north of the country. The Tigers have appropriately been identified by the State Department as a terrorist organization.

The LTTE's tactic of indiscriminate suicide terrorist bombings have succeeded mostly in killing and maiming dozens of innocent civilians at a time, occasionally succeeding in taking out their target.

Yesterday, such an attack, attributed to the Tamil Tigers, killed the Minister for Industrial Development, C.V. Gooneratne, and at least 20 other people. At least 60 people were injured, including Mr. Gooneratne's wife, who was critically hurt. I strongly condemn this terrorist act; I express my condolences to all who suffered losses.

And regrettably this was only the most recent such attack. Last year President Kumaratunga was wounded in a suicide bomber terrorist attack at a campaign rally; that bombing and one at another rally left 22 people dead and more than 100 wounded.

In a statement yesterday, the State Department stated, "The LTTE's legacy of bombing, assassinations, massacres and torture has alienated the people of Sri Lanka and the international community, and has done nothing to promote the legitimate needs and aspirations of the Sri Lankan Tamils. The LTTE must abandon these methods if it hopes to play a constructive role in ending the conflict." I am pleased by the strength of this condemnation, and I am in full agreement with it.

I hope that my colleagues will join me and Congressman PALLONE, my fellow Sri Lanka Caucus co-chair, and other Members of the Caucus in condemning LTTE terrorism and supporting the people of Sri Lanka in their effort to combat terrorism and maintain a united democratic nation.

TRIBUTE TO AN EDUCATOR: IN THANKS TO DAVID GROSS OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a friend of education and a dedicated public servant to the people of San Diego: Mr. David Gross, the budget supervisor to San Diego City Schools, who has retired from the schools after 23 years of service this past April.

As budget supervisor, David exercised particular interest and expertise in ensuring that children with disabilities had the educational resources they needed to succeed in school. He had responsibility for special education, gifted and talented programs, the Health Services Billing System and major categorical programs. With this responsibility, he worked closely with teachers, administrators and families to develop budget plans that met students' needs.

In fact, David was a statewide leader in this important field. He was a member of the State Special Education Fiscal Task Force and the Department of Education's Financial Reporting Oversight Committee. He assisted in the development of the California Association of

School Business Officials' Training Manual, and piloted the system established by the State of California for school districts to bill MediCal and private insurance companies for health services provided in school.

David served on several other state and local leadership boards important to the improvement of special education. These included service on the Special Education Task Force (1986–88), the Local Education Area Health and Social Services Advisory Committee (1994–98), Advisory Committee on Special Education (1996–99), and the AB 602 Special Disabilities Working Group.

This important work is no less important to excellent education than is the day-to-day dedication of parents, teachers and other administrators; for if the school system lacked the administration of resources to do its job, school literally could not open. Even so, David took this critical financial stewardship task to a higher level by continually taking great care to ensure that his work in school system budgets was related to the real, day-to-day educational needs of students, and professional needs of teachers and administrators. For many years, he served hour upon hour as a volunteer tutor in a local San Diego area elementary school.

Let the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States show that Mr. David Gross is a friend of education and a friend to America, and a dedicated and gifted public servant whose hard work and great talent will be honored and missed by his friends and colleagues.

HELSINKI FINAL ACT 25TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, an international accord whose signing represents a milestone in European history. As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission, I have been privileged to be associated with the Helsinki process and its seminal role in advancing human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Europe. I am pleased to be joined by my fellow Helsinki Commissioners Representatives HOYER, WOLF, CARDIN, SALMON, SLAUGHTER, GREENWOOD, FORBES and PITTS as original cosponsors. A companion resolution is being introduced today in the Senate by Helsinki Commission CoChair Sen. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL.

The Helsinki Final Act and the process it spawned has been instrumental in consigning the Communist Soviet Empire—responsible for untold violations of human rights—into the dustbin of history. With its language on human rights, the Helsinki Final Act, for the first time in the history of international agreements, granted human rights the status of a fundamental principle in regulating international relations. The Final Act's emphasis on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is rooted in the recognition that the declaration of such rights affirm the inherent dignity of men and women and are not privileges bestowed at the whim of the state.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, the standards of Helsinki which served as a valuable lever in pressing human rights issues also provided encouragement and sustenance to courageous individuals who dared to challenge repressive communist regimes. Many of these brave men and women—members of the Helsinki Monitoring Groups in Russia, Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and similar groups in Poland and Czechoslovakia, Soviet Jewish emigration activists, members of repressed Christian denominations and others—paid a high price in the loss of personal freedom and, in some instances, their lives, for their active support of principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act.

Western pressure through the Helsinki process—now advanced in the forum of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—greatly contributed to the freeing of the peoples of the Captive Nations, thus bringing an end to the Cold War. The Helsinki Commission, on which I have served since 1983, played a significant role in promoting human rights and human contacts. The congressional initiatives such as hearings, resolutions, letters and face-to-face meetings with representatives of Helsinki signatories which violated human rights commitments, encouraged our own government to raise these issues consistently and persistently. The Commission's approach at various Helsinki meetings has always been to encourage a thorough and detailed review of compliance with Helsinki agreements. Specific cases and issues are cited, rather than engaging in broad, philosophical discussions about human rights. With the passage of time—and with the leadership of the United States—this more direct approach in pressing human rights concerns has become the norm. In fact, by 1991 the Helsinki signatory states accepted that human dimension commitments "are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the state concerned."

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the OSCE region has changed dramatically. In many States, we have witnessed dramatic transformation and a consolidation of the core OSCE values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. In others, there has been little if any progress, and in some, armed conflicts have resulted in hundreds of thousands having been killed and in the grotesque violation of human rights. The OSCE, which now includes 54 participating States, has changed to reflect the changed international environment, undertaking a variety of initiatives designed to prevent, manage, and resolve conflict and emphasizing respect for rule of law and the fight against organized crime and corruption, which constitute a threat to economic reform and prosperity. The Helsinki process is still dynamic and active, and the importance of a vigorous review in which countries are called to account for violations of their freely undertaken Helsinki commitments has not diminished.

This resolution calls on the President to issue a proclamation reaffirming the United States' commitment to full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. All signatory states would be asked to clarify that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democratic principles as well as economic liberty, and the implementation of related commitments continue to be vital elements in promoting a new era of democracy, peace and unity in the OSCE region. In the twenty-five years since this historic process was initiated in Helsinki, there have been many successes. Mr. Speaker, the task is still far from complete, and we must continue to do our part in championing the values that Helsinki espouses.

OUR LADY OF LOURDES ACADEMY WINS 1ST PLACE IN NATIONAL COMPETITION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Our Lady of Lourdes Academy for winning first place at the National Finals of the "We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution."

The group was invited to Washington D.C. as the finalist representing all of Florida and went on to win the first place trophy. There were over 50 groups in the competition.

I want to congratulate Giannina Berrocal, Erika Bloch, Carolina Bolado, Gabriela Chamorro, Natalie Dela Maza, Elizabeth Herald, Stephanie Hew, Ana Manrara, Carmen Manrara, Jennifer McNally, Kellie Montoya, Alexandra Mora, Cn'stina Moreno, Carmen Ruiz-Castaneda, Jennifer Smith and Olga Urbieta for their hard work, and especially Ms. Rosalie Heffernon, their teacher, who helped give them direction in this important endeavor.

Congratulations to these Lourdes students for taking such an active interest in the history of our nation, and I am sure that this bright group of high school students will be the voices echoing in the national debate of the years to come.

HATE CRIMES

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, sitting on a bench, riding on a bus, or even walking down the street, a hate crime can occur anytime or any place. Hate crimes are acts of pure unadulterated evil, wronging someone because they are different. People should not and cannot live in fear because of their race, color, religion or sexual orientation; it is time that we take the strongest course of action to prevent these crimes.

Over the past decade the number of hate crimes has risen rapidly, consummating with 1999's "summer of hate." If taking anything positive from this infamous period is possible it is, that we have not done enough to prevent such crimes. Committing a hate crime is the most serious of offenses. It is our duty to

make the punishment severe enough to deter even the most prejudicial person from considering a crime of this size. We in Congress have the ability and the opportunity to prevent the possible consequences of bias from occurring.

Today, as we commemorate the second anniversary of James Byrd's tragic death, we must pledge upon ourselves to do everything in our power to reduce the number of hate crimes. No one should ever fall victim to a hate crime, or any other crime for that matter, and we must renew and maintain our focus of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act (H.R. 1082), to ensure that crimes cease.

THE WISEWOMAN EXPANSI0N ACT OF 2000

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the "WISEWOMAN (Well-Integrated Screening and Evaluation for Women Across the Nation) Expansion Act of 2000" with my colleague, Congressman JAMES LEACH, the Co-Chair of the Congressional Prevention Coalition.

This legislation would allow the highly successful WISEWOMAN demonstration project, currently operating in four states, to expand to other states that qualify. The "WISEWOMAN Expansion Act" would authorize the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to make competitive grants to states to carry out further preventive health services, in addition to the breast and cervical cancer screenings that the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Programs (NBCCEDP) currently provide. Examples of these additional vital services include screenings for blood pressure, cholesterol, and osteoporosis; health education and counseling; lifestyle interventions to change behavioral risk factors such as smoking, lack of exercise, poor nutrition, and sedentary lifestyle; and appropriate referrals for medical treatment and follow-up services.

The need for this program is clear. Each year, nearly half a million women lose their lives as a result of heart disease and stroke. Many of us associate cardiovascular disease with men, but the American Heart Association estimates that nearly one in two women will die of heart disease or stroke. In fact, cardiovascular diseases kills nearly 50,000 more women each year than men. Sadly, many of these deaths could have been prevented. Had these women known they were at risk for cardiovascular disease, they could have taken preventive measures to lower their risk factors and perhaps prevent heart disease and stroke. Osteoporosis, affecting half of all women over the age of 50, is also a preventable disease. Fortunately, some of the preventive measures women can take to reduce their risk for cardiovascular diseases, such as eating more nutritious foods and exercising, can also reduce their risk for osteoporosis.

The bill would also add flexibility to the program language that would allow screenings and other preventive measures for diseases in addition to cardiovascular diseases, such as osteoporosis, as more preventive technology becomes available. It would allow flexibility for the WISEWOMAN program to grow and adapt with the needs of individual states and would ensure full collaboration of the WISEWOMAN program with the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program (NBCCEDP).

States would be eligible for this program only if they already participate in the NBCCEDP and agree to operate their WISEWOMAN program in strong collaboration with the NBCCEDP. The bill would authorize funding to carry out this program at a level of $20 million for fiscal year 2001, $25 million for fiscal year 2002, for $30 million for fiscal year 2003, and "such sums" as necessary for each subsequent year.

Early prevention of cardiovascular disease stroke and osteoporosis would result in a substantial cost-savings for our health care system, but more importantly, it would improve the quality of life for our mothers, our sisters, our daughters and our friends. If we can reach women who are at high risk early in their lives, assist them in altering their behavior to live healthier lifestyles, we could prevent countless diseases and injuries and ultimately, we would save lives. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

SOUTH SIDE HIGH SCHOOL JUNE SCHOOL OF THE MONTH

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have named South Side High School in Rockville Centre as the Fourth Congressional District School of the Month for June 2000. Mr. Robin Calitri is the Principal, with Mrs. Carol Burris to assume that post on July 1. Dr. William H. Johnson is the Rockville Centre School District Superintendent of Schools.

South Side High School students have it all—a well-rounded education, an ability to excel in academics and in sports, and what they give of themselves to the school and the community.

High academic standards and results, coupled with winning extra-curricular activities lead to an award-winning high school. A description of the school reads, "The staff at South Side understands that excellence must be inclusive; thus the pursuit of equity is a priority among its educational goals."

One of the top-performing schools in the country—with awards too numerous to mention—South Side was named a Blue Ribbon School in May 1998. South Side is an All Regents High School, and students excel academically, as seen in the fact 19 percent of the school's graduates earned Regents diplomas with honors. Furthermore, South Side offers its honors students the opportunity of International Baccalaureates, allowing college credit as well as admission to overseas and national universities. South Side is one of four schools in New York state to offer the program.

South Side's students are incredibly energized. They participate in the Congressional Arts Competition year after year, and have an active Model Congress and Student Government Association.

One of South Side's numerous clubs is the Inter-generational Committee. Students spend time with Long Island seniors, volunteer at senior centers and help them with grocery shopping and other errands in an effort to promote and foster understanding between seniors and high school students.

I am proud to name South Side High School in Rockville Centre School of the Month for June in the Fourth Congressional District of New York.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO DAY SCHOOL GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER CHAMPIONS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, with the 2000 Major League Soccer season in full swing, I would like to recognize a school from the Sixth District of North Carolina that captured a state soccer championship recently. Greensboro Day School has been crowned the 2000 North Carolina girls' high school soccer champions among our state's independent schools.

Greensboro Day School captured the girls' soccer 3–A NCISAA state title. In their sixth championship in the past six years, the Bengals claimed the title with a decisive 5–0 victory over Charlotte Christian High School. Greensboro Day school also claimed the PACIS conference championship with a 7–0–1 record in conference.

We congratulate Carley Allen, Elizabeth Lancaster, Mary Dickinson, Emily Crowe, Suzanne Cole, Nancy Calhoun, Shannon Burbine, Jenny Gilrain, Jen Pool, Blair DeGraw, Kirsten Paul, Sarah Cantrell, Dana Murphy, Clarence Mills, Merrill McCarty, Rachel Wolff, Michelle Kuzma, Ashley Bergin, Jessica McComb, Rebecca Barger, Meredith McAdams, and Angela Berry. They were led by Head Coach Michael Burroughs and his assistants Mike Johnston, Lynn Pantousco, and Patra Glavin.

The Sixth District of North Carolina is proud of this team from Guilford County for their hard work and dedication. Congratulations to the girls from Greensboro Day School for a job well done.

HONORING FAYETTE COUNTY SCHOLARS

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize three young scholars from Fayette County High School in Fayetteville, Georgia: Ms. Crystal Bradley, Ms. Kim Dempsey, and Ms. Lauren Stoll.

Their project, a five minute news story for the Aeronautics and Space Science Journalism competition sponsored by the NASA

Student Involvement Program, focused on the F–22 Raptor Fighter, and the debate surrounding its funding. The report explained how the F–22 will be the backbone of American air dominance well into the 21st century. I was honored to play a very limited role in their project by participating in an interview.

Their entry was selected a national winner. They were flown to Washington, DC for the National Symposium where they shared their project with the nation. I am pleased to acknowledge such excellence among our young people, and to recognize the outstanding leadership provided to them by Warren Bernard of Fayette County High School.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 6th and part of June 7, 2000, due to a death in my family, I missed the following votes:

Had I been present on June 6th, on Rollcall votes 234, 235, 236, and 237, 1 would have voted ''aye'' on all four votes.

Had I been present on June 7th, on Rollcall votes 238, 239, and 240, 1 would have voted ''aye'' on all three votes.

IN SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DOCTOR DENNIS ALAN VIDMAR ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AFTER TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to an outstanding member of our armed forces. Tomorrow, Friday, June 9, 2000, Dr. Dennis Alan Vidmar will conclude his illustrious twenty-eight year career of service in the United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, Dennis Vidmar was born in Cleveland, Ohio in August of 1950. He attended Case Western Reserve University and received his Bachelor of Science and MD degrees from the Ohio State University. In 1972, Dr. Vidmar began his military service as a First Division Officer aboard the U.S.S. *Detroit*. For the next twenty-eight years, Dr. Vidmar would devote his energy and talents to the field of medicine and to the service of his nation.

Currently, Dr. Vidmar serves as a Captain in the United States Navy Medical Corps in the Dermatology Department at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. In addition, Dr. Vidmar is a Professor of Military Medicine and Dermatology in the Department of Military and Emergency Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dennis Vidmar has truly been an asset to the profession of medicine and to the United States Navy. His excellent care and unselfish dedication in directing the Dermatology Department have proven invaluable in the treatment of his patients. Dr. Vidmar has been published more than thirty times in various military and medical journals. Clearly, Dr. Vidmar's work has been outstanding and his efforts admirable. To honor his service, he has been awarded the Navy Achievement Medal and the Navy Commendation Medal.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that success of America is due in part to the dedicated efforts of her sons and daughters. Dr. Dennis Vidmar has spent a large part of his life furthering the profession of medicine and honorably serving his nation in the United States Navy. While his work will be sorely missed, we wish him the very best in all of his future endeavors. At this time, I would urge my colleagues of the 106th Congress to stand and join me in paying special tribute to Dr. Dennis Vidmar—an outstanding doctor, a dedicated Naval officer, and a true American hero.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY PETRO

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mary Petro as she is honored by the Jefferson Democratic Club of Flushing for her many years of dedicated service as a District Leader.

The Jefferson Club is one of the oldest Democratic clubs in Queens County, New York. Mary Petro served valiantly and with great distinction as a District Leader from 1976 until she stepped down last year. In this capacity, Mary played an instrumental role in local New York City politics for nearly a quarter of a century, through devoted service to her community, to the Borough of Queens, to the Jefferson Club and to the Queens County Democratic Organization. Mary's service to her community and her involvement in civic affairs are legendary in the Borough of Queens.

In 1968, Mary moved to Flushing, and immediately became an active member of the community. Mary has volunteered her time and her energies to countless community organizations and charitable endeavors, preeminently among them the Police Athletic League. For her work as the chief PAL fundraiser for the 109th Precinct, and as an officer of the 109th Precinct's Community Council, Mary was named a ''Civilian Patrolman of the Month.''

Despite her tireless community service, Mary Petro has been a faithful employee of Con Edison for more than four decades, and a caring and devoted wife to her husband, Jimmy, for more than 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing Mary Petro for a quarter of a century. I have been constantly amazed by her boundless energy, and her innumerable good works done on behalf of her community and her party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in extending our thanks and appreciation to Mary Petro as she is honored by the Jefferson Democratic Club of Flushing for her many years of service to the people of Queens County.

REPRESENTATIVE LEE: POLITICIAN WHO MAKES A DIFFERENCE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It aptly describes my good friend and colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE, as someone who makes a difference because she thinks globally and acts locally. Her compassion for those who are less fortunate is matched by her legislative skill. We are most fortunate to have her as part of the Bay Area delegation.

[From the Oakland Tribune]

REP. LEE: POLITICIAN WHO MAKES A DIFFERENCE

(By Paul Cobb)

Congresswoman Barbara Lee is one woman who does make a difference because she acts and thinks globally and locally simultaneously.

During her young career in the United States Congress as a member of the powerful Banking and International Relations committees, she has often stood alone with her ''votes of conscience'' on Kosovo, Cuba, Colombia and Banking legislation.

CONNECT THE DOTS

She has often disagreed with President Clinton, her own party and members of the Republican Party. Yet, she has won their respect by making them realize they need her because she knows how to meld pressing social and moral issues with practical, vital, economic and security interests.

Schooled by the likes of Ron Dellums, former Oakland mayor Lionel J. Wilson, Willie Brown, John George, Gus Newport, Maudelle Shirek, Hazaiah Williams and Bishop Will Herzfeld, Congresswoman Lee knows how to ''connect the dots.''

She matches money to needs.

Knowing that money, economic and financial interests are the mother's milk of politics, Lee has managed to stand alone in the fiery furnace of opposition to votes on the White House's agenda and still bring home the bread and bacon to her district. Oakland's port, schools, housing community development and health programs, such as AIDs funding have increased during her tenure.

Even though she doesn't sound her own trumpet or spend excessive time raising funds for her own campaign coffers, she's not about to allow the vital concerns of her constituents to be drowned out by the noisy symbolism of political rhetoric.

Last week the Leach/Lee World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act (H.R. 3519) passed the House by a unanimous voice vote.

Lee has surprised and floored her fellow congresspersons and watchers with the passage of H.R. 3519 because she put together a bi-partisan effort around an explosive and contentious issue. And, what is more, she astounded legislative leaders on both sides of

the aisle by expanding the understanding of the global AIDS crisis. By skillfully demonstrating that the AIDS scourge threatens our national security and financial institutions, she connected needs to resources.

Lee garnered the support of Republican committee chair James Leach and thanked and acknowledged the leadership of former Congressman Dellums, now serving as chair of the President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS (PACHA) and a leader of the Constituency of Africa, for being ''my mentor and inspiration.''

SECURITY INTERESTS

Lee utilized her membership on the Domestic and International Monetary Policy Subcommittee to talk with the President, Secretary of Treasury, United Nations officials, World Bank, International Monetary Fund and other financial institutions to develop her plan to commit the U.S. to $500 million in seed money. The funds would then be leveraged 9:1 from funds donated by other G–7 nations and the private sector.

''If the moral and health arguments don't work, then the economic and security interests will,'' said Lee as she pointed to photos taken while she was a member of the California Assembly and Senate where she managed to get more than 60 legislative bills signed by then-Gov. Pete Wilson.

With the support of Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, Lee says she will monitor the progress of her bill in the U.S. Senate.

Lee confidently pointed to the portion of Oakland seen from her 10th floor office in the Dellums Federal Building and said, ''I know that the legislative process from bill to law and then to funding is dynamic. But I will be vigilant. No stone will go unturned because this disease knows no boundaries. The whole world is at risk to this AIDS pandemic of biblical proportion.''

Sen. John Kerry, D–Mass. introduced S2033 as a companion bill and its language has been included in the Helms/Biden Foreign Affairs Technical Assistance Act. Lee's proposed trust fund, housed at the World Bank, would use its leveraging capacity to increase the resources for the fund. Lee envisions esteemed world leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Ron Dellums as part of the fund's governance structure to assure that the monies go to needy regions.

GIANTS' SHOULDERS

How did a newly elected congresswoman who represents the most left-of-center constituency in the country manage to get arch-conservative Republican Sen. Jesse Helms to support the intent of her legislation while simultaneously coordinating grassroots organizations and AIDS service organizations?

''With a lot of hard work,'' Lee said. ''I can stand up to the legislative leaders in both parties because I stand on the shoulders of giants who preceded me.''

With an earnestness and conviction she pointed to the photos depicting some of the causes, neighborhoods and political leaders she's worked for or with and said ''every time I walk past the Lionel Wilson Building. Elihu Harris Building, Judge Don McCull statue and into the Dellums Federal building, I'm humbled by the awesome responsibility. And, because I have been blessed to have been connected to all those giants, I won't lose my focus.''

Lee's office is encouraging the public to join the African American Walking Tour of Downtown Oakland Sunday, July 16, 2 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. She praised the African American Museum and Library (AAMLO), the Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA), the Oakland Tours Program, and the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey for collaborating on the tours.

''I want all children and families, especially African Americans, to tour these places because it reminds me of my childhood in El Paso, Texas when I first started seeking answers to the questions of who I was and where I came from,'' said Lee.

She said she will invite her congressional colleagues, who will be in Oakland August 12 seeking solutions to issues of housing affordability, redlining, neighborhood reinvestment and undercapitalization, to also participate in the walking tours as well as Oakland's Chabot Science Center. Lee, a Mills College and University of California, Berkeley graduate, is also helping to find funding to make the Chabot Center a magnet for math, science and astronomy for children. ''I want the first astronauts to Mars to come from my district,'' she says.

Eleven million of the world's 14 million AIDS deaths are in Africa.

''Africa is the epicenter of this epidemic. We need to declare a global state-of-emergency, like we pioneered in Alameda County, and provide the money to fund strategies to address the AIDS deaths,'' Lee said.

''This disease has plagued us like the Bubonic Plague once did and it knows no boundaries. It is not just found in Africa. It is moving swiftly in India, Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean as well,'' Lee said.

And here in Alameda County, she warns of a corresponding calamity facing African Americans because she says the statistical profile of AIDS incidence shows a reversal of infection rates that once were 70 to 30 percent white to non-white that are now the exact opposite.

IN HONOR OF THE 40 JOURNALISTS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES PURSUING THE NEWS IN 1999

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of World Press Freedom Day was held in May, when the names of journalists who have died covering the news were added to The Freedom Forum Journalists Memorial located in Arlington, Virginia. There were 40 people who died in 1999 in their efforts to bring us the news from around the world.

We owe a debt of gratitude to these journalists who risked their lives to bring us the news about many dangerous places in the world, from Sierra Leone to Chechnya to Bosnia to Kosovo. Were it not for their courage and bravery, perhaps the world would never have known about the horrors and the atrocities that have been and are now taking place there.

The deadliest country from which to report last year was the nation of Sierra Leone, as 10 journalists died there in 1999—the most in any one country. Sierra Leone has been a battlefield that has taken the lives of many of the world's finest journalists, including the most recent casualties that are still fresh in many of our minds—Reuters correspondent Kurt Schork and Associated Press cameraman Miguel Gil Moreno de Mora, who, along with four Sierra Leone soldiers, were shot to death there just two weeks ago in a rebel ambush.

Mr. Speaker, I am sharing with our colleagues a news release from the Newseum and also a list of the names of the 40 journalists who died in 1999.

THREE HUNDRED THIRTY-TWO JOURNALISTS WHO DIED COVERING THE NEWS SINCE 1812 TO BE ADDED TO JOURNALISTS MEMORIAL

CEREMONY TO TAKE PLACE ON WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY, MAY 3, AT 11 A.M.

ARLINGTON, VA.—The names of 332 journalists who died covering the news since 1812, including 40 journalists killed in 1999, will be added May 3 to The Freedom Forum Journalists Memorial. The memorial, located in Freedom Park, now pays tribute to 1,369 reporters, editors, photographers and broadcasters killed as a result of covering the news. May 3 also marks World Press Freedom Day.

Thomas Johnson, chairman and chief executive officer of the CNN News, will speak at the 11 a.m. ceremony in Freedom Park, following readings by journalists of names on the memorial. The ceremony will be attended by friends, family members and colleagues of journalists honored on the memorial, as well as representatives of the news organizations for which the slain journalists worked.

Two hundred and ninety-two of the names to be added are of journalists who died between 1812 and the end of 1998. These deaths were discovered or verified during ongoing research conducted by The Freedom Forum since the memorial was originally dedicated in May 1996. The remaininig 40 names are those journalists killed last year.

''Sadly, we have learned that by this time next year, it is likely that another 30 to 40 journalists will have died pursuing the truth,'' said Charles L. Overby, chairman and chief executive officer of The Freedom Forum. ''We must never forget them, and we hope this memorial will be a part of their legacy.''

Myles Tierney of Associated Press Television News is one of the names being added to the memorial. The 34-year-old American producer was covering Sierra Leone's civil war when a rebel fighter opened fire with a semiautomatic rifle on the car Tierney was traveling in, killing him instantly.

Sierra Leone was the deadliest country for journalists in 1999, with ten deaths occurring there. Latin America, particularly Colombia, remains a dangerous place for those covering stories about politics, drug trafficking and organized crime.

Popular political satirist Jaime Garzon was shot five times in the head and chest while driving to his Bogota radio station. He had been threatened repeatedly by Carlos Castano, leader of the United Self Defense Forces of Colombia, a right-wing paramilitary organization fighting against leftist guerrillas. Garzon had scheduled a meeting with Castano Aug. 14, the day after he was killed.

''In an age of information overload, it is easy to forget that there are people still willing to die for journalism,'' said Peter S. Prichard, president of The Free Forum and Newseum. ''The memorial reminds us what sacrifices journalists are willing to make for a free press.''

Journalists' names are added each year to the glass panels of the monument, which stands at the apex of Freedom Park, adjacent to the Newseum and The Freedom Forum World Center in Arlington, VA.

Research by Freedom Forum staff and the Committee to Protect Journalists documents incidents where journalists were

killed or died while covering the news. Some were killed reporting on wars, natural disasters or violent crimes, some were injured or fell ill while on assignment, and some were murdered to silence their reporting. Journalists who died as a result of accidents unrelated to an assignment are not listed, nor are those who instigated the violence that caused their deaths. An independent panel of journalists and journalism historians reviews difficult cases.

A list of the names of the 40 journalists who died in 1999 is attached. To view a database listing the 1,369 memorialized journalists, their affiliations and the circumstances of their death, visit the Newseum online at www.freedomforum.org/newseumnews/memorial.asp or www.newseum.org/newseum/aboutthenewseum/freedompark.htm#memorial.

The Newseum, the only interactive museum of news, takes visitors behind the scenes to see and experience how and why news is made. The 72,000-square-foot Newseum is funded by The Freedom Forum, a nonpartisan, international foundation dedicated to free press, free speech and free spirit for all people. The Newseum is open Tuesday through Sunday from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. and is closed Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Year's days. Freedom Park is open daily from dawn to dusk. Admission is free.

1999

Ricardo Gangeme—El Informador Chubutense (Argentina) in Argentina.
Jaime Garzon—Radionet (Colombia) in Colombia.
Pablo Emilio Medina Motta—TV Garzon (Colombia) in Colombia.
Guzman Quintero Torres—El Pilon (Colombia) in Colombia.
Hernando Rangel Moreno—Freelance, in Colombia.
Luis Alberto Rincon Solano—Freelance, in Colombia.
Alberto Sanchez Tovar—Producciones Colombia (Colombia) in Colombia.
Roberto Julio Torres—Emisora Fuentes de Cartagena (Colombia) in Colombia.
Agus Muliawan—Asia Press International (Japan) in Indonesia.
Supriadi—Medan Pos (Indonesia) in Indonesia.
Sander Thoenes—Financial Times (United Kingdom) in Indonesia.
Ilan Roeh—Israel Radio (Israel) in Lebanon.
Samuel Boyi—The Scope (Nigeria) in Nigeria.
Fidelis Ikwuebe—Freelance, in Nigeria.
Sam Nimfa-Jan—Details (Nigeria) in Nigeria.
Oleg Chervonyuk—Metropress Agency (Russia) in Russia.
Supian Ependiyev—Groznensky Rabochiy (Russia) in Russia.
Shamil Gigayev—Nokh Cho TV (Russia) in Russia.
Ramzan Mezhidov—TV Tsentr (Russia) in Rassia.
Valentina Neverova—Pravo (Russia) in Russia.
Lyubov Sloboda—Vesti (Russia) in Russia.
Alpha Amadu Bah Bah—Independent Observer (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Jenner Cole—SKY–FM (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Abdulai Jumah Jalloh—African Champion (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Mabay Kamara—Freelance, in Sierra Leone.
Mohammed Kamara—SKY–FM (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Paul Mansaray—Standard Times (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
James Ogogo—Concord Times (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Conrad Roy—Expo Times (Sierra Leone) in Sierra Leone.
Myles Tierney—Associated Press Television News (USA) in Sierra Leone.
Munir Turay—Freelance, in Sierra Leone.
Anura Priyantha Cooray—Independent Television Network (Sri Lanka) in Sri Lanka.
Rohana Kumara—Satana (Sri Lanka) in Sri Lanka.
Vasthian Anthony Mariyadas—Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation (Sri Lanka) in Sri Lanka.
Indika Pathinivasan—Maharaja Television Network (Sri Lanka) in Sri Lanka.
Michelle Lima—KSAT–TV (USA) in Texas.
Ahmet Taner Kislali—Cumhuriyet (Turkey) in Turkey.
Slavko Curuvija—Dnevni Telegraf (Yugoslavia) in Yugoslavia.
Gabriel Gruener—Stern (Germany) in Yugoslavia.
Volker Kraemer—Stern (Germany) in Yugoslavia.

IN HONOR OF MRS. GILBERT T. ADAMS

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today with great sadness I honor Viola Mae Joss Adams, who passed away Thursday, June 1, 2000. Viola Adams, known affectionately by all who knew her as Vi, was a woman of grace and elegance.

She was also a woman of intelligence and character. After graduating from high school in 1924 at the age of 16, she continued her education at The University of Texas at Austin. She graduated in 1929 with a double major in English and psychology and went on to teach high school.

Vi met Gilbert T. Adams during her time in Austin, and in 1932 they were married during the Great Depression on "a borrowed fifty dollars and a dime store ring." Vi and Gilbert subsequently moved to Gilbert's hometown of Beaumont, and she became a vital part of the civic life of her new community.

Mrs. Adams championed the issue of safety and received national recognition for her effort to see that every home in the country had first aid training. President Dwight D. Eisenhower recognized the value of Mrs. Adams'work and mandated that first aid be taught in public schools. An active Democrat, and a proud supporter of her husband's professional and political endeavors, Gilbert and Vi Adams were recognized by the Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson administrations for their contributions to our democratic process.

A woman strongly devoted to her family, Mrs. Adams had four children: Gilbert Timbrell Adams, Jr., John D'Estang Adams, Elizabeth Vi Adams, and Patricia Ann Adams. She also was graced during her lifetime with eight grandchildren, and two great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Viola Adams was a remarkable woman who was committed to her community, her country, and above all, her family. She was generous in spirit and was of deep religious conviction. She was of the utmost character, and her attributes of selflessness and commitment to others are rare gifts that this nation was lucky to have. With her passing, a great loss will be felt in the spirit and the heart of Beaumont.

COMMENDING THE MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHERS GROUP FOR ADDRESSING OVER FOUR DECADES OF INJUSTICE AND EXTENDING TEMPORARY MEMBERSHIP TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation, along with Congressman ROTHMAN, commending the member countries of the United Nations' Western European and Others Group (WEOG) for addressing four decades of discrimination in the UN and admitting Israel as a temporary, conditional member to that regional bloc.

For those of my colleagues who are unfamiliar with this issue, this is an important milestone for Israel because it places them firmly on the road to becoming a fully participating member of the United Nations. In order to be a fully participating member of the United Nations, countries must serve in a regional group.

Members of regional groups select member states on a rotating basis to serve on important United Nations bodies such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Because of anti-Israeli sentiment, Israel has been denied the opportunity to serve in the Asian States Group at the United Nations, even though it geographically belongs in that bloc.

Until such time as Israel can be an effective member of the Asian States Group, Israel has expressed a strong desire to serve on WEOG. WEOG consists of Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Turkey, New Zealand and Australia.

The struggle to gain Israel membership in WEOG has been a long and difficult one. And, until last week, one thought to be impossible by some. But, with Congressional support, dedicated individuals in the Clinton Administration, such as Vice President AL GORE and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Richard Holbrooke, were able to raise this issue with the highest levels of WEOG member governments and make it a clear priority. I thank them for all of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Congressional support for Israel's acceptance into WEOG is very strong. Last October, I led a letter to Ambassador Richard Holbrooke signed by over 60 members, requesting that he make Israel's membership in WEOG a high priority. Additionally, legislation introduced by Congressman ROTHMAN calling for full equality at the United Nations for Israel has 63 cosponsors. I am proud to be an original sponsor of this legislation.

So Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate, for we have achieved something truly notable. However, the struggle for Israeli acceptance continues.

Israel's membership in WEOG is only temporary and must be reevaluated in four years. Additionally, Israel cannot participate as a WEOG member in meetings in Geneva, or on the Human Rights Committee at the United Nations. Although I have a great deal of respect for the human rights efforts of the U.N., they have been particularly unkind to Israel and it is a bitter pill to swallow to have them excluded from this committee.

This legislation, "Commending the member states of the United Nations Western European and Others Group for addressing over four decades of injustice and extending temporary membership to the state of Israel," also mentions the new hurdles that must be overcome to finally gain Israel status as a full member of the United Nations. It urges the WEOG member countries to admit Israel as permanent member, without conditions, until such time as she can play an effective part as a member of the Asian group.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of my colleagues to give strong consideration to cosponsoring this legislation. It took four decades to get Israel this far; it must not take as long to reach the final goal of full membership for Israel.

I would again like to thank my friend and colleague, STEVEN ROTHMAN, for his help and leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Vice President GORE, along with Ambassador Holbrooke, for working so hard and keeping the pressure on the WEOG member countries. A copy of the legislation follows.

Commending the member states of the United Nations Western European and Others Group for addressing over four decades of injustice and extending temporary membership in that regional bloc to the state of Israel.

Whereas Israel has played an active role in the international community and within the United Nations;

Whereas in order to be a fully participating member of the United Nations countries must serve in a regional group;

Whereas members of regional groups select member states on a rotating basis to serve on important United Nations bodies such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council;

Whereas Israel has been denied an opportunity to serve in the Asian States Group at the United Nations, even though it geographically belongs in that block;

Whereas the Western European And Others Group (WEOG) at the United Nations consists of Western European nations, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Turkey, and Australia and is the only group at the United Nations that is not geographically based;

Whereas Israel was offered membership in the WEOG regional bloc at the United Nations on Friday, May 26, 2000, by the chairman of WEOG at the time, Ambassaor Peter van Walsum of the Netherlands;

Whereas that offer was officially accepted by Israeli officials on Sunday, May 28, 2000; and

Whereas Israel is a democracy and an ally and friend of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) commends the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) members for extending temmporary membership to Israel;

(2) congratulates Israel on its new-found role in the United Nations;

(3) reaffirms Israel's right to be a full participating member and equal partner in the United Nations; and

(4) urges the members of WEOG to extend full and permanent membership to Israel, without conditions, until such time as Israel can serve as an effective member of the Asian States Group.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG ACT OF 2000

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, when Medicare was created in 1965, seniors were more likely to undergo surgery than to use prescription drugs. Today, prescription drugs are often the preferred, and sometimes the only method of treatment for many diseases. In fact, 77 percent of all seniors take a prescription drug on a regular basis.

And yet, nearly 15 million Medicare beneficiaries don't have access to the lifesaving drugs you produce because Medicare doesn't cover them. Countless others are forced to spend an enormous portion of their modest monthly incomes on prescription drugs with 18 percent of seniors spending over $100 a month on prescriptions.

Seniors want and need prescription drug coverage. Hence, the question before Congress is not whether we should provide a Medicare drug benefit but how to do it?

There are some in Congress who think that the way to do this is to turn the problem over to the private insurance market, but the private insurance market is pulling out from under seniors in the Medigap and Medicare+Choice markets. Others believe that we should limit how much drug companies can charge. I disagree. I understand the investment required for R&D and I believe that price controls will ultimately limit access.

I've devised what I believe is a commonsense approach that incorporates a generous, defined benefit that's easy for seniors to understand with provisions that reduce administrative inefficiencies and increase competition. The result will be a more affordable drug benefit for both beneficiaries and the Federal Government.

The bill is simple. Available to all Medicare beneficiaries, the Federal government will pay half of an individual's drug costs up to $5,000 a year (when fully phased in). There are no deductibles and a modest premium of approximately $44 a year. For seniors who exceed $5,000 in drug expenditures or $2,500 in out-of-pocket costs—the Federal Government picks up the whole tab.

What about drug costs? By allowing multiple PBM's to participate, my bill will, for the first time, introduce open competition into Medicare and drive down prices. We know from the private marketplace that simply purchasing a large quantity of drugs does not drive down prices. Drug companies grant discounts when a PBM can show that it will increase its market share. By allowing multiple PBMs, my bill increases competition, lowers prices and provides greater consumer choice.

We also removed administration of the program from HCFA. The healthcare system has evolved rapidly, and regrettably HCFA has not kept pace. HCFA lacks the expertise to run a benefit that relies on private sector competition to control costs. Fortunately, there is another agency that has expertise interacting with private sector health plans, and has proven that it can administer benefits effectively and efficiently with a minimum of bureaucracy. It's the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) which runs the widely acclaimed Federal Employee Health Benefit (FEHB) program. Under OPM's leadership, I'm confident that an efficient and effective competitive benefit can be integrated successfully into the Medicare program.

Congress must enact a Medicare drug benefit this year. For our Nation's seniors, prescription drugs are not a luxury. During these times of historic prosperity and strength, there is absolutely no reason that we should force seniors to make between buying prescription drugs or groceries. In introduction today I urge all of my colleagues to give careful consideration to my bill. It provides a real answer for seniors without price controls and without threatening innovation.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER STEPHEN PATRICK (PAT) WISNESKE ON THE OCCASION OF THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF HIS ORDINATION

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a most remarkable individual—a dear friend, a counselor, a shepherd, a man of the people and a man of God. I pay personal and heartfelt tribute to Father Stephen Patrick Wisneske, the pastor of Holy Spirit Church of Menominee, MI, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his ordination, his golden jubilee.

Father Pat came to Menominee 28 years ago. He came to town at a particularly difficult time for the local Catholic faithful, who were being reorganized from the five traditional congregations—including the old settlement alignments of the French church, the Irish church, the Polish church, and the German Church—to three new congregations, based on neighborhood and proximity. The restructuring made sense in terms of reducing the infrastructure that church members needed to support, but it presented real challenges in forging new congregational bonds and establishing new ministries. Father Pat became pastor of the newly structured Holy Spirit Church.

He brought years of service in other northern Michigan communities to his new task. Born in 1922, Father Pat was raised in a Catholic home, attended Catholic school for

12 years, served as an altar boy, and was interested in Church affairs even before he was called to his religious vocation. Father Pat was ordained on June 3, 1950 by Bishop Francis J. Hass at St. Andrew's Cathedral in Grand Rapids, and within the month he was assigned as assistant at Holy Trinity in Ironwood. In 1951 he became an assistant at St. Thomas Catholic Church in Escanaba, and in 1953 became an assistant at St. Mary and St. Joseph in Iron Mountain, where he also served as chaplain to veterans in the hospital there.

Like his religious predecessor Bishop Baraga, Father Pat spent time in several small parishes in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan—Dollar Bay, Loretto, Quinnesec, White Pine, and Bergland, before his posting to Menominee.

Perhaps because of his own Catholic schooling, Father Pat has always shown that his commitment to his parish—to all local families—lies outside the walls of his beautiful and more than 100-year-old Gothic church. He regularly visits Menominee Catholic Central School, meeting and greeting parents, teachers and children in this more informal setting.

Father Pat has become well-known for his homily—his brief moment of addressing the congregation during each Mass. A quick sense of humor has always served him well in helping to drive home the important lesson he wished to teach each week.

I have always admired Father Pat for his positive outlook and his concern for his congregation. But it was when tragedy struck my own family that the depth of his wisdom, love, and advice, to me, to my wife Laurie and my son Ken was truly revealed. He counseled, sheltered, and guided us through our darkest hours, and his homily to my son BJ captured the essence of this vital young man for friend and stranger alike. For these kind acts in our greatest time of need, I and my family will always be grateful to Father Pat.

Mr. Speaker, moments of crisis often bring brief flashes of insight so brilliant that we are forever changed in our view of the world. In a moment of darkness, I was given an opportunity to truly understand the mission of a parish priest as an agent of divine compassion and strength. I and my family were held in Mighty Hands and bathed in a river of sublime love. Father Pat, a man of the people and a man of God, has spent 50 years shaping himself to be a funnel of that great Power. There can be no greater calling.

DEBATE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the Defense Appropriations bill last night because of its pricetag that is unprecedented in peacetime and unjustified by the threat, and the misplaced priorities within the bill.

Representative DEFAZIO'S amendment was a step in a more rational direction. It would have reduced the next two years' purchases of F–22 fighter aircraft, as recommended by the General Accounting Office, and redirected the savings to readiness and quality of life accounts.

It was a modest amendment, and it did not cut money from the defense budget. It just spent it on higher-priority issues at a time when the F–22 continues to experience technical problems and we already have the world's most advanced fighter, the F–15.

The $930 million saved would have been spent instead on items that were not funded at the level requested by the Department of Defense, or were included on the Pentagon's unfunded "wish list." Those items include additional funding for troops on food stamps, nuclear threat reduction, bonus payments to sailors on sea duty, facilities maintenance, spare parts, and recruiting.

I want to also speak to the larger issues of the bill. We made some gains this year on the issue of military retirees' health care. Most important is this bill's provision of $94 million for a pharmacy benefit for all Medicare-eligible military retirees and eligible family members. This set an important precedent for us to eventually provide prescription drug coverage to all Medicare recipients. Those who have served in our military are a well-deserving group with which to start.

This bill continues various health care demonstration projects—including Medicare subvention and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. Another important aspect of military retiree health care included in this bill is the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan. These are locally-run, community-based HMOs that provide military retirees another choice. I look forward to the findings of the independent oversight panel funded in this bill which will present recommendations to Congress on a permanent military health care program for the Medicare-eligible.

Unfortunately, there continue to be unmet needs. The Department of Defense Comptroller has just done a study that shows that the military health care system for active-duty and retirees up to age 65 as currently structured is underfunded over the next 6 years by $9 billion.

In addition to taking care of its people, our military has an important role to play in taking care of the environment, Congress needs to make clear that cleaning up after itself is a cost of doing business for our military just as it is for any other polluter.

DOD is responsible for environmental cleanup at thousands of what are known as Formerly-Used Defense Sites. At many of these properties, owned by private parties and state, local, and tribal governments, the public may come into contact with residual contamination. The cost of completing this cleanup is estimated at over $7 billion by the Army Corps of Engineers, yet funding in this bill is less than $200 million.

Another danger to communities is unexploded ordnance, old bombs and shells that could kill or injure people who encounter them. The cost of clearing these bombs is estimated at $15 billion by the Defense Science Board. The consistent underfunding of this challenge could begin to be addressed if it had its own line item in the defense budget. I call upon the Administration to create this line item in the request it is preparing now for submission to Congress for FY02 funding.

More than a decade after the Soviet Union collapsed, our investment in national defense has returned to cold-war levels. During the cold war, the United States spent an average of $325 billion in current year dollars on the military. This year's budget resolution gave the Pentagon $310 billion—95 percent of cold-war levels and 52 percent of discretionary spending.

And now Monday's Washington Post has a front-page story stating that, starting now, the Joint Chiefs of Staff plan to submit budget requests that call for additional spending of more than $30 billion a year through most of this decade.

There is no reason to continue our reliance on a cold-war economy. Our massive investments in weapons and bases could be replaced with massive investments in education and health care and the other things that make for livable communities. While we are first in military expenditures among industrialized countries, we are 17th in low-birthweight rates, 21st in eighth-grade math scores and 22nd in infant mortality.

The defense budget is large, certainly large enough to fund the programs that are needed for the people who serve and have served us and for the environment. Instead, it spends too much on duplicative weapons systems and questionable technologies at a time when we lead the world many times over in military might. We need to get our priorities right.

DEBATE ON THE FUTURE OF THE F–22

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the fiscal year 2001 Department of Defense appropriations bill, there was a rather rancorous debate about the future of the F–22. I submit for the record a devastating critique of the F–22 written by retired Colonel Everest Riccioni as well as a letter he wrote correcting misstatements made during the House floor debate.

Colonel Riccioni is not just any critic of the F–22. His credentials are impeccable. He was one of three legendary "Fighter Mafia" mavericks who forced the Pentagon to produce the F–16 to improve U.S. air superiority. He served in the Air Force for 30 years, flew 55 different types of military aircraft, and worked in the defense industry for 17 years managing aircraft programs, including the B–2 bomber.

We should heed his warning that the F–22 will not work as advertised.

JUNE 8, 2000.

Representative RANDY CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: Your comments during yesterday's floor debate require response. The comment about the F–15 not keeping up with the F–22 does not establish the existence of supercruise, and reflects your lack of insight into supersonic cruise. Cruise means the ability to cover distance

and it is not a speed. Proof of supercruise is established by a number, specifically the number of miles that can be covered while at a supersonic Mach like 1.6. This number is never forthcoming because few know the definition of supercruise or are unwilling to reveal it.

The fact that the F–16 flown by General Ryan could not keep up with the F–22 is again an irrelevant speed statement on the relative speed of the two aircraft. The requirements for the F–16 specifically stated that there was no requirement that it fly faster than Mach 1.6, a fact probably unknown to the general. Had the general been flying a 40 year old F104A–19, he could have flown formation with the F–22.

Pragmatic supersonic cruise is the ability to sustain significant supersonic speeds (like 1. 6–1.8) for combat relevant distances. For perspective, the original design mission for the Advanced Tactical Fighter, cum F–22 was a 100 mile subsonic cruise-out to the Russian border, 400 NM supersonic penetration at 1.6 Mach, consumption of the combat fuel, a 400 nautical mile supersonic return to the border at Mach 1.6, with a 100 NM return to land with normal reserves.

A true measure of the super cruise potential of the F–22 is—the penetration supersonic distance that can be flown at 1.6 Mach out and back, with the same 100 nautical mile legs and the same fuel reserved for combat and landing reserves. The supersonic penetration distance is the validation of supercruise. This number has not been established. The supercruise potential of the F–22 remains unknown.

If that number is 50 NM it is a fruitless achievement that the F–104 can easily fulfill using its afterburner. A 100 NM penetration can also be accomplished by the F–104A–19. A 200 NM penetration is not a great achievement; 300 NM means the F–22 is a pragmatic supercruiser, 400 NM will remain a dream. The distance number validates whether the F–22 has it, nothing else.

Retention of the wrong definition will forever retain confusion.

Sincerely,

COL. EVEREST RICCIONI,
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA.

THE F–22 PROGRAM—FACT VERSUS FICTION

(By Everest E. Riccioni, Col. USAF, Ret.)

THE DREAM

To provide the USAF Air Superiority for the period following 2005.

To Conduct—Offensive Counter Air Operation deep in Russia—Its Primary Mission (300 Nautical Mile (NM) Combat Mission—100 NM cruise to the point of penetration—200 NM supersonic ingress and egress plus combat and fuel reserves).

To provide a 750–800 Aircraft Fleet to replace the aging F–15 Fleet.

To be designed to a Unit Flyaway Cost Limit in 1986 dollars—$35 Million.

To control cost by conforming to a Weight Limit—50,000 lbs (Cost and Weight comparable to the extant F–15—clearly the imagined F–22 would have been a bargain).

Dominant Characteristics: High Stealth; Effective Supersonic Cruise; Ultra-High Performance and Maneuverability; and Superior Avionics for Battle Awareness and Effectiveness.

Additional Aims: To Rejuvenate the Fleet (Reduce the average age); Design for Low Maintenance (3 man-hours per sortie); and Form a High-Low Mix with the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) fleet.

THE REALIZATION

SUMMARY

Unrealized Dreams

The dreams for Stealth, Supercruise, Ultra-High Climb, Acceleration, and Maneuvering Performance have not been realized. The Outstanding Avionics will not be properly tested before purchase and possibly not even before combat.

High Cost, Low Numbers

The number of F–22s purchased will not provide a critical mass of fighters.

The ''Dream'' of 800 fighters for $70 Billion fell to 648 for $64.2B (after a 1992 Selected Acquisition Report), to 442 for $64.2B (after the Bottom-Up Review of defense strategy), and to 339 for $64.2B (after a Quadrennial Defense Review).[2] Study groups and the Congressional Budget Office seeking responsible funding are considering options of 175 and even 100 F–22s. This is a total program cost of more than $200M per aircraft—one-third the cost of the B–1! This cost (predicted in 1976) is worse than obscene.[3]

Despite high funding levels—the future size of the Air Combat Command will soon be greatly reduced.

The low number of F–22s will not rejuvenate an aging F–15, F–16 fleet. (Algebraic averaging)

A mix of F–22s and JSFs cannot be a High-Low Mix. It will be An Ultra-High—High Mix. There is no low element. The complementary F–15 and F–16 do both the air superiority and air-to-surface missions. The F–22 mainly does air superiority missions. Both have deserted our US Army.

The few F–22s possessing quasi-F–15 performance will degrade the air superiority capability of the Air Combat Command, composed of 1600 fighters.

Our decision-makers have (again) opted for unilateral disarmament in the face of their perceived threats.[4]

VALIDATION

Stealth

The F–22 is not a Stealthy Aircraft.

Stealth means the proper suppression of all its important ''signatures''—Visual Signature, Radar Signature, Infrared Signature, Electromagnetic Emissions, and Sound.

Visually—The F–22, one of the world's largest, most identifiable fighters, cannot hide in daylight. Its role is in daylight. Stealth operations are night operations. Unfortunately stealth against radar invariably increases the size of a fighter making it more visible.

The radar signature is utterly inadequately reported. Only a single data number is provided to congressional committees and the GAO—the average radar signature in the level forward direction within 20 degrees of the nose, presumably to enemy fighter radars. In the B–1B reporting fiasco, the 100/1 signature advantage over the B–52 became a real 1.8/1. One cannot design an aircraft to simultaneously hide from low and medium frequency ground radars and from high frequency airborne fighter radars. Properly, all the data should be portrayed and reported—for all azimuths, for all ''latitudes,'' and for all radar frequencies. Single data points constitute lying by omission and gross incompleteness.

The temperature increases of supersonic cruising flights make the F–22s beacons in the sky to infrared sensors.

Fighters, with radar to search for and find the enemy autonomously, at long ranges, cannot hide their high powered electric emissions to modern, sophisticated, Russian equipment. The Russians excel at this art and export their equipment to many nations. Further, F–22 detection of enemies by radar is an inverse fourth power phenomenon, while detection of the F–22's radar is an inverse square phenomenon, giving the advantage to the enemy. In other words, the F–22's radar will be detected by an enemy plane before the F–22 detects the enemy.

It appears that designing air superiority aircraft primarily for radar stealth is an error.

Supersonic Cruise—''Supercruise''

The F–22 has not yet demonstrated effective supersonic cruise.

The USAF has never appreciated that speed without persistence is meaningless. Proof—Six USAF aircraft capable of Mach 2.2 never exceeded 1.4 Mach in combat over North Vietnam in 10 years of war, in hundreds of thousands of sorties. The F–15 has never demonstrated its performance guarantee of Mach 2.5 flight in a combat configuration on a realistic combat mission profile.

The USAF has the wrong definition of supercruise—(supersonic flight in turbojet thrust, i.e. without using an afterburner.) Cruise means covering distance efficiently. Fighters with wings properly sized for subsonic maneuver achieve efficient supersonic flight at altitudes of 60,000 feet requiring partial afterburning thrust. This may be unknown to the testers since the test program limits testing to below 50,000. The proper cruise condition may remain unknown. All supercruisers cruise at very high altitudes using some afterburning (i.e. ramjet) thrust—MiG–31, SR–71, as did the many designs that I have studied, generated, or supervised. (Detailed aerodynamic-thermodynamic analysis is available upon request.)

The GAO report that the F–22 has demonstrated supercruise is specious and misleading. The reports have merely stated that the F–22 has demonstrated 1.6 Mach flight speeds in pure turbojet (dry) thrust. No report of distance traveled or persistence at those speeds was made. Supersonic speeds in dry thrust bode well, but this capability is not sufficient to achieve supercruise. Proper data are global radius of action and global persistence plots as functions of speed and altitude, for rational missions.

These data must be then compared to those of the F–15 and the ancient F–104–19 to establish progress. For example—the 40 year old F–104A–19 has twice the supersonic radius of the 20 year old F–15C at 1.7 Mach, and outaccelerates it at Mach 2.2. Compare! In comparison lies the proof of progress.

The Fuel Fraction of the F–22 is insufficient for pragmatic supersonic cruise missions. Fuel Fraction, the weight of the fuel divided by the weight of the aircraft at takeoff, impacts cruise-range, be it super- or subsonic. At today's state of the art, fuel fractions of 29 percent and below yield subcruisers; 33 percent provides a quasi-supercruiser; and 35 percent and above provides useful missions. The F–22's fuel fraction is 29 percent, equal to those of the subcruising F–4s, F–15s and the Russian MiG29 Flanker. The Russian medium range supersonic interceptor, the MiG–31 Foxhound, has a fuel fraction of over 45 percent. Supersonic cruise fighters require higher fuel fractions since they must have excessive wing for supersonic cruise. Breguet's range equation establishes the dependence of aircraft radius on speed, lifi-to-drag ratio, specific fuel consumption and the part of the total fuel fraction available for cruise.

The ''dream'' design mission was continually redefined and degraded to—a) conform

to physical reality, and—b) to reduce the uncontrolled cost and weight. (Flexible (rubber) Requirements.)

Ultra-High Performance

The F–22 does not provide a Great Leap Forward in performance relative to the F–15C or MiG–29. At 65,000 lbs, with 18,500–18,750 lbs of fuel, with two nominal 35,000 lb thrust engines—it has the thrust to weight ratio of the F–15C, the fuel fraction of the F–15C, and a wing loading that is only slightly inferior to that of the F–15C, so it will accelerate, climb, and maneuver much like the F–15C for reasons of basic physics.

There are two differences from the F–15—thrust vectoring and supersonic speeds in dry thrust. Thrust vectoring allows the F–22 to maneuver controllably at sub-stall speeds, which other aircraft cannot. This, in the helicopter speed domain, is in seeming contradiction to an aircraft designed for supersonic engagement with slashing attacks using its beyond visual range missiles.

The flight test program to validate maneuverability is utterly inadequate. Using a single number—the maximum steady-state G at 30,000 ft at 0.9 Mach—on an aircraft that operates from 40 knots to beyond Mach 2, from sea level to above 60,000 ft is a throwback to the Dark Ages of aircraft evaluation. Proper presentations are global, all-altitude all-speed plots at the two major power settings. They must be compared to friendly and enemy aircraft. Comparison reveals progress, the whole truth, and even allows the formulation of battle tactics.

Superior Avionics

The expectations for the avionics are to provide great battle awareness and effective weapons management. The F–22 is to autonomously identify (ID) the enemy from friend, from neutral, regardless of the country that produced the aircraft.

But, testing will not be fully completed before going into production! The pressure is on to meet production schedules and to do incomplete testing to save time and money. Incomplete testing is fatal and extremely wasteful. B–1 avionics, similarly treated, still do not function in the aircraft after two decades, despite large transfusions of funds.

Such refined identification capability has never been achieved though frequently promised. Given failure and dependence on visual identification, the F–22 will be at the level of the F–15 and F–16. The requirement for visual ID made the AIM–7D/E, the Talos, the complex long-range Phoenix missile and the Aegis missile cruiser relatively worthless. The avionics are to be treated as ''guilty'' until tested and proven to be innocent.

The software is more extensive and complex than that of the Aegis missile cruiser. Dependence on the integrated, complex system belies the dream of a low maintenance requirement.

Most likely result—The F–22 will be declared combat ready much before it is.

Relevance of Air Superiority

The relevance of air superiority in the modern world is vastly overstated. The USAF has faced no air superiority force since the Korean War. Nor have our ground troops faced an enemy air-to-surface threat.

US air superiority fighters are aimed at enemy fighters—the irrelevant half (of the problem. Our foreseeable enemies achieve air superiority with competent, relatively affordable, highly mobile Russian vehicles carrying surface-to-air missiles (IR radar, and optically guided), and two 30mm cannon (the Tangkuska). These are armed with SA–6, SA–8 and SA–10 missiles. The F–22 only counters non-existent enemy fighters. Hence air-to-surface F–16s, A–10s, and F–15s become the de facto air superiority aircraft. Attempts to equip the F–22 to suppress enemy defenses are easily defeated by enemy tactics used in Vietnam and Serbia.

The USAF is already over-equipped to handle any imaginable air superiority problem. Today, Air Combat Command is capable of handling any coalition of air superiority threats. Air Combat Command has the most important factor—competent pilots, the second most important factor—large numbers (1,600–2,400 fighters), and the least important advantage—the best aircraft. In Germany during World War II US numbers, not quality, reigned supreme.[5] The USAF has always had and has always depended upon superior numbers to win. Numbers guarantee victory. Numbers develop intensity and allow multiple attacks.

The US has no realistic future air superiority problem facing it. A sane US will not war with India, China, or Russia. Nor will we war with France, England, Japan, and Germany. None of these nations will attack the US. Other countries are not threats. Nor will we war with our friends to whom we sold US aircraft.[6] The US must minimize its enemies, not create them artificially to sustain the arms industry. Even Canada has been listed as a possible threat! Yet, the US continues to seek foreign sales before our modern aircraft see service in the USAF and US Navy. (Examples—the US Navy's F–14, F–18E, and the F–22.)

The conjured need to cope with our weapons places our country in a self-perpetuating arms race with itself.

CONCLUSION

Money expended on the program will weaken Air Combat Command and the USAF in two ways—

By getting involved with an aircraft that has no function, and no relevance to modern wars.

By denying themselves funds they really need—for training and for new aircraft to support a US Army, completely shipped of supporting airpower.

Approximately 90 percent of the program funding can still be saved, and reprogrammed to relevant Air Force programs.

ARTICLE BY JAMES L. HECHT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as we go forward with the budget process, I'd like to bring the attention of my colleagues to an article published in the Baltimore Sun. The author is a senior fellow at the Center for Public Policy and Contemporary Issues at the University of Denver. Although I don't necessarily agree with all the points he makes, I think the article is valuable for purposes of informed debate.

[The Sun: Tuesday, March 21, 2000]

SPECIAL INTEREST DEFENSE

(By James L. Hecht)

For a while, it looked as if Congress might do the right thing: kill an unneeded weapons program, saving $60 billion and increasing security. But in the end, Congress gave a higher priority to the interests of Lockheed Martin, providing $1 billion in this year's budget to buy up to six F–22 fighters—and keeping alive the possibility of buying more than 300 more at a cost of at least $187 million each.

The F–22 is an example of how the military budget is driven more by the desire of members of Congress to get re-elected than by security. The public interest is no match for lobbyists for the military-industrial complex who in 1996 contributed an average of $18,065 to every member of Congress, almost three times the level of tobacco-industry influence peddling.

Why is the F–22 an unneeded weapon? The American F–15 and F–16 fighters are the best in the world and, if more fighters are needed, these can be built for less than one-quarter the cost of an F–22. Moreover, the F–22 may be outdated soon by the Joint Strike Fighter, an even better plane on which the Pentagon is spending billions for development.

We spend more than $30 billion a year to maintain more than 10,000 nuclear warheads. A 1,000-warhead force with the destructive force of 40,000 Hiroshima explosions would be more than enough—and save about $17 billion a year.

How political pork supersedes military needs is demonstrated by the appropriation in last year's budget of $435 million for seven C–130 cargo transport planes. The Pentagon requested only one. They got seven because manufacture of these planes provided jobs in Newt Gingrich's district.

Huge expenditures for unneeded weapons is one reason that U.S. military spending is more than twice as much as all potential adversaries combined, including Russia, China, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. While polls indicate that 72 percent of Americans believe it better to have too much defense than too little, 83 percent think that spending should be no greater than that of all potential adversaries combined.

America's unreasonable military spending also results from the policy that the United States be able to simultaneously fight and win two major regional wars without the help of allies. This two-war doctrine is rooted in the idea that the United States should be able to exercise unilaterally its ''global responsibilities.''

But having this capability and then using it to act alone or with little military support from allies—as we did in Kosovo and continue to do in the skies over Iraq—decreases our security. We make bitter enemies of people that are no threat to us militarily, but can be a serious threat if in anger and frustration they resort to terrorism.

Our security also is decreased because our huge military spending consumes money that otherwise could be spent on education. With the economic success of nations becoming increasingly more dependent on a well-educated work force, shortchanging educational needs is a threat to the economic security of Americans in the 21st century.

Security is the most important function of government. But we should not—in the name of security—needlessly spend tens of billions of dollars a year for the benefit of politically connected interests.

ISSUES IN CYPRUS AND KOSOVO

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Harry Moskos is the highly-respected editor of the Knoxville

News-Sentinel, the major daily newspaper for East Tennessee. More importantly, everyone who gets to know Mr. Moskos soon realizes he is one of the finest men they have ever known.

Over the years, he has developed a real expertise in foreign policy. He writes honest, sincere thoughtful editorials, without undue prejudices or special axes to grind. He is certainly not beholden to or controlled by any special interests.

Within the last few days, he has written two very important pieces which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

The first is an insightful editorial on the history, current situation, and what needs to be done now to settle the thorny Cyprus issue. He points out that the Turkish invasion in 1974 resulted in 200,000 Greek Cypriots being expelled from their homes and almost that many Turks and Turkish Crypriots living illegally on land and in homes that are not theirs.

The second article is one that was distributed by the Scripps-Howard News-Service and reprinted in the Washington Times and other newspapers. It deals with the situation in Kosovo and the continuing cycle of violence, ethnic cleansing and retribution.

I hope that those in the State Department and in the Congress who deal most directly with these issues will give serious consideration to these editorials by Harry Moskos.

[From The Knoxville News-Sentinel, June 4, 2000]

TWO SIDES MUST TALK—OPPORTUNITIES MORE FAVORABLE THAN IN PAST FOR SETTLEMENT OF CYPRUS ISSUE

The eastern Mediterranean sovereign state of Cyprus has been forcibly divided in two since the invasion of the island republic in 1974 by Turkey. Now, 26 years later, the issue of Cyprus remains one of the world's thorniest international problems awaiting resolution.

Reflecting the position of President Clinton, Secretary of Defense William Cohen has stressed that the status quo in Cyprus is not acceptable. Since the invasion, the Cypriot government controls the south of the island while the north is under Turkish occupation with more than 35,000 troops from mainland Turkey stationed there in violation of numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions. In fact, most of the Turks now living in the occupied areas of the island are not Turkish Cypriots but are Turkish settlers.

About 200,000 Greek Cypriots, expelled from their homes in the north, are still prevented from returning.

Historically, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots lived in comparative harmony until recent time. The Turkish invasion further increased the tension—an invasion in which some believe then-American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger played a direct role by working behind the scenes with Greece's then-military junta to successfully oust Archbishop Makarios as Cypriot president. Turkey used the coup against Makarios as a pretext to invade Cyprus.

Of the 780,000 people currently living in Cyprus, there are about 65,000 to 80,000 Turkish Cypriots and about 100,000 Turks who have moved illegally to the island from Anatolia.

A solution to the Cyprus problem has been elusive for more than a quarter-of-century with President Clinton raising the Cyprus issue in his State of the Union Address this year, terming it one of his highest priorities. It was the first time in 20 years that a president had mentioned the Cyprus question in that annual speech.

Clinton, who has actively immersed himself in other international issues including Ireland and the Middle East, still has seven months remaining in office to push for a Cyprus settlement.

There are hopeful signs that the situation is improving.

Devastating earthquakes that hit both Greece and Turkey last year resulted in both countries coming to the aid of victims. In Cyprus itself, Turkish and Greek Cypriots worked together to solve common issues, such as in the divided city of Nicosia when officials resolved sewage problems and other municipal issues. And hundreds of Turkish Cypriots volunteered to have their blood tested to see if they could provide a bone marrow transplant for a six-year-old Greek Cypriot boy fighting for his life.

Another round of U.N.-sponsored talks aimed at reunifying the island will get underway July 5 in Geneva.

U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan hopes the pace of the talks will accelerate but stresses it is difficult to anticipate what progress will be made. He urges both parties to discuss key issues.

The European Union and the United States are pushing for a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation, the framework for a solution that has repeatedly been endorsed by the U.N. Security Council.

Cypriot President Glafcos Clerides fully supports the actions of the international community for a solution along the U.N. guidelines. Turkey, however, has remained intransigent in seeking an island with two separate states, which is a wholly unacceptable solution.

While Clerides is recognized internationally as the head of Cyprus, only Turkey has recognized the self-proclaimed ''Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'' in the occupied area of the island headed by Rauf Denktash, who to date has refused to budge from his hard line.

Compromise is needed. The U.N. plan is the framework to follow since it is a carefully constructed outline that both communities previously accepted, but the Turkish side keeps changing its position.

An eventual solution needs to include a complete demilitarization of the island, with the Turkish troops leaving and the illegal settlers returning to where they came from.

Reunification also will allow both communities to enjoy the benefits of EU membership since Cyprus is expected to join the organization within a few years.

Lellos Demetriades, the Greek Cypriot mayor of Nicosia, points out that ''you can't live next to each other and not talk.''

This is what is needed most at this time—constructive and substantive talks that will lead to a settlement of the Cyprus issue. As Defense Secretary Cohen points out, a resolution is needed sooner rather than later. Active leadership from the United States is needed now more than ever to solve this issue.

[From the Washington Times, June 6, 2000]

KOSOVO'S ONGOING AGONIES

(HARRY MOSKOS)

Nato Secretary-General Lord Robertson took a walking tour this week to see for himself what it is like in Pristina after the allied war in Kosovo.

Where he didn't walk illustrates that nearly one year after NATO's 78-day bombing of the province that all is not well—or safe.

Lord Robertson's stroll took him down a central shopping street where he was met with cheers from ethnic Albanians. He also toured parts of Kosovska but bypassed the northern, predominantly Serbian, part of the city.

Tensions between Serbians and Albanians remain high. Lord Robertson stressed that the violence has to be reduced or there is danger that ethnic Albanians could lose the sympathy of the international community.

His comments came a few days after an attacker opened fire on a group of Serbs gathered in a store in Cernica, killing a 4-year-old boy, his 60-year-old grandfather and another man. Cernica, 28 miles southeast of Pristina, is patrolled by U.S. peacekeepers who were only 200 yards away when the gunman, an ethnic Albanian, opened fire and escaped.

In another unsolved case, a 25-year-old Serbian U.N. translator was found stabbed to death. The translator was murdered after a newspaper closely tied to Kosovo Albanian leader Hashim Thaci accused the translator of membership in a Serbian paramilitary unit—a rash accusation made without any formal charge or much less even an investigation.

As the Canonical Conference of Orthodox Christian Bishops in America rightly observed recently, the international community must not allow the cycle of violence, ethnic cleansing and retribution to continue in Kosovo.

NATO's troubles are not limited to continuing atrocities in Kosovo.

Three teachers at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point have raised the issue of whether NATO violated the rules of land warfare by using tactics that protected combatants by placing civilian bystanders at greater risk, resulting in a corrosion of the professional military ethic. And another military study has shown that NATO had overstated—roughly by a factor of 10—the effectiveness of its attacks against Serbian forces during last year's conflict.

The 78-day bombing campaign did accomplish its goal to end Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's dictatorial grip on Kosovo, but this has not brought the promise of better times.

NATO entered this fray to help the ethnic Albanians, but unless they are now kept from taking the law into their own hands, the aftermath of Kosovo will only see more 4-year-old boys dying at the hands of assassins.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. DAVID JEFFERSON, SR.

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues here in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring a very special person, Reverend Dr. David Jefferson, Sr., who has earned an outstanding reputation as a teacher, preacher, civic leader, community servant, attorney, and visionary. He has excelled spiritually, academically, and professionally and has made valuable contributions to his community.

Reverend Jefferson has provided vital leadership to his church in creating formidable

ministries, outreach evangelism to the surrounding communities, and leadership training seminars. He has orchestrated a Mens and Boys Breakfast with over three hundred people in attendance. The church has formed a Mass Choir, a Bible Study of over eight hundred people, and car pooling for college students who wish to attend services.

Reverend Jefferson has built a strong and diverse graduate level of education. Upon leaving Grambling State, Reverend Jefferson immediately enrolled in the University of Dayton in Dayton, Ohio. Here he earned a Master of Business Administration degree in Marketing and Finance. He then received a Juris Doctorate of Law from Capital University in Columbus, Ohio and a Master of Divinity from Drew University in Madison, New Jersey. In 1988 he was awarded a fellowship to the prestigious ''Sloan Fellows Program'' at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Here Dr. Jefferson completed his Master of Science in Management in 1989.

Reverend Jefferson is happily married to the former Linda Mouton of Jennings, LA. They are the proud parents of four beautiful children; Kimberly, David Jr., Lou Ella, and Jasmine. He is a member of the New Jersey Bar and American Bar Associations, and Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me on June 11th, in congratulating Reverend Dr. David Jefferson, Sr. on his outstanding accomplishments in expressing our appreciation for his dedicated community service. Let us extend our best wishes to Dr. Jefferson for continued success and fulfillment.

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF NEED TO CREATE INDEPENDENT FEDERAL AGENCY TO INVESTIGATE THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced legislation, H.R. 4105, to establish an independent federal agency to investigate allegations of wrongdoing on the part of Justice Department personnel. As part of my ongoing efforts to have this important legislation enacted into law, I have been investigating allegations of wrongdoing within the Justice Department that have not been appropriately and completed investigated and prosecuted.

One of the incidents I uncovered occurred in my own Congressional District, and it involves serious allegations of misconduct on the part of the Federal Bureau of Investigation agents in Youngstown, Ohio. The attached sworn affidavit makes serious allegations that should be aggressively investigated by the Justice Department and Congress.

STATE OF OHIO, COUNTY OF TRUMBULL—AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES A. KERCHUM

After having been duly sworn in accordance with law, I, James A. Kerchum, hereby depose and say:

(1) I, James A. Kerchum, was an active participant of the Mahoning Valley Corruption Task Force during the approximate period of February 1998 thru April 23, 1999.

(2) During the period of February 1998 thru April 23, 1999, I primarily planned and worked with the following people: Louis Slay, Director Supervisor U.S. Dept. of Justice; Anthony Sporanza, Special Agent FBI; Mike Cizmar, Special Agent FBI; Pete Proach, Special Agent FBI; Wally Sines, Special Agent FBI; and Dennis Direnzo, Agent BCI & I

(3) During the hereinabove written time period I was primarily a paid informant for the FBI and my FBI Code Name was Cheeze 1. My main FBI contact was Special Agent Mike Cizmar.

(4) During the hereinabove written time period, FBI Special Agent Mike Cizmar related the following to me:

(a) Congressman Jim Traficant was the FBI's number one target across the United States because he beat them in a Federal Court in Cleveland, Ohio in 1983 and that he was an embarrassment to the FBI.

(b) The FBI investigated Jim Traficant from the time he was the Mahoning County Sheriff and that the FBI was going to get him one way or another.

(c) When you go to Quantico, Virginia there is one special class you take and that's on getting Jim Traficant.

(d) If I got Jim Traficant, they would build a monument for me in Washington, D.C.

FBI Special Agent Anthony Sporanza also made statements in support of the hereinabove written.

(5) Within the herinabove written time period FBI Special Agent Mike Cizmar asked me to kill Girard, Ohio Police Detective Anthony Zuppo.

Further Affiant Sayeth Naught.

TRIBUTE TO WESLEY RHODES

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to honor Wesley Rhodes of Pineview, GA. Wesley, a student at Fullington Academy, was named a National Award Winner in Science. This special award recognizes fewer than ten percent of all American high school students. Wesley was recommended for the award by teachers and school staff for his outstanding academic performance in science, interest and aptitude, leadership qualities, responsibility, enthusiasm, motivation to learn and improve, citizenship, attitude and cooperative spirit, and dependability.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Wesley for his achievements in science and for his exemplary leadership at Fullington Academy. He is an exceptional student and has made the people of my district and myself proud.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes,

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, reducing fraud and abuse in Medicare has been identified by the Majority Leader as a major initiative. The Budget Committee has a Medicare Fraud Task Force to look into ways to reduce Medicare fraud. The Ways and Means and Commerce Committee has held hearings on reducing Medicare fraud.

And yet, this bill would actually reduce already appropriated funds for fighting fraud and abuse in Medicare by $50 million. These funds were appropriated in advance when the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) was enacted in 1996 and intended to fight Medicare fraud. This program has returned $17 for every dollar invested in it. Because of our fraud-fighting efforts, we have experienced the lowest growth in Medicare spending ever.

Obviously, the Appropriations Committee disagrees with the Majority Leader and other Committee Chairmen who want to reduce Medicare fraud. Instead, the Committee would reduce our anti-fraud efforts. Evidently, the Committee feels that there is not enough fraud in Medicare, so we should let it grow.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting Office and others have issued numerous reports recently about the alarming abuses and poor quality of care of senior citizens in nursing homes—the care of our mothers and fathers and our constituents. GAO said that one in four nursing homes actually harm our senior citizens or place them in danger of being harmed. The GAO recommended stronger enforcement of quality standards.

In Northern California, only 6 percent of nursing homes were found by State inspectors to be in full or substantial compliance with requirements.

The President proposed additional funding to support a Nursing Home Initiative for enforcing nursing home standards more strictly.

Yet this bill would eliminate the funding for this Nursing Home Initiative.

Obviously, the Appropriations Committee simply does not care what happens to our senior citizens in nursing homes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment to restore funds for fighting Medicare fraud and for the Nursing Home Initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I submit into the RECORD a letter sent to me by the National Citizens' Coalition for Nursing Home Reform.

NATIONAL CITIZENS' COALITION
FOR NURSING HOME REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 1, 2000.

Hon. FORTNEY ''PETE'' STARK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: The National Citizens' Coalition for Nursing Home Reform (NCCNHR) urges you to vote no on the Labor/HHS/Education bill because it fails to provide funding for the Nursing Home Initiative.

The Nursing Home Initiative was established to increase funding for improvement in nursing home quality nationwide. As part of the Nursing Home Initiative, new survey protocols were put in place such as improved federal oversight over state survey efforts, staggered inspections, and expedited investigation of resident complaints.

For FY 2001, the Administration proposed a major funding increase that would invest $70.1 million in improving oversight of nursing homes. It would include (1) training surveyors in effective inspection of nursing homes; (2) surveying nursing homes during evenings and weekends; and (3) surveying substandard facilities more frequently than other facilities. However, in Subcommittee, the discretionary funding was virtually eliminated for the Initiative.

By passing an appropriations bill without funding for the Nursing Home Initiative, the House would be ignoring overwhelming evidence of harm to residents that is occurring because of lack of adequate enforcement. The 1998 GAO report on California nursing homes showed that one in three facilities has violations that cause either actual harm to residents or place them at risk for serious injury or death. This report launched the Nursing Home Initiative to address the poor care in nursing homes. We cannot abandon these efforts, which are now beginning to have an effect. Otherwise, we are abandoning the most vulnerable and frail population in this country who need protection from a strengthened enforcement system.

Sincerely,

SARAH GREENE BURGER,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON A BILL TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO IMPROVE THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR REPRESENTATION OF CLAIMANTS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with Congressman CLAY SHAW, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, to introduce legislation regarding fees owed to attorneys who represent Social Security disability claimants. This bill would require the Social Security Administration to pay the attorney fees it owes in a timely fashion or else grant those attorneys an exemption from the administrative assessment that SSA charges in exchange for handling such fees.

Under current law, when an attorney successfully represents a Social Security disability claimant and that claimant is entitled to past-due benefits, SSA retains a portion of those past-due benefits in order to pay the attorney for the services he or she provided. Specifically, SSA withholds and certifies for direct payment to the claimant's attorney an amount equal to the lesser of 25 percent of the past-due benefits or the fee that SSA had previously authorized the attorney to charge his or her client. (Fees authorized by SSA may not exceed 25 percent of past-due benefits or $4,000, whichever is lower).

As a result of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Act of 1999 (P.L. 106–170), SSA is now required to impose an administrative assessment of 6.3 percent on all such fee payments to attorneys. Some maintain that this 6.3 percent assessment is necessary to cover the costs that SSA incurs in withholding and processing fee payments to attorneys. If this is indeed the case and the 6.3 percent assessment is simply compensation for services rendered, then it is not unreasonable to expect that SSA will process fee payments to attorneys in a timely fashion.

The legislation we are introducing today simply seeks to put that reasonable expectation into law. H.R. xxxx would prohibit the Social Security Administration from charging an attorney the 6.3 percent assessment unless the agency certifies his or her fee for payment within 30 days of the award of past-due benefits to his or her client. Without this commonsense legislation, SSA would be permitted to charge the 6.3 percent assessment without regard to how long the agency takes to process attorneys' fee payments.

As necessary as this legislation may be, it is not all that is required of this and future Congresses. We in Congress must also remain vigilant and ensure that the new administrative assessment imposed by the Work Incentives Improvement Act does not deter attorneys from representing disability claimants. Given the complexities of the disability determination process, if claimants are unable to secure professional legal representation, the results could be disastrous.

Claimants without professional legal representation appear to be far less likely to receive the benefits to which they are entitled. For example, in 1998, 57.6 percent of claimants represented by an attorney, but only 35.7 percent of those without one, were awarded benefits at the hearing level.

As mandated by the Work Incentives Improvement Act, the General Accounting Office will examine the impact of this new administrative assessment upon claimants' access to legal representation. If the GAO finds that the assessment does impair claimants' access, I fully expect that, consistent with the conference agreement on the Work Incentives Improvement Act, Congress will revisit this issue once more.

In closing, I look forward to working with Chairman SHAW on this piece of legislation in the same bipartisan manner that characterized our successful efforts last fall on the Work Incentives Improvement Act and again this spring on the repeal of the Social Security retirement earnings test. With this sort of collaboration, I am certain that we can pass this bill as well, thereby creating incentives for SSA to improve its procedures for making payments to attorneys and ensuring that disability claimants have qualified and reliable attorneys to whom they can turn for assistance.

MAKE-A-WISH FOUNDATION 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and join in the celebration of the Make-A-Wish Foundation's 20th Anniversary. In its twentieth year, the Make-A-Wish Foundation is a non-profit organization that fulfills the wishes of children fighting life-threatening illnesses. This organization provides once in a lifetime experiences to children, under the age of 18, who may not have the rest of their lives to seek opportunity. Born out of a wish made by a seven-year-old fighting Leukemia in Arizona, the Make-A-Wish Foundation has grown to 80 chapters in the United States and 20 international affiliates on five continents and is the largest wish granting foundation in the world. In its twenty years of existence, the Make-A-Wish Foundation has granted wishes to over 66,000 children worldwide. The Make-A-Wish Foundation of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., in particular, helps to serve children in my district as well as other children throughout the entire state of Maryland.

The Make-A-Wish Foundation has granted wishes to children as simple as trips to Disney World and other amusement parks to meeting their favorite entertainer or role model. One young man from my district had his wish fulfilled when he met South African leader and political figure Nelson Mandela. He remarked that there was no better way to learn about blacks and whites living together in peace than to learn firsthand about the life of someone so oppressed yet as unbroken as Mr. Mandela.

The Make-A-Wish Foundation gives children that are fighting life-threatening illnesses a positive break from a world of doctors, hospitals and medicine. I salute the Make-A-Wish Foundation's volunteers and supporters who work to make wishes come true not only in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, but literally all over the world. Congratulations on 20 years of making wishes come true.

HONORING ANITA HINOJOSA

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a South Texas educator, Anita Hinojosa, who will retire in July after 31 years in vocational and adult education. Anita helped make Corpus Christi a better place by virtue of her lifetime commitment to education.

After working as a home economics teacher after graduating from Texas A&I University at Kingsville, and as a consultant, Anita became the Vocational Education Coordinator while also working as an adjunct Professor of Occupational Education at Corpus Christi State University.

In 1990, she became the Career and Technology Education Director for the Corpus

Christi Independent School District, the position she will soon leave to enjoy retirement. During the course of her work here, she has supervised some of the most important programs available at CCISD, those programs that work with those who need special training because of their age or special circumstances.

Anita currently oversees the following programs: Adult Basic Education; Alternative High School Center; Summer Training and Education Program (STEP); Pregnancy, Education, and Parenting; Guidance and Counseling; Instructional Technology; and several at-risk programs.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending a special patriot, one who spent a lifetime in pursuit of education and teaching, Anita Hinojosa.

HONORING EDWARD WEISS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, public service, when performed wisely and well, is the most noble of callings. Today I honor a man who has been in public service and who performed in just those ways. Edward Weiss is retiring from the United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, after 30 years of service.

In his many capacities with the Department, Ed has received outstanding performance ratings from every United States Attorney General under whom he has served since 1981. He is well known for his ability to prepare and litigate cases. He also coordinated the Criminal Alien Program for the New Jersey District.

Ed received his BA degree from Syracuse University and graduated from Brooklyn Law School. He and his wife Susan have two daughters; Robyn, in a pre-doctorate program in Religion at Hebrew University, and Karen, studying law at George Washington University.

Ed is retiring to follow his other passions, hiking and traveling. He is a dedicated professional of who we can all be proud. I join his many friends in wishing him and his family many happy years in his retirement.

HONORING JUSTIN ''JAY'' CAUFIELD

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a very special man. He is a friend, a community leader, and an exceptional educator. His dedication, competence and responsible attitude exemplify all that is right with America's public school system.

For more than twenty-five years, Justin "Jay" Caufield has served as a Principal in the Saugus Union School District. He has been a very active member in the community and in the school district.

Prior to entering the field of education, Mr. Caufield served four years in the U.S. Army in Special Forces. Mr. Caufield is highly respected by his peers, teaching staff and parents. As a teacher and principal in the Saugus School District, Jay Caufield has touched the lives and made a difference for thousands of students.

For the past 17 years, Mr. Caufield has served as the Principal at Emblem Elementary School. As a result of his fine leadership and commitment to excellence, Emblem has earned both State and National recognition. In 1995, Emblem achieved the status as a California Distinguished School. In 1996, the school received recognition from the California School Board Association by earning the Golden Bell award for its highly regarded TEAMS program. In 1997, Emblem Elementary School received the highest possible recognition by being named a National Blue Ribbon School. Under Mr. Caufield's direction, Emblem has continued to excel and uphold its high academic standards.

I want to commend Mr. Jay Caufield for his selfless commitment to the students and to the entire educational community. His distinguished career has been a shining example for all.

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4205) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal 2001. I believe that a strong and effective defense system is vital to the future of this country. I believe that we must do all we can to identify potential threats in this new post-Cold War environment and to prepare for the possibility that these threats might require a military response. But I question the price that this bill is asking us to pay to achieve these goals.

My concerns about this bill have to do with priorities. By that, I mean I think the priorities among the programs funded in the bill are wrong. But, even more importantly, I think the sheer size of the bill reflects an imbalance between military spending and other important priorities.

First, the big picture: At $15.8 billion over FY2000 appropriated levels, the President's budget request for defense programs in FY2001 indicates the importance of defense spending for this Administration. But—not content with a bill to meet the President's request for $60 billion in weapons procurement as well as to fully fund missile defense and other major weapons systems—the Republicans want more.

The bill we will vote on today appropriates $4 billion more than the budget request, and $22.4 billion more than last year's appropriated levels. Along with defense funds provided in the recently passed Military Construction Appropriations bill and funds expected to be provided in the FY2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, total defense appropriations this year come to about $310 billion—more than $4.5 billion over this year's budget request.

With this defense bill alone appropriating more than half of the discretionary funds available to Congress, it is clear to me that something is wrong with our priorities. The President's budget balanced increases in defense with increases in funding for education, health care, national parks, science, environmental protection, and other non-defense programs. What the Republicans have done is to increase defense spending even more, all at the expense of domestic programs that are so important to the citizen of this country.

Second, there are the bill's own priorities: Not only would this bill provide too much, but it also would provide too much of the wrong thing.

I can't support funding F–22 production when the Appropriations Committee's own Survey and Investigations staff reported that a December 2000 date for beginning production is premature, and when the GAO recommended that six, not ten, planes be built, which could save as much as $828 million.

Nor can I support funding for national missile defense procurement until the technology has been proven and until we've come to some agreement with our allies as to how to proceed. We must not view national missile defense as a substitute for arms control efforts. I believe Congress should primarily be encouraging further reductions in global nuclear weapons, while examining the need for, timing of, and feasibility of national missile defense within a global arms-control context. I don't believe that we should be doing anything more than examining these questions at this time.

There are some good things about the bill. For example, I'm pleased that the measure provides a 3.7 percent pay increase for military personnel, and that the bill includes important provisions to revamp the military health care system, including restoring access for all Medicare-eligible military retirees and creating a plan to implement a permanent health care program for military retirees over 65.

But Mr. Speaker, this bill does not provide a balance between our domestic and international responsibilities. We may be more secure than ever before, but I question whether the country wouldn't be better off if we were to invest more in education, health care, and the needs of our children. We must remember that this nation's strength comes not just from military preparedness, but also from its citizens. Adequate investments in them are just as important as protection for them.

HONORING COMMANDER WILLIAM ROBERT ANDERSON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I honor retired Commander William Robert Anderson for his service to his Country in both the military and the House of Representatives.

Commander Anderson distinguished himself in combat and scientific accomplishment during his long career in the submarine service. During World War II, he completed a total of 11 submarine war patrols and earned a Bronze Star for his assistance in the sinking of 17 cargo-carrying crafts and the rescue of a downed aviator.

In May of 1953, Captain Anderson was granted his first command, the submarine U.S.S. *Wahoo,* and saw even more action during the Korean War. Two years later he would be chosen for another type of command, as head of the Tactical Department at the U.S. Submarine School in New London, Connecticut.

This would not be the end of his sea duty, though. In fact, his most important command and date with history was yet to come. It was actually while Anderson was at the U.S. Submarine School that the United States commissioned its first nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus* on January 17, 1955.

The potential of this new type of submarine brought a need for more officers trained in nuclear operations. And so, Commander Anderson found himself being called into Rear-Admiral H.G. Rickover's office to interview for the program in January of 1956.

He soon found himself recruited and awaiting a new command. During this time Rickover asked Anderson to devise a method of study for new officers entering the program. This project eventually evolved into the core study program for all nuclear submarine commanders.

It was on April 30, 1957, that Captain Anderson was ordered to assume command of the U.S.S. *Nautilus.* His classified mission was to be ready to take his submarine and crew under the Arctic polar ice cap whenever he received the order.

Known as ''Operation Sunshine'' by the Navy, this project would challenge both Captain Anderson's leadership skills and his nautical training.

No one had ever succeeded in finding a northern sea passage before, and the lack of information and charts on the pack ice, the inability of normal navigational instruments to operate so near to the magnetic North Pole and other instrumentation problems had to be sorted out and solved—all in the deepest of secrecy.

With the summer of 1957 ending, the crew of the *Nautilus* made its first attempt to traverse the ice pack while submerged. Using special ice detecting sonar, the *Nautilus* started maneuvering around the icebergs. It would not succeed on this attempt or the next one in June of 1958.

The same cannot be said for the third attempt, and on August 3, 1958, Captain Anderson and the crew of the *Nautilus* finally crossed under the North Pole. Upon return to the United States, the entire crew was honored with a ticker tape parade in New York City and Anderson was personally awarded the Legion of Merit by President Eisenhower.

Commander Anderson's career continued to flourish—from his serving as an aide to the Secretary of the Navy, Fred Korth, to his appointment as the Director of the National Service Corps, which would be renamed the Peace Corps in later years by President Kennedy.

In 1960, Anderson was even considered as a possible gubernatorial candidate in Tennessee, but he decided to fulfill his 20 year commitment to the Navy. Upon retirement from the Navy, Anderson was elected as the Representative from the Sixth District of Tennessee in 1965, and he continued to serve his constituents for four successive terms in office before retiring to Virginia.

I, for one, am proud of the accomplishments of my fellow Tennessean, William Robert Anderson. For his diligent and long-standing service to this great Country and the State of Tennessee, I would like to return the honor by paying him this tribute to his great accomplishments.

While Commander Anderson now resides in the great state of Virginia, we Tennesseans still choose to claim him as one of our native sons.

HONORING ROBERT A. CHAPMAN

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a South Texas educator, Bob Chapman, who will retire on July 1, 2000, after 29 years in vocational and adult education. Bob helped make Corpus Christi a better place by virtue of his lifetime commitment to education.

After completing his military experience, his education and a stint in business, Bob worked as a training instructor at a Texas high school, then went to work for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in 1983.

He served there as an area specialist, providing assistance to teachers, schools and administrators in a 26-county area in South Texas. From there, he went to Austin as a specialist in vocational education. In 1986, he came to Corpus Christi as a vocational education consultant in the Corpus Christi Independent School District (CCISD).

It was at CCISD that Bob spent the better part of his professional life and in 1993 he became coordinator of the Adult Learning Center for CCISD, the position he will soon leave to seek another career in private industry.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending a special patriot, one who spent a lifetime in pursuit of education and teaching, Bob Chapman.

A WAY TO SAVE MEDICARE, BENEFICIARIES AND TAXPAYERS BILLIONS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STAARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, even in an era of unprecedented budget surpluses, wasting Medicare dollars is unacceptable.

The same procedures, carried out in a physician's office, an ambulatory surgical center or in a hospital outpatient department are reimbursed at widely different rates. These differences exist across medical specialties and do not consistently relate to the setting in which the service is provided and may vary up to 179%. (Table 1).

The disparity in payments for equivalent services, regardless of setting, needs to be eliminated and payments reduced to the lowest levels.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no reason in the world for us to pay $1001 for glaucoma surgery in a hospital outpatient setting, when we can provide the same service for $415 in an ambulatory surgical center.

The taxpayers, beneficiaries and Medicare can save billions of dollars in the years to come if we simply pay at the lowest of the hospital outpatient, ambulatory surgical center or doctor's office rate. We should pay at the lowest rate a service can be safely provided, regardless of setting. I have proposed this in H.R. 2115, and I urge the Members to consider this legislation as a way both save money and help beneficiaries.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF PAYMENT RATES ACROSS SETTINGS FOR SELECTED HIGH VOLUME AMBULATORY CARE SERVICES, 2000.

Type of service	Code	Description	ASC rate	OPD rate	Practice expense rate
Gastroenterology	45380	Colonoscopy and biopsy	$425	$387	$260
	45378	Diagnostic colonoscopy	425	387	192
Ophthalmology	66170	Glaucoma surgery	415	1001	.....
	68720	Create tear sac drain	491	1149	.....
Orthopedics	23420	Repair of shoulder	1110	1753	.....
	29880	Knee arthroscopy/surgery	680	1191	.....
Otolaryngology	30520	Repair nasal septum	537	1232	.....
	69436	Create ear drum opening	233	583	.....
Dermatology/Reconstructive Surgery	19120	Removal breast lesion	411	623	.....
	13131	Repair of wound or lesion	383	181	.....
Diagnostic	93880	Duplex scan, extracranial arteries	132	.....	150
	93307	Echo exam of heart	213	.....	171

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF PAYMENT RATES ACROSS SETTINGS FOR SELECTED HIGH VOLUME AMBULATORY CARE SERVICES, 2000.—Continued

Type of service	Code	Description	ASC rate	OPD rate	Practice expense rate
Radiology	70450	CAT scan of brain/head	237		188

Source: Federal Register 1999, Federal Register 2000a, Federal Register 2000b.
Note: OPD (outpatient department), ASC (ambulatory surgical center), Practice Expense Rate (physician's office), CAT (computerized axial tomography).

BIOGRAPHY OF MR. IRVING KWASMAN OF SHERERVILLE, INDIANA

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Irving Kwasman was born on March 15, 1925, and died on June 8, 2000 at age 75. Mr. Kwasman was a loving husband for over 50 years, and father of two sons. He was also grandfather of two grandchildren.

Mr. Kwasman served in the United States Army behind enemy lines in WWII, and received 3 bronze stars for bravery. Only four soldiers earned 3 bronze stars in WWII, and Colin Powell only earned 2 for Vietnam. He fought in the battle of the Bulge and of a unit 314, only 7 survived.

Irving Kwasman is a Hero in every sense of the word. He was a successful furniture salesman, and had his own business. He was a practicing Jew of very strong religious stature, and proud grandfather of Adam Kwasman, U.S. House Page. My most sincere sympathies go out to Adam Kwasman and family. Rest in peace, and God bless.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD R. LUONGO

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to a special person who will be honored at a recognition ceremony in Belleville, New Jersey this week, Mr. Richard R. Luongo, who has given twenty-seven years of dedicated service to the Newark Police Department.

Lieutenant Luongo has earned a fine reputation as an outstanding law enforcement officer who is strongly dedicated to his work and to the community he serves. He ascended in his career first to Sergeant and later to Lieutenant. He first started as a police officer for Newark on October 15, 1973 and retired on June 1, 2000. In addition, he is currently serving in the capacity of President of the Superior Officers' Association of the Newark Police Department.

Mr. Luongo and his wife Gilda have two wonderful daughters, Nicole and Erica. The Luongos currently reside in the township of Bloomfield.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Lieutenant Luongo for a job well done and in wishing him continued success as he begins a new phase of his life.

HONORING SEYMOUR NAIDICH

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I warmly congratulate Seymour Naidich who is celebrating his eighty-first birthday. This is a double commemoration for a wonderful man who recently celebrated his Golden Wedding anniversary of a half century of love, warmth and affection with his wife, Blanche. Seymour and Blanche have two daughters, Donna and Michelle who are joining with the extended family, of which I am happily a member, to wish Seymour the happiest of birthdays as he enters his ninth decade.

Seymour and Blanche met in 1947 after he returned from serving in World War II in the African and Asian theaters. It is emblematic of the closeness of Seymour and his friends that he met Blanche through a friend who had dated her. They spent the day at the friend's house and on the way home he impulsively asked if they could meet again the following day. The rest is a story for everyone who believes in love.

Seymour's celebration of his eightieth birthday was deferred for a year because of illness. But now he is well and we all look forward to celebrating this wondrous event with the promise of more golden years to come.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MELVA JONES, ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON FOUNDATION AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate a remarkable woman, Melva Jones, who was recently chosen as one of only ten people nationally to receive the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Community Health Leader award. The award is considered the nation's highest honor for community health leadership and includes a $100,000 grant to help further her work.

Ms. Jones is the director of the Mattie B. Uzzle Outreach Center in Baltimore, which provides street outreach to help people with substance abuse problems get treatment, counseling, food, clothing, and emergency funds. The center, which is located in a neighborhood with one of the state's highest substance abuse rates, also offers housing, job referrals, free testing for HIV, and community education programs on drug-related issues.

Ms. Jones, who is a native of my district in Baltimore, gave up a lucrative nursing administration career to help found the center in 1994 after watching drug abuse transform a once-thriving neighborhood into streets of boarded up houses. The center is a ''neighbor'' to residents in this community and has steered more than 2,500 people into drug treatment programs since its inception. It also boasts a forty-five percent recovery rate, which is 10 percent higher than the national average.

With her hands-on approach, Ms. Jones has been instrumental to the success of the program. A visible force in the neighborhood every day, she serves as a welcome sight to a community that is all too familiar with the horrors of drug addition up close. With a reputation for persistence and tough love, she makes regular rounds to find people in need and coax them into treatment.

Mr. Speaker, Melva Jones has demonstrated true leadership by addressing one of the most difficult problems in our community and it comes as no surprise that she was selected for this distinguished award. Although much more needs to be accomplished in the fight against substance abuse, in Baltimore and across the United States, it is a comfort to know that there are people like Ms. Jones on the street, working every day.

STAR WARS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STAR WARS II

HERE WE GO AGAIN

(By William D. Hartung and Michelle Ciarrocca)

If you stopped worrying about the bomb when the cold war ended, you were probably surprised to learn that two of the hot-button issues of the eighties—arms control and missile defense—will top the agenda at the Clinton/Putin summit on June 4–5. A central issue in Moscow will be how to reconcile Russian President Vladimir Putin's proposal for deep cuts in US Russian nuclear arsenals with the Clinton Administration's fixation on developing a National Missile Defense (NMD) system.

Clinton has pledged to make a deployment decision this fall, after the Pentagon and the White House analyze the results of the next ''hit to kill'' test of the missile defense system, slated for late June or early July. The system failed its most recent test, conducted in January, while an allegedly successful test conducted last October was made possible only by the fact that the kill vehicle was guided to the right spot by a large, easy-to-find decoy balloon.

The Clinton/Gore proposal is a far cry from Ronald Reagan's Star Wars scheme, which

was designed to fend off thousands of Soviet warheads at a cost estimated by former Wisconsin Senator William Proximire at up to $1 trillion. In contrast, this missile defense plan is meant to deal with a few dozen incoming warheads launched by a ''rouge state'' like North Korea, at a projected cost of $60 billion. But despite the NMD's seemingly more modest goals, it is every bit as dangerous and misguided as the Reagan scheme, threatening to unravel thirty years of arms-control agreements and heighten the danger of nuclear war.

NMD's surprising political revival is rooted in the three Cs of contemporary US politics: conservative ideology, Clintonian cowardice and corporate influence. These short-term pressures are in turn reinforced by an ambitious long-range military objective: the misguided quest for a state of absolute military superiority.

The strongest push for missile defense has come from Reaganite true believers in conservative think tanks, especially the small but highly effective Center for Security Policy. On Capitol Hill, the NMD lobby is spearheaded by new-look conservatives like Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona, who led last fall's successful Republican effort to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Fresh from that victory, the NMD lobby is now seeking to destroy the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty as the next target in its campaign to promote ''peace through strength rather than peace through paper,'' as Kyl put it in a recent speech.

The right-wing crusade for missile defense has received aid and comfort from Bill Clinton and Al Gore, who have decided that looking ''tough'' on defense is more important than protecting the world from weapons of mass destruction. Support has also come from the lumbering behemoths of the military-industrial complex: Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and Boeing, which are desperately seeking a new infusion of taxpayer funds to help them recover from a string of technical failures and management fiascoes that have cut their stock prices and drastically reduced their profit margins.

NMD's military boosters see the system primarily as a way to enhance the offensive capabilities of US forces, not as a defensive measure. In its revealing ''Vision for 2020'' report, the US Space Command—a unified military command that coordinates the space activities and assets of the Army, Navy and Air Force—sings the praises of outer space as the ideal platform for projecting US military dominance ''across the full spectrum of conflict.'' Pentagon hardliners have a more immediate military goal: using NMD as a shield to protect US forces in interventions against states like North Korea (whose missile development effort, it is worth noting, has been on hold for almost two years).

A growing number of moderate-to-conservative Democrats are also supportive of a limited NMD system. Whether or not missile defense is an effective response to alleged threats, it seems to offer a sense of security to some members of Congress, who lack the expertise and inclination to question the fevered threat projections of the US military and intelligence establishments.

While at least some of the motives of NMD advocates may be understandable, they are also disastrously misguided: Even Clinton and Gore's ''limited'' system is unnecessary, unworkable and unaffordable. The mere pursuit of an NMD system could pose the most serious threat to international peace and stability since the height of the cold war. Russian President Putin has emphatically stated that any US move to withdraw from the ABM treaty will lead Moscow to treat all existing US/Russian arms agreements as null and void. And China's chief arms negotiator, Sha Zukang, has warned that if Washington goes ahead with an NMD deployment designed to intercept ''tens of warheads''—a figure suspiciously close to the eighteen to twenty single-warhead ballistic missiles that represent China's entire nuclear deterrent capability—Beijing will not ''sit on its hands.''

In short, the official Clinton/Gore Administration position on NMD is that we should jeopardize the best change in a generation to reduce the world's nuclear arsenals in order to preserve the option to deploy a costly, technically dubious scheme designed to defend against a Third World missile threat that does not currently exist and may not ever materialize. To understand how we got into this mess, we need to take a look at the genesis, ''death'' and resurrection of Reagan's Star Wars dream.

A SMILE AND A SHOESHINE

When Reagan gave his March 1983 Star Wars speech, in which he pledged to launch a program designed to render nuclear weapons ''impotent and obsolete,'' he was acting primarily on the advice of Edward Teller, the infamous ''father of the H-bomb.'' In closed-door meetings organized by the conservative businessmen in Reagan's kitchen Cabinet, Teller sold Reagan on a new nuclear doctrine of ''assured survival'' based on the alleged technical wonders of his latest brainchild, the X-ray laser. As New York Times science writer William Broad pointed out in his 1992 book, Teller's War, the X-ray laser was largely a figment of Teller's imagination, composed of scientific speculation, wishful thinking and outright deception. But Reagan was buying into the concept of missile defense, not the details, so he forged ahead unaware of these inconvenient facts, his enthusiasm reinforced by his desire to counter the nuclear freeze movement.

But, as Frances FitzGerald shows in her new book, Way Out There in the Blue (the title derives from Arthur Miller's line in Death of a Salesman in which he describes Willy Loman as ''a man way out there in the blue, riding on a smile and a shoeshine''), Reagan's Star Wars proposal was more than just a political con game; it was also a potent symbol that served radically different purposes for the different factions within his Administration. For hard-liners like Caspar Weinberger, Richard Perle and Frank Gaffney—a Perle protégé who went on to found his own pro-Star Wars think tank, the Center for Security Policy—Reagan's missile defense plan offered a chance to promote their two main goals: sustaining the Reagan military buildup and thwarting progress on US/Soviet arms control. For White House political strategists, the Star Wars plan was a way to boost Reagan's flagging popularity ratings, which had plummeted in the face of the deepest recession since the thirties and a growing fear that the President's aggressive anti-Soviet stance was moving the world to the brink of a nuclear confrontation.

The most constructive response to the Star Wars speech within Reagan's inner circle came from his Secretary of State, George Shultz. Rather than trying to convince Reagan of the manifold flaws in his pet project, Shultz treated the Star Wars speech as an opportunity to press Reagan to engage in his first serious discussions with Soviet leaders on nuclear weapons issues. Shultz found an unlikely ally in Paul Nitze, the old cold warrior who was appointed as a special envoy to the US/Russian nuclear talks at Schultz's request. Nitze honed in on the fatal flaw that has plagued all missile defense schemes to date, which is that it is much cheaper to overwhelm a defensive system with additional warheads or decoys than it is to expand the defensive capability to meet these new threats. As a result, Shultz and Nitze were able to prevail over the Weinberger/Perle faction and persuade Reagan to endorse historic agreements to eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons from Europe and implement substantial cuts in long-range weapons under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). Star Wars was a security blanket that allowed Reagan to engage in serious negotiations with the ''evil empire'' without being perceived as some sort of weak-kneed liberal arms controller among the conservatives who formed his core constituency.

When George Bush took office in January 1989, Reagan's Star Wars fantasy was rapidly overtaken by the reality of sharp reductions in the US and Soviet nuclear forces. Both sides ratified the START I arms reduction pact and followed up with a START II deal that called for cutting US and Soviet strategic arsenals to one-third their Reagan-era levels. On a broader front, the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the dissolution of the Soviet Union between 1989 and 1991 made spending billions on a high-tech scheme to defend against Soviet missiles seem irrelevant and absurd. Despite the decline of the Soviet ''threat,'' however, the Bush Administration and Congress continued to cough up $3–$4 billion per year for missile defense. The project's new focus was protection against an accidental nuclear attack.

Soon yet another rationale appeared in the form of the ''rouge state'' strategy, developed by Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Gen. Colin Powell, and based on the notion that the United States should be prepared to fight two heavily armed regional powers like Iraq and North Korea simultaneously. In the 1991 Gulf War Saddam Hussein came to personify the rogue-state threat; Iraqi missile attacks on Tel Aviv and a devastating direct hit on a U.S. military barracks in Saudi Arabia prompted calls for more effective defenses against medium-range ballistic missiles.

But even that was not enough to sustain enthusiasm for a major new program. A few months after Clinton took office in January 1993, Defense Secretary Les Aspin proclaimed the Star Wars program dead (though the Pentagon continued to spend $3–$4 billion per year on missile defense research).

ENTER NEWT

Newt Gingrich is gone from the political scene, but the most dangerous plank of his 1994 Contract With America remains: the section that calls for ''requiring the Defense Department to deploy antiballistic missile systems capable of defending the United States against ballistic missile attacks.'' That plan was added to the contract by Gingrich and his fellow Republican co-author Dick Armey at the urging of Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy.

Efforts to turn the contract's rhetoric into viable legislation proved unsuccessful in the short run, but in mid-1996 the Clinton Administration decided to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory by offering a missile defense compromise known as the ''3+3'' plan—three years of research and testing followed by a three-year crash program to deploy a system—if the President decided it was necessary, feasible and affordable. The ''3+3''

gambit allowed Clinton to push off a politically controversial decision on missile defense until a later date that fell well past the 1996 presidential election. Unfortunately for Al Gore, that ''later date'' is now smack in the middle of his second run for the White House. As John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists put it, ''This is a political decision driven by the need to defend Al Gore from Republicans rather than defend America against missiles.''

While Clinton was yielding ground, Capitol Hill Republicans were regrouping for their next offensive—one result of which was an amendment in the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization bill calling for the establishment of a blue-ribbon panel to ''assess the nature and magnitude of existing and emerging ballistic missile threats to the United States.'' The Republicans wanted their new commission to be viewed as an authoritative and objective body, not just a partisan project. Bearing that in mind, House Speaker Gingrich and Senate majority leader Trent Lott, who were empowered to nominate the majority of the panel's members, chose former Ford Administration Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to head the commission, in the hopes that they could capitalize on his reputation as a moderate Republican with pragmatic views on military matters. Rumsfeld proved worthy of Gingrich's and Lott's confidence when he hammered out a unanimous final report with the appropriate aura of bipartisanship, complete with signatures from Democratic appointees such as former Carter Administration arms-control official Barry Blechman of the Henry L. Stimson Center and eminent physicist and longtime missile defense critic Richard Garwin. Just two weeks after the report came out, Garwin placed an Op-Ed in the New York Times denouncing the misuse of the report by missile defense boosters, asserting, ''I am alarmed that some have interpreted our findings as providing support for a new national defense system.''

The Rumsfeld Commission report was unveiled in July 1998 amid hysterical cries from Gingrich that it was the ''most important warning about our national security system since the end of the cold war.'' Hysteria aside, the report's primary finding was that given enough foreign help, a rogue state like North Korea could acquire a missile capable of reaching the United States within five years of making a decision to do so—one-third to one-half the warning time projected in the CIA's official estimates. The Star Wars lobby finally got what it needed: an official, government-approved statement that could be interpreted as endorsing its own exaggerated view of the Third World missile threat. While the Rumsfeld report drew heavy editorial fire in papers like the Chicago Tribune and the Milwaukee Sentinel, the Wall Street Journal applauded it as a long-overdue clarion call for missile defense, and Washington's newspaper of record, the Post, published a measured response that endorsed the panel's findings as ''useful and plausible.''

INSIDE THE MISSILE DEFENSE LOBBY

Upon reflection, it is clear that the Rumsfeld report's Republican backers had always intended to use the panel as a tool to advance their pro-missile defense agenda. All the report actually says is that if a country like North Korea gets major foreign assistance—including the extremely unlikely possibility that a country like China would simply give Pyongyang a fully operational ballistic missile—it will achieve the capability to hit the United States much more quickly than if it had to build the missile without outside help. As Joseph Cirincione of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace demonstrated in Congressional testimony delivered this past February, the Rumsfeld Commission's conservative backers have used the report as a vehicle for changing the intelligence community's traditional means of assessing the ballistic missile threat, from one that attempts to predict the likely pace of missile proliferation in a given nation in the light of political, economic and military factors, to a ''worst-case scenario'' approach that asks how quickly a given nation could achieve a threatening missile capability if it had no economic or political impediments. As Cirincione also demonstrated, the ''sky is falling'' approach has been used to obscure the underlying reality that the ballistic missile threat to the United States has decreased in the last decades, not increased.

Just as the Rumsfeld Commission turned out to be less objective than it first appeared to be, so did its chairman. Far from being a moderate, Donald Rumsfeld is a card-carrying member of the missile defense lobby. Prior to his appointment to head the commission that bears his name, he was publicly singled out as a special friend in the annual report of the pro-Star Wars think tank, the Center for Security Policy. As a further sign of his commitment to the missile defense cause, Rumsfeld has also given money to Frank Gaffney's group. If Gaffney's organization were just an abstract ''study group,'' that would be one thing. But it is a highly partisan advocacy organization that serves as the de facto nerve center of the NMD lobby.

Gaffney's center, which now has an annual budget of $1.2 million, was started in 1988 with support from New Right funders like Richard Mellon Scaife and Joseph Coors. Since that time, Gaffney has turned it into a sort of working executive committee for the missile defense lobby. The center's advisory board includes representatives of larger conservative organizations, including Ed Feulner, president of the Heritage Foundation; William Bennett, co-director of Empower America; and Henry Cooper of High Frontier, the original Star Wars think tank, which was launched during the early years of the Reagan Administration. Other CSP advisory board members include Charles Kupperman and Bruce Jackson, who serve as vice president for Washington operations and director of planning and analysis, respectively, at Lockheed Martin; key members of Congress like Republicans Curt Weldon, Christopher Cox, and Jon Kyl; and a who's who of Reagan-era Star Warriors like Edward Teller and former Reagan science adviser George Keyworth.

Unlike most think tanks concerned with military issues, the Center for Security Policy receives a substantial portion of its funding from weapons manufacturers. Three out of the top four missile defense contractors—Boeing, Lockheed Martin and TRW—are all major corporate contributors to CSP, which has received more than $2 million in corporate donations since its founding, accounting for roughly one-quarter of its total budget.

Rumsfeld's link to CSP is not his only affiliation with the Star Wars lobby. He's also on the board of Empower America, which ran deceptive ads against anti-NMD Senator Harry Reid of Nevada in the run-up to the November 1998 elections. In recognition of his service to the missile defense lobby, in October 1998—just three months after his ''objective'' assessment of the missile threat was released—CSP awarded Rumsfeld its ''Keeper of the Flame'' award for 1998 at a gala dinner attended by several hundred Star Wars boosters. In accepting the award, Rumsfeld joined the company of Reagan, Gingrich and several Congressional NMD boosters.

NMD RESURGENT: FAST TRACK TO OBLIVION?

In a reprise of the political two-step that preceded the 1996 presidential elections (Republicans lead, Clintonites follow), the Clinton Administration moved closer to the Republican position on missile defense with a January 1999 announcement that the President would seek a six-year, $112 billion increase in Pentagon spending. The proposal included $6.6 billion in new funding for procurement of missile defense equipment before 2005, the new target date for NMD deployment established by Defense Secretary William Cohen.

Clinton's decision to accelerate NMD funding was propelled in part by the furor caused by North Korea's August 1998 test of a two-stage ballistic missile, but the trump card in the Republican-led effort to jack up both overall military spending and NMD ''deployment readiness'' funding was the backlash from the Monica Lewinsky affair.

Long before the Lewinsky scandal, Clinton decided that throwing money at the Pentagon was the best way to shore up his credentials as Commander in Chief and divert attention from allegations that he had dodged the draft during the Vietnam War. By the fall of 1998, the combination of a growing federal budget surplus and the President's perceived political weakness resulting from the Lewinsky matter emboldened Congressional Republicans and Clinton's own Joint Chiefs of Staff to press him for billions of dollars in additional military funds.

In mid-September, the Joint Chiefs invited the President to a closed-door briefing where they read Clinton their wish lists on everything from boosting military pay and weapons procurement to applying fresh coats of paint to underutilized military bases. Within a week's time Clinton sent the Chief a letter pledging a Pentagon budget increase that would insure that ''the men and women of our armed forces will have the resources they need to do their jobs.'' In October, Congressional Republicans did the Joint Chiefs one better, loading up Clinton's $1 billion Pentagon supplemental appropriations bill aimed at addressing the military's newfound ''readiness crisis'' with what analyst John Isaacs of the Council for a Livable World has described as ''a $9 billion grab bag of pet projects'' that included an additional $1 billion for National Missile Defense.

Clinton's apparent embrace of NMD prompted Helle Bering of the conservative Washington Times to complain bitterly that ''Clinton has appropriated yet another set of Republican issues.'' In mid-January Cohen took the Administration's NMD commitment one step further when he made the highly provocative statement that if the United States deemed it necessary to withdraw from the ABM treaty in order to field an effective defense against rogue-state missiles, it would do so regardless of Russia's reaction.

Meanwhile, back on Capitol Hill, NMD advocates were rallying around Senator Thad Cochran's National Missile Defense Act. In March 1999, aided by the votes of moderate and conservative Democrats who had been persuaded in part by the Rumsfeld Commission's official (albeit misleading) depiction of the North Korean missile threat, the House and Senate both passed bills calling

for the deployment of a national missile defense system ''as soon as it is technologically feasible.''

Clinton signed the bill into law that July. Although his signing message made it clear that the Administration will consider economic, technical and arms-control factors before deciding whether to deploy an NMD system, Star Wars boosters in Congress have been portraying the legislation as a firm national commitment come hell or high water.

THE NMD DECEPTION

From its inception in the Reagan White House to its resurrection in the Clinton era, the marketing of missile defense has been accompanied at every step by exaggerated technical claims, misleading cost estimates and outright lies. If experience is any guide, the missile defense test scheduled for late June or early July will almost be certainly be rigged. (In 1984, in an instance of fraud that only came to light nine years later, a test of Lockheed's Homing Overlay Experiment was rigged by placing a beacon in the target missile so that it could literally signal its location to the interceptor missile.)

But even if the next test misfires, the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) has already put forward a rationale that Clinton could use to give the green light for deployment, namely that two more ''hit to test'' tests could be squeezed in between now and next spring, when construction will begin on the critical NMD radar site in Shemya, Alaska, if Clinton decides to go full speed ahead on deployment. Even one successful ''hit'' in any of these next three tests—which will occur before BMDO contractors actually break ground on the Alaska radar project but after the Administration has committed funds to long-lead-time materials and services that will be needed to meet the starting date for construction—will be offered as proof of the dubious proposition that the system will work under real-world conditions.

Unfortunately, fraudulent testing of missile defense components is far from ancient history. Nira Schwartz, a computer software expert who worked on tests of the NMD interceptor for TRW, filed a civil suit against the company in April 1996 charging that it forced her to misreport her findings on the critical question of whether the interceptor missile can tell the difference between a real warhead and a decoy. The documents in the case were unsealed earlier this year and featured in a March 7 front-page *New York Times* story. The company has denied Schwartz's allegations, but another engineer who worked on the tests has backed her up.

Since Schwartz' claims became public earlier this year, MIT missile defense expert Theodore Postol had conducted an independent analysis of the data generated by the test in question, and he has concluded that the results raise fundamental questions about the ability of any currently available technology to discriminate between warheads and decoys. Since this capability is essential for even a modest NMD system to have any chance of intercepting a handful of incoming warheads, TRW and the Pentagon have gone to great lengths to cover up this embarrassing fact. When Postol sent a letter to the White House outlining his findings, the Pentagon responded by ruling that the contents of Postol's letter should be classified on the grounds that they contained top-secret material. On May 25 the BMDO released a cursory letter charging that Postol's findings were ''incomplete'' and his conclusions ''wrong'' because ''Dr. Postol is not considering all the capabilities of our system of systems.'' Postol fired back the same day at a DC press conference organized by the Global Research/Action Center on the Environment, presenting his technical critique of the NMD system in detail and slamming the Administration for ''foot-dragging and playing politics with an important decision that directly affects the security of the nation'' rather than appointing an impartial panel to investigate seriously his charges of fraud in the test program.

In addition to the evidence of outright fraud, the NMD program has recently been subjected to a flurry of questions from critics within the Pentagon and the U.S. intelligence community. On May 19, a few days after Postol sent his letter to the White House, the *Los Angeles Times* published an interview with a high-level U.S. intelligence official who flatly contradicted the Clinton Administration's contention that China has nothing to fear from a limited U.S. NMD system. The official also noted that the North Korean and Iranian missile threats have not been moving along as rapidly as expected, and he asserted that the concept of the ''rogue state'' was in itself an impediment to objective analysis of the missile threat.

Meanwhile, a blue-ribbon panel chaired by former Reagan Administration Secretary of the Air Force Gen. Larry Welch has issued two scathing critiques of NMD program management, the first of which pointed out that the NMD system was on a far tighter testing schedule than any recent weapons development program of comparable scale. It went on to charge that the program was on a headlong ''rush to failure.'' The second Welch report, released this past November, strongly encouraged the Administration to push back its NMD deployment decision to avoid ''regressing to a very high risk schedule.'' In February a report by Philip Coyle, the Pentagon's director of operational test and evaluation, charged that the Pentagon was facing heavy pressure to ''meet an artificial decision point in the development process.''

There is one final element distorting the NMD testing program: corporate greed. The major corporate players in the NMD testing program—Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Raytheon—all have serious and direct conflicts of interest, since the results of the tests they are helping to carry out will determine whether they start reaping multibillion-dollar missile defense contracts over the next few years. Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon has tried to wave off charges of fraud involving TRW's NMD ''hit to kill'' vehicle by arguing that TRW's version has not been chosen for inclusion in the final NMD system. However, Bacon fails to mention that Boeing, which is now in charge of overall systems integration for the entire NMD project, designed the interceptor vehicle that has been the subject of the fraud allegations. Whether Boeing colluded with TRW's manipulation of test results or merely overlooked them, it doesn't bode well for its role as the principal monitoring agent for subcontractors. The fox is guarding the chicken coop: If Boeing is able to orchestrate a series of seemingly credible tests, it stands to make billions of dollars in production contracts for decades to come. This inherent conflict of interest at the heart of the NMD testing programs is one of the factors that have led missile defense experts at MIT and the Union of Concerned Scientists to call for the appointment of an independent panel to assess the feasibility of missile defense before the President makes a deployment decision.

Boeing is not the only company with an interest in helping the Pentagon put the best face on the NMD program. Lockheed Martin, whose ''legacy'' company, Lockheed Aircraft, was in charge of the 1984 Homing Overlay Experiment, which was later exposed as fraudulent, brags in a recent edition of its company newsletter, *Lockheed Martin Today*, that it produces the rockets used to propel both the mock warhead and the ''kill vehicle'' involved in NMD ''hit to kill'' tests. This is certainly a convenient setup if the company and the BMDO are thinking of stacking the deck on the next intercept test to insure a successful result.

Of the four largest NMD contractors (the others are Boeing, Raytheon and TRW), Lockheed Martin has the most to gain. If US/Russian arms-reduction talks are stymied by US stubbornness on NMD, Lockheed Martin will be able to sustain its key nuclear weapons programs. And if NMD deployment moves forward, Lockheed Martin will receive billions in additional funding for production of numerous components and subcomponents of the national missile defense system.

Given what's at stake, the companies have decided to leave nothing to chance. Since Republicans took control of both houses of Congress in January 1995, weapons industry PAC's have given twice as much to Republican Congressional candidates as they have to Democrats, a far higher margin than prevailed when the Democrats ruled Capitol Hill, when they receive about 55 percent of defense industry PAC funds, compared with 45 percent for Republicans. Hard-line Star Warriors have gotten the bulk of this industry largesse. A World Policy Institute analysis of two recent pro-Star Wars letters to President Clinton—one from twenty-five senators organized by Jesse Helms stating that they would kill any arms-control deal with the Russians that attempted to put any limits on the scope of future NMD deployments, the other from thirty-one Republican senators pushing the Center for Security Policy's pet project, a sea-based missile defense system-reveals that the signatories of these pro-Star Wars missives have received a total of nearly $2 million in PAC contributions from missile defense contractors in this election cycle.

Lockheed Martin has not neglected the presidential candidates. On the Republican side Lockheed Martin vice president Bruce Jackson, who served as chairman of the US Committee to Expand NATO, was overheard by one of the authors at an industry gathering last year bragging about how the industry's troubles will be over if George W. Bush is elected, since Jackson would be personally writing the defense plank of the Republican platform. And Loral CEO Bernard Schwartz, who has longstanding ties to Lockheed Martin dating from when Lockheed absorbed Loral's defense unit in 1996, was the top individual donor of soft money to the Democratic Party in the 1996 presidential cycle; Loral employees gave $601,000 to Democratic Party committees. Schwartz has nearly doubled that amount in the run-up to the November 2000 elections, with $1.1 million in soft-money contributions to Democratic committees to date. He was briefly in the spotlight last year when he was accused of lobbying the Clinton Administration to ease the standards for the export of satellite technology to China.

NMD AND BEYOND

The continued pursuit of NMD will have far-reaching consequences for the future of arms control and goal of nuclear abolition. It will mean a false sense of security for Americans and an increased threat of nuclear war for the world.

Instead of going down the road, the US government should focus its energy and resources on preventative measures. When Clinton meets with Putin on June 4, he could pledge to get US/Russian nuclear reductions back on track through steps that include seeking increased funding for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program—which has helped finance the destruction of thousands of Russian nuclear warhead and weapons facilities—and working toward continued reductions in US and Russian nuclear forces under START agreements. Clinton could also pledge to work for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was defeated last fall by the Senate despite overwhelming public support. Above all, Clinton could assure Russia that the United States has no intention of withdrawing from the ABM treaty. That would put Al Gore in a much stronger position to criticize George W. Bush's misleading proposal to pursue unilateral cuts in US nuclear forces in combination with an ambitious NMD plan that would usher in an era of instability by demolishing what's left of the global nuclear arms control regime.

The newly resurgent peace and arms-control movement, led by organizations like Peace Action, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Global Network Against Nuclear Weapons and Power in Space, and the Fourth Freedom Forum, is trying to generate a large-enough outcry for ''arms reductions, not missile defense'' over this summer to beat back missile defense hysteria. But stopping NMD is just one step toward a sane nuclear policy; ultimately only the abolition of all nuclear weapons can provide the safety and security that Reagan and his latter-day disciples have pledged to provide through the false promise of missile defense.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to vote on H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. Had I been in Washington, I would have voted yes. I regret that I was not able to vote on this very important bill to help reduce the enormous tax burden on the American public.

I was also unable to vote on the amendment to remove the prohibition on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) proposed ergonomics regulations. I would have voted to keep the prohibition.

TRIBUTE ON THE CELEBRATION OF JUNETEENTH

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 19th, thousands of African Americans in Galveston, Texas, the birthplace of Juneteenth, and around the Nation will celebrate this holiday of freedom and justice.

Juneteenth, as this holiday is known, is a celebration of emancipation from slavery. On June 19, 1865, 30 months after President Lincoln had signed the Emancipation Proclamation, General Gordon Granger, who had been placed in command of the Federal occupation troops, arrived at Galveston Bay. He issued General Order No. 3—Emancipation. This was the birth of Juneteenth in Texas. Juneteenth celebrations were held informally for 115 years.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Texas State Representative Al Edwards. In 1978, Mr. Edwards envisioned that blacks could have a formal celebration of emancipation from slavery. During his first year as a legislator he wrote and lobbied to get passed into law the bill making June 19th a legal State holiday. Overcoming numerous setbacks, Representative Edwards pushed the bill through successful votes of the Texas House of Representatives and Senate within the last 24 hours of Texas' 66th Legislative Session. At a memorable and historical ceremony on the grounds of the Texas State Capitol in Austin, hundreds of supporters witnessed the bill's signing into law by Governor William P. Clements on June 13, 1979. As a result of Representative Edwards' efforts, Texans now witness the ''New Celebration of Juneteenth,'' an official State holiday.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is a cherished word to all humanity, particularly to those in bondage. I challenge all of us to take this opportunity while we celebrate our rich history of freedom to rededicate ourselves to equal opportunity for all Americans, because that is at the heart of Juneteenth and the American ideal.

ROBERT P. CASEY: LIBERAL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the June 5, 2000 Washington Post contained an excellent column by Mark Shields concerning Robert P. Casey, entitled ''A Conservative in Name Only.''

The column points out the progressive nature of Bob Casey's reign as Governor of Pennsylvania from 1987–1995. During this time, Shields writes, Governor Casey enacted a Children's Health Insurance Program which mandated early intervention and coverage for every child until age 5, rebuilt the state water supply system, chose more women cabinet members than any other Governor at the time, appointed the nation's first African American woman to a state Supreme Court, and brought family and parental leave to the state.

So with this record, why is he considered a conservative? Because he happened to be strongly anti-abortion in a party that is strongly pro-choice. Thankfully, our party has come a long way since those days in terms of tolerance for other views on this and other issues, and therefore it should no longer be the case that one issue should entirely overwhelm a public official's lifetime public record.

Robert P. Casey was an effective public servant and improved the lives of thousands of families in his state. He is survived by his wife and children, and many, many of us who will think of him fondly, and with great respect for what he stood for.

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MARSHALL ''MARK'' SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4205) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a strong national defense, but in reluctant opposition to the FY 2001 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 4576). A strong defense is not simply a function of how much we spend, but also of how intelligently we spend it. Depending on who's counting, the United States spends as much on defense as the next six or seven highest countries combined. The 281 billion that the United States spent on defense in 1998 was more than all of our NATO allies combined and accounted for more than a third of all world military spending. Yet today, our military faces serious problems in training, recruiting, retention, and readiness.

One reason for this situation is the lack of a coherent national strategy. Our men and women in uniform have been dispatched across the globe in operations that are not in the national interest. This wears out our soldiers and equipment, and leaves the military less prepared to defend real national interests. The common lament I hear is that we are ''spreading ourselves too thin''. The lion's share of responsibility for this problem lies with the Administration.

But we're spreading ourselves too thin in the defense budget process as well, and responsibility for that falls on Congress. Congress continues to spend critical defense dollars on items that the Pentagon does not want or need.

For example:

1. F–15 aircraft—The Air Force requested no funds for additional F–15 aircraft, but the House passed $400 million for 5 addition F–15E's. The Air Force has difficulty getting spare parts for the planes it already has. Building more unrequested planes only aggravates that problem.

2. Cold Weather Equipment—Congress added $24 million for Gore-Tex cold weather gear that the Pentagon did not request, at the request of a Congressman whose constituents manufacture the gear. With the recruiting problems the military has, it has difficulty getting enough soldiers just to fill out the gear it already has.

3. Wolverine Heavy Assault Bridge—The Army requested no funds for the Wolverine heavy assault bridge. In fact, although the

Army received $82 million for the Wolverine for FY 2000, it did not intend to spend it on the bridge. H.R. 4576 commands the Army to spend the $82 million on the Wolverine, as well as an additional $15 million. In short, Congress is forcing the Army to spend $97 million on a bridge that it doesn't need.

4. Medical Research—The Administration requested $16.5 million for medical research in the defense bill. The Appropriations Committee reported out $252.2 million in H.R. 4576, including: $6 million for laser vision correction research, $3.7 million for nutrition research, $10 million for ovarian cancer research, $15 million for HIV research, $3 million for chronic fatigue research, and $7 million for alcoholism research.

Now, some of these programs may be valid, but they are non-defense items. We have a Labor/Health and Human Services Appropriations bill that is more suitable for these programs. Hiding these items within H.R. 4576 is unfair to our taxpayers.

In addition, H.R. 4576 skirted two important issues with profound budget and readiness implications:

Base Realignment and Closure Commission—H.R. 4576 does not include funding for two new BRAC rounds, despite the fact that the Pentagon has estimated it has an excess base capacity of 23%. CBO estimates that two new BRAC rounds would save the Defense Department $4.7 billion by 2010, and that after completion in 2012, DOD could realize recurring savings of about $4 billion per year. Congress' inaction means that the Pentagon must continue to waste billions of taxpayer dollars maintaining obsolete bases.

Aircraft—H.R. 4576 includes billions for research, development and procurement of three different fighter planes (the Navy's F–18 E/F, The Air Force F–22, and the Navy & Air Force Joint Strike Fighter) when there is not a strong consensus that all three fighters are necessary. Some defense experts say the military needs the F–18 & F–22. Some say it needs the JSF instead. Congress' answer is simply to fund all of the fighter planes in question. Now, Congress is forging ahead with funding the production of 10 F–22 Aircraft when there are indications that the program is not ready for production. In doing so, Congress takes away from aircraft (specifically bombers and unmanned aerial aircraft [UAVs]) that, while less glamorous, are a more pressing need for the military.

I agree that the Congress should fund a military that is second to none. And H.R. 4576 does include several important items I support, like funding for domestic terrorism response, more decent enlisted pay, and missile defense. But it is also weighed down with too many items that are unnecessary for, and in fact, counterproductive to, our national defense. Therefore, I reluctantly oppose the bill.

HONORING STEPHEN CHEN OF THE TAIWAN ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE [TECRO]

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I express our deepest appreciation to Representative Stephen Chen of the Taiwan Economic and Cultural Representative Office [TECRO] for his service as his country's senior diplomat here in Washington since 1997. Stephen has served the people of Taiwan with distinction for over 47 years as a member of Taiwan's diplomatic corps. He has served abroad in the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia and as Vice Foreign Minister and Deputy Secretary General to President Lee in Taiwan. Stephen has been a staunch supporter of bilateral relations between the United States and Taiwan and has earned the respect and friendship of many Members of Congress. I invite my colleagues to join in wishing Stephen and his family best wishes on the occasion of his return to Taiwan and his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELICA MILTON

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to honor Angelica Milton of Folkston, GA. Anglica was named a National Award Winner for honor roll. This prestigious award is offered to fewer than 10% of American high school students. Angelica was selected by her teachers and school staff members for her excellent academic performance, interest and aptitude, leadership qualities, responsibility, enthusiasm, motivation to learn and improve, citizenship, attitude and cooperative spirit, and dependability.

Angelica is an exceptional young lady, who exemplifies the qualities of a true leader, and I am proud to recognize her as an outstanding citizen of my district.

RECOGNIZING THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION AND POSTAL SERVICE EFFORTS IN PROMOTING CONSUMER AWARENESS OF UNSAFE PRODUCTS

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, defective products can have devastating effects on American lives. One of the strongest safeguards we have in protecting the safety and health of our citizens is the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The CPSC is working with manufacturers and retailers to keep harmful or dangerous products off of store shelves and away from Americans.

The U.S. Postal Service has made an innovative attempt at remedying this problem by giving defective products more exposure in its offices. Over 33,000 post offices nationwide are displaying posters containing color pictures of products recalled by the CPSC. Since almost 7 million people visit those post offices everyday to mail letters and ship packages, this should be highly effective in disseminating to consumers the names of those products that have been recalled by the CPSC.

I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial that recently appeared in the Ft. Lauderdale Sun Sentinel regarding this issue. I applaud the CPSC and the Postal Service for their initiative in protecting the public.

[From the Sun-Sentinel, Apr. 24, 2000]

PRODUCT RECALLS—POSTERS IN POST OFFICES WILL HELP

The U.S. Postal Service, which for years has been helping to get defective people off the streets by displaying the FBI's ''most wanted'' list, now wants to do the same with defective products.

Posters containing color pictures of products recalled by the Consumer Product Safety Commission are going up in 33,000 post offices nationwide. Every day, about 7 million people will visit those post offices to mail letters and ship packages. Now they'll be able to get potentially life-saving information while they're there.

''We can get dangerous products off store shelves, but the real challenge is to get them out of families' homes,'' commission Chairwoman Ann Brown said.

That's the crux of it. As more and more products are recalled, a smaller and smaller percentage of them rate a mention in news reports. For the rest, it's left to consumers to determine whether products they own have been recalled. That's a bad system, and as the Sun-Sentinel reported in its product recall series last year, several proposals have been put forth to fix it.

Ralph Nader, for example, has suggested using computers to notify consumers immediately if products they own have been recalled. Others want to repeal or modify section 6b of the Consumer Product Safety Act, which requires that recalls be kept secret until the companies involved can review the information, a process that can take years.

Those are good ideas, but unless and until they are implemented, displaying posters in post offices will help. It's another way in which the post office can serve as ''the one hand that binds this nation together,'' as one postal official put it.

And hey, if you see any wanted criminals on your way to return a defective product, call the police and tell them you want to report a defective person.

NATIVE NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND POLICY ACT OF 2000

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to establish the Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management, and Policy (NNI). I am

pleased to be joined by the Chairman of the Resources Committee Mr. Young and a number of our colleagues.

The Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management and Policy will provide an essential and comprehensive training program for American Indian leaders so that present and future generations of tribal leaders will have access to necessary management and policy decision making skills.

The Native Nations Institute will be based at the University of Arizona and be under the leadership and guidance of the Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy. The Udall Center will take on primary responsibility for the implementation of NNI's programs while the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation (established by Public Law 102–259) will approve NNI's annual budget and manage any federal appropriations. The governing committee of NNI will be comprised of individuals from the Morris K. Udall Foundation, the Udall Center, representatives from Indian Nations, and representatives from other academic groups directly involved in NNI's projects.

The Native Nations Institute will empower Native American leaders by providing a comprehensive program that focuses on (1) leadership and management training and (2) policy analysis. The leadership and management training program has six components that will (a) provide for the current educational needs of the senior leaders and managers of Indian Nations, (b) provide a distance learning program that reaches a broad reservation audience, and (c) provide a Master's degree in Public Administration focused on tribal governance and designed for mid-career individuals and students who are seeking careers in tribal government. In addition, the leadership and management program will (d) create an alliance with tribal colleges that provide curricular materials, program cooperation, and assistance in meeting the educational needs of Indian reservations, (e) provide a nine month Washington DC internship program focusing on federal government, and (f) create a curriculum development program designed for NNI and for other educational institutions working in Indian country All of the components in the leadership and management program will share a common focus—they will enable skills such as nation-building, strategic planning and policy making, administration and management, and external relations to be developed and strengthened. As policy makers ourselves, we can do no greater service to Indian tribes than to provide them with opportunities to help strengthen their governments.

Policy analysis, the second program at the NNI, will address contemporary issues facing tribal governments including economic development, solving intricate social problems, interacting with other governments, and managing natural resources. NNI will perform policy research grounded in Indian country to address these issues and will use this research in the leadership and management training program by providing data, case studies, and analysis for the program's students.

By providing indigenous people customized educational experiences in policy and management, we will continue to move toward the policy goal of self-determination for Indian tribes. I urge my colleagues to recognize and to continue to fulfill our obligation to Indian Nations by supporting the Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management, and Policy Act of 2000.

HONORING AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSIC AND KANSAS CITY JAZZ

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the House gave unanimous support to House Resolution 509 offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania's 2nd district, Representative CHAKA FATTAH. This resolution recognizes the importance of the United States to study, reflect on, and celebrate African American music. Artists have used and continue to use the African American experience as an important source of inspiration for various musical genres including jazz, gospel, blues, rhythm and blues, rap, and hip-hop. It is especially important to recognize this in June, which President Clinton designated three years ago as African American Music Month. In 1997, the President noted that ". . . America's musical heritage music is the voice that proclaims who we are as a people, then African Americans have helped to give this voice its content, its tone, its volume, and its power. . . . This music continues to grow and change, continuously adding depth and richness to America's cultural heritage."

African American music, more specifically jazz, has played an important role in the cultural development of Missouri's Fifth District. In the 1920's and 1930's, Kansas City was the birthplace of swing and a major center in the maturation of bebop style jazz. Several jazz greats including Charlie "Bird" Parker, Count Basie, Big Joe Turner, and Jay McShann have called Kansas City their home, and their legacy is alive and well in the community today.

To recognize Kansas City's role in jazz history and to further the appreciation of the art form, Kansas City has revitalized the district where jazz once played non-stop through the night. In 1997, the American Jazz Museum opened at the historic 18th and Vine address immortalized in Lieber and Stoller's song "Kansas City." This 50,000-square-foot complex features interactive exhibits and sound samples chronicling the music and the musicians who made jazz great. Dedicated to the unknown African Americans who fought for self-sufficiency, the American Jazz Museum also remembers the plight of Africans in America from slavery to freedom. The Parker Memorial adjacent to the museum is a 17-foot sculpture of Charlie Parker in honor of his vast contributions to American culture. More than 350,000 visitors from the inner city, suburbs, and around the country experienced the museum last year alone.

Kansas City showcases African American music through its annual Blues and Jazz festival which takes place near the historic WWI Liberty Memorial. More than 50,000 people come from all parts of the city and the region to enjoy some of the best music America has to offer.

This resolution also comes in conjunction with the Jazz Conference sponsored by BET on Jazz and Billboard Magazine June 7–9 in Washington, DC to discuss new strategies for taking jazz into the new millennium. I hope many of my distinguished colleagues join me at this historic event to study the past and anticipate the future of jazz.

By recognizing the influence and importance of African American music, we have called on Americans to learn the history of blues, jazz, and other genres. Hopefully, other cities will follow Kansas City's lead to promote and study the musicians and their music. Mr. Speaker, please join me in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania and supporting adoption of this historic resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was home in my district this Tuesday, June 6, to vote and participate in my state's primary election. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 234, 235, 236, and 237.

EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the House Education and the Workforce Committee conducted an oversight field hearing last Monday in the State of Minnesota.

Among the most informative presentations made before the member participants was one delivered by Mr. John H. Scribante, a Minnesota businessman and honorable American.

Mr. Scribante's passion for children and their need for first-rate learning opportunity was most impressive and we hereby submit for the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Scribante regarding the important topic of school reform.

Mr. Speaker, we commend the excellent observations and conclusions made by Mr. Scribante to our colleagues.

EDUCATIONAL FASCISM IN MINNESOTA

(A statement submitted by John H. Scribante—Entrepreneur)

(Respectfully submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Committee on Education and the Workforce, June 6, 2000)

STATEMENT

We're gathered here this morning at a very interesting time . . . 56 years ago today, D-Day, 2,500 Allied soldiers died in Normandy fighting Fascist Germany for the freedom for Americans to pursue liberty. This offers us a unique perspective on this monumental issue of educational change. We're poised at the

beginning of the 21st century, and while the rest of the world is abandoning central labor planning, Minnesota is driving through School-to-Work programs for central control of its economy against the will of the people.

Consider that in just over 200 years, this country became the Greatest Nation on Earth. We've had more Nobel Prize recipients than any other industrialized nation. We've sent men into outer space and brought them back alive; we've pioneered open-heart surgery, and our science and technologies are copied worldwide. Those who accomplished these incredible feats were the product of an education system that emphasized academics, not life-long job training.

I've been to Eastern Europe, 'I've seen the life destroying results of governments trying to plan the economy and control education, and I've spoken to people who have been subject to their central controls. This is not what America was founded on . . . and besides; it has been proven not to work. Those of you who have sworn to uphold the United States Constitution will be hard pressed to support such a system of tyranny.

Today in Minnesota, the best interests of children have become secondary to the interests of bureaucrats, un-elected non-profits, and economic forecasts. In many districts, children are already being required to choose a ''career cluster'' by the end of the 8th grade that will determine their secondary school curriculum. The system is a radical shift towards government central planning.

The world is open-ended. We don't know what we will learn tomorrow. We can be sure that at any particular time, we are overlooking valuable information and opportunities. Our knowledge is incomplete and resources are, undoubtedly being misdirected. However, we have a 225-year proven method for discovering and correcting these errors called Capitalism. Entrepreneurs search out instances where resources are being underutilized and redirect them to those that produce profits . . . nothing else approaches its power to stimulate discovery. The application of this principal in education should be obvious. Since we don't know today what we may learn tomorrow about educational methods and knowledge, we need entrepreneurship in education. Government is not equipped for the task.

History has proven, time and time again, that where competition does not exist, mediocrity ensues. Nowhere is this truer than in many of America's public schools.

If you must have government-funded education, at least leave the private schools and home schools alone to compete for ideas and innovation.

BUSINESSES HAVE BEEN DUPED

Businessmen and women are being told that they can and should become partners in the education of our children. With tax funded incentives, subsidies, reimbursements, and free training . . . how can these businesses resist?

According to the Minnesota School to Work publication called Making Connections, page 11: the SCANS report instructs business to ''look outside your company and change your view of your responsibilities for human resource development. Your old responsibilities were to select the best available applicants and to retain those you hired. Your new responsibilities must be to improve the way you organize work and to develop the human resources in your community, your firm, and your nation.''

The Minnesota STW program seeks 100% employer compliance and further provides a ''Work-Based Learning Coordinator'' to ''help'' me in my ''responsibilities'' of complying with this lunacy. Who is running my business anyway? I've got all the capital at risk . . . Just leave me out of this mess.

This experiment may be very attractive in the short run . . . but business will pay in the long run in higher taxes to fund these programs, in less educated people and a loss of economic freedom. Productive labor is their goal, not an educated populace. This will be the end of a free America.

My company needs entrepreneurial minds and intellectual capital. People who can think, read, write, and add. I interview many young people who are products of Minnesota schools, and they cannot solve simple conversion equations. Who is training students for what I need? What is wrong with teaching people how to think? I don't need work skills . . . I need people who can think of great ideas and be willing to put their knowledge to the test!

Why is it that government vigilantly looks for predatory pricing, anticompetitive, and monopolistic behavior in the private sector, and yet it is the greatest offender?

To quote Ralph Moore ''The REAL credit in life should go to those who get into the ARENA—if they fail, they at least fail while DARING TO BE GREAT. Their place in life will never be with those COLD AND TIMID SOULS who know neither victory nor defeat.''

In a free market economy, consumers ultimately determine what is produced. What school or government bureaucrat could have predicted ten years ago how many webmasters we would need today? From the information I've seen from the Department of Labor's SCANS reports, they're planning on teaching manure spreading, car washing, working the fryer at the diner and how to take a message off an answering machine.

In St. Cloud, MN, the STW program has already put a company out of business and severed off the arm of a 17-year-old student running a machine on a STW assignment.

School-to-work is a dangerous shift in education policy in America. It moves public education's mission from the transfer of academic knowledge to simply training children for specific jobs. And most tragically, the job for which it will train will have little or nothing to do with that child's dreams, goals, or ambitions.

Parents, however, in this three way partnership with business and the State may be troubled knowing that their children are the pawns that the educational system trains to meet the needs of industry.

The economic goals of education should never be promoted over the virtue and importance of knowledge itself. School to work transition issues would disappear if schools focused on strengthening core curricula, setting high expectations, and improving discipline and forgetting about retrying failed ideas.

THE RESULT

The sad truth is, in exchange for federal chump change, the state of Minnesota sold out it's commitment to high academic standards and agreed to follow national standards based on moral relativism, politically correct group thinking, and getting kids out of the classroom to work in local businesses, beginning in kindergarten.

Our state threw out a system of education that worked brilliantly for most all Minnesota youngsters. It worked brilliantly, that is, until approximately 35 years ago when Minnesota public education started flirting with the progressive, trendy movement away from high academic standards. Under the Profile of Learning, high academic standards are practically banned from the classroom.

In 1993, the Minnesota legislature repealed 230 education statutes, thus creating a structural vacuum to make way for the new federal Goals 2000 system already in the works. This left Minnesota without tried and true standards.

There are no longer any course requirements for any child in Minnesota. No 4 years of English, no 4 years of history, no 3 years of math, or a year of geography, or years of science. Most public schools don't have a copy of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution and few even mention them in classes.

This system is really nothing new. Tyranny has always waited in the wings, ready to step to center stage at the first hint of apathy towards freedom.

For over 230 years we've enjoyed the finest freedom and prosperity the world has ever known. Yet we were warned by Edmund Burke that, ''The eternal price of liberty is vigilance.'' As a people we've been asleep at the switch, and now our entire nation, not just Minnesota, has signed on to this crazy new system of totalitarianism, where everyone is under government's control, from cradle to grave.

This system has been tried around the world, across the centuries. But it is radically new for those of us used to freedom. This new system has more to do with fascism than freedom.

Now we need to work to eliminate the entire STW & Goals 2000 system, while there is time. As Sir Winston Churchill wrote to convince the British to join in the fight against Nazi Germany: ''If you will not fight for the right—when you can easily win without bloodshed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure—and not too costly, you may come to the moment when you will have to fight—with all the odds against you—and only a precarious chance of survival. There may be even a worst case. You may have to fight—when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.''

CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN TAIWAN: INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI-BIEN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the peaceful and democratic transition of executive power in the Republic of China on Taiwan. On May 20, 2000, the presidential inauguration of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) leader Chen Shui-Bien marked the culmination of decades of political, social, and economic reform. Chen's ascent to power—the first President not a member of the long dominant Kuomintang (KMT) party—is only the latest illustration of the democratic culture that characterizes Taiwan in the twenty-first century.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Taiwan reflects the principles envisioned by Dr. Sun Yat-sen when he led the successful movement to overthrow the Chinese emperor and the undemocratic imperial system nearly ninety years ago. While

the times after Dr. Sun's victory initially were tumultuous—civil wars, World War II, the establishment of the People's Republic of China, and the establishment of the Republic of China on Taiwan—they strengthened the Taiwanese people and forced them to overcome obstacles that stood in the way of their freedom and prosperity. By the 1970's, Taiwan had become a thriving marketplace of industry, ideas, and culture. It exported products to all corners of the globe and won the respect of the largest and most vibrant free market economies.

In recent years, economic justice has been mirrored by the flourishing of social justice, human rights, and democracy. During the 1980's Taiwan's leaders lifted restrictions on freedom of expression and freedom of the press. As these constraints were eased, the openness of political debate grew exponentially. Competitive local and regional elections were first held in 1980, followed by the development of opposition parties and Taiwan's first competitive presidential election in 1996. The victor of that campaign, President Lee Teng-hui, received a mandate to continue his principled efforts to liberalize Taiwanese society.

Mr. Speaker, these progressive reforms seem likely to thrive under the leadership of President Chen Shui-Bien. The son of a farm laborer, he excelled in his studies and became a prominent defense attorney. During the early 1980's, Chen began providing legal assistance to opposition leaders, and this eventually led him to enter politics in a more active capacity. This was not a simple calling during the pre-reform years. Chen, the editor of a dissident magazine, Formosa, served time in jail on a trumped up libel charge brought by a government politician. He persisted, however, and he eventually served as a DPP member in the Legislative Yuan and later as the mayor of the capital city of Taipei. His success in the latter role prompted Time Magazine to name him as one of the 100 most promising young leaders of the 21st century.

President Chen's inaugural address offered more evidence of his commitment to freedom and political openness. He proclaimed his devotion to human rights with a passion that demands respect: "We are also willing to promise a more active contribution in safeguarding international human rights. The Republic of China cannot and will not remain outside global human rights trends. We will abide by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention for Civil and Political Rights, and the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action. We will bring the Republic of China back into the international human rights system. . . .We hope to set up an independent national human rights commission in Taiwan, thereby realizing an action long advocated by the United Nations. We will also invite two outstanding non-governmental organizations, the International Commission of Jurists and Amnesty International, to assist us in our measures to protect human rights and make the Republic of China into a new indicator for human rights in the 21st Century."

Mr. Speaker, as the founder and co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I applaud President Chen's determination to stand up for justice and civil liberties.

I am also confident, Mr. Speaker, that Taiwan under the leadership of President Chen Shui-Bien will continue to work for peace with the Mainland in the years to come. Chen has pledged to continue negotiations with China and increase economic and social cooperation across the Taiwan Straits. He realizes that understanding—not violence and conflict—offers the promise of ending the tension between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China. As Chen explained to an Asian Wall Street Journal reporter last April, "Pursuing lasting peace in the region is not only our highest goal, it is also the moral responsibility of the leadership."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in offering wholehearted congratulations to President Chen and Vice President Annette Lu on their inaugurations, and in commending the people of Taiwan for their commitment to peace, democracy, and human rights.

FAREWELL TO PAGES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages who have served so diligently in the House of Representatives during the 106th Congress.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the House of Representatives operate. This group of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is good about our country. To become a page, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience, they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends, and learned the details of how our Government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. At the same time, they face challenging academic schedule of classes in the House Page School. I am sure they will consider their time spent in Washington, D.C. to be one of the most valuable and exciting experiences of their lives, and that with this experience they will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, as the Democratic Member on the House Page Board, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. They certainly will be missed:

2000 SPRING SEMESTER PAGES ADDRESS/PHONE NUMBER/E-MAIL ADDRESS

Max Abbott, 464 Heritage Drive, Lewisville, NC 27023, (336) 945–4645.

Dominic Adams, 3905 Maryland, Gary, IN 46408, (219) 884–2095.

Sarah Baca, 103 Colonial Avenue, Evanston, WY 82930, (307) 789–7256, sarahbee—@hotmail.

Tom Bazan, 241 Elemeda, Holland, MI 49424, (616) 397–7061, zeut@macatawa.org.

Christopher Bower, 44 Bcardslee Hill Drive, Ogdensburg, NJ 07439, (973) 827–9125, bower55@hotmail.com.

Brown, Geoff, 419 Grove Street, Elmira, NY 14905, (607) 732–9037, octavician@yahoo.com.

Lorena Brunder, 2024 Coast Guard Drive, Stafford, VA 22554, (540) 720–5705.

Michael Buck, 120 Charles I. Boyle Rd., Queen Anne, MD 21657, (410) 758–3426, miked81482@aol.com.

Eric Cercone, 59 Penwood Drive, Cheektowaga, NY 14227, (716) 656–0465, ericcercone@hotmail.com.

Adam Cheatham, 9304 Hallston Court, Fairfax Station, VA 22039, (703) 690–9753, AQC1983@aol.com.

Christopher Clark, R.R. #1, Box 137, Kirkwood, IL 61447, (309) 627–2108, clarky2001@aol.com.

David Cook, 31390 Sunnyside Road, California, MO 65018, (573) 796–4555, biadave70@yahoo.com.

Andrew D'Anna, 1800 Woodspoint Cove, Jonesboro, AR 72401, (870) 935–4449, apd82@hotmail.com.

Ashley Daugherty, P.O. Box 806, Coloma, MI 49038, (616) 468–9618, sunflower436@hotmail.com.

Katherine B. Fortune, 4649 North Wilson Avenue, Fresno, CA 93704, (559) 227–4924.

Ashley Foster, 303 Iroquois, Waxachie, TX 75165, (976) 938–8154, ASHGr101@aol.com.

Kara Frank, 53 Seneca Street, Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522, (914) 693–6332.

Amy Gaddis, 1895 Montana Way, Green River, WY 82935, (307) 875–6046.

Adam Gellman, 1810 Nobel Drive, Golden Valley, MN 55422, (612) 522–7827, Adam782@aol.com.

Dana Hall, 11442 Vale Spring Drive, Oakton, VA 22104, (703) 620–4085, danamarie24@hotmail.com.

Kristopher Hart, 1210 Malinda Road, Oreland, PA 19075, (215) 886–6832, KDHart 2020@aol.com.

Laura Heaton, 1162 SE Main Street, Roseburg, OR 97470, (541) 673–3720, ladybuglaurah@hotmail.com.

Androni Henry, 148 Boltwood Drive NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49505, (616) 365–1855, major_henry@hotmail.com.

Rebecca Hoffman, 36 Old Grandview Avenue, Dallas, PA 18612, (570) 674–9799, HX564@Hotmail.com.

William Hooper, 1011 Yancey Drive, White House, TN 37188, (615) 672–4805.

Jay Kanterman, 1748 Stifel Lane Drive, Town and Country, MO 63017, (314) 453–0072.

Susanna Khalil, 13433 Andy Street, Cerritos, CA 90703, (562) 860–5341, ShaAya2@aol.com.

James Kelley, 2111 Timeless Drive, St. Leonard, MD 20685, (410) 586–2739, James_B_Kelley@hotmail.com.

Stevens T. Kelly, 2635 Whitney, Ft. Gratiot, MI, (810) 385–4809.

Julia Koplewski, 4316 Conifer Court, Glen Arm, MD 21057, (410) 665–6686, jkoplewski@hotmail.com.

David Kroontje, 5844 Sand Road, Bellingham, WA 98226, (360) 592–2660.

Adam Kwasman, 7268 N. Cathedral Rock Rd, Tucson, AZ 85718, (520) 299–7890, ack@worldnet.att.net.

Ray LaHoud, 1134 Washington Street, Easton, PA 18042, (610) 252–8220, raylahoud@politician.com.

Andrew Lerch, 204 East Captil Street, NE, Washington, DC 20003–1036, (202) 544–6551, agl@vbe.com.

Amy Leung, 31772 Nardelli Lane, Roseville, MI 48066, (810) 296–3106, ALPAGE82@hotmail.com.

Bradford Lyman, 31792 Paseo Terraza, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675, (949) 661–2835.

Alison Lowery, 3200 N. Vermont Street, Arlington, VA 22207, (703) 538–2015.

Renee Mack, 315 Manzanita Ave, Ventura, CA 93001, (805) 653–0141.

Jeff Mannion, 108 Roland Road, E. Fallowfield, PA 19320, (610) 486–6571, jblase611@aol.com.

Megan Marshburn, 1304 Smyrna Court, Virginia Beach, VA 23464, (757) 495–0040, magan14@mailcity.com.

Marcella Martinez, 713 DelMar Drive, Twin Falls, ID 83301, (208) 734–5586.

Lindsay Moon, 112 Basswood Drive, Aiken, SC 29803, (803) 649–4484, moonie56@yahoo.com.

Clint Morris, 2510 Knolltop Lane, Henderson, KY 42420, (270) 826–9730, clinton_morris@hotmail.com.

Nancy Nicolas, 2836 W. 23rd Street, Apt. 12J, Brooklyn, NY 11224, (718) 373–8859.

Casey Osterkemp, 448 Cardinal Hill Lane, Powell, OH 43065, (614) 846–7464, CaseyOster@aol.com.

Parker Payne, 104 Dogwood Lane; Levelland, TX 79336, (806) 894–3765, ParkZ716aol.com.

Ashley Percy, 2331 E. Burt Road, Camden, MI 49232, (517) 254–4673, ashley_percy@hotmail.com.

Christopher Perr, 711 Cloverleaf Court, Mansfield, OH 44909, (419) 756–9761, mi6pilote@aol.com.

Jessica Porras, 12702 Royal Oaks Court, Yucaipa, CA 92399, (909) 795–8550, JJmarie@aol.com.

Tessa Powell, 95 Bryant Street, Williamsburg, KY 40769, (606) 539–9284, TxLi@cheerful.com.

Lindsey Ransdell, 13104 Trump Avenue, Louisville, KY 40299, (502) 261–0722, lindseyransdell@hotmail.com.

Jennifer Reed, 6107 Turtle Pointe Drive, Hixson, TN 37343, (423) 843–0700, je824@aol.com.

Moriah Reed, P.O. Box 450 (700 Maple), Harrisburg, SD 57032, (605) 767–5114.

A.J. Rosenfeld, 2145 Old Glenview Road, Wilmette, IL 60091, (847) 256–5682, kspirit5@aol.com.

Chase Rowan, 10209 S. River Tr., Knoxville, TN 37922, (865) 675–6409, c.rowan@usa.net.

Danielle Ruse, 1020 SE 5th Street, Ocala, FL 34471, (352) 732–3773, anjiiphish@aol.com.

David Schweinfurth, 9022 Queen Maria Court, Columbia, MD 21045, (410) 884–1772, Farero18@aol.com.

Megan Smith, 133 West 39th Ave, Spokane, WA 99203, (509) 747–4042, lakemegan@aol.com.

Nouvelle L. Stubbs, 1274 County Club Drive, Akron, OH 44313, (330) 873–1715.

Samuel Sinkin, 254 E. Summit, San Antonio. TX 78212, (210) 737–3111, N540@aol.com.

Erin Sweeney, 22 Panorama Drive, Sussex, NJ 07461, (973) 875–9622, leo20august@yahoo.com.

Christine Tancinco, 9746 Refugio Court, House, TX 77064, (281) 807–3419, chrsinet@aol.com.

Anika Tank, 3835 N. 9th St. Apt 510 W, Arlington, VA 22203, jacqueanik@aol.com.

Margaret Theobald, 5 Countryside Court, Richmond, VA23229. (804) 288–2770), MagieMae16@aol.com.

Lindsay Thomson, 1043 Curtis Drive, Norco, CA 92860, (909) 270–1137, linza714@yahoo.com.

Amber Walker, 807 N. Springfield Street, Berryville, AR 72616, (870) 423–4085, amberwalker@hotmail.com.

Lauren Weeth, 9412 Farragut Drive N.E., Alburquerque NM 87111, (505) 823–9859, UNIKITA@hotmail,com.

Julie Wise, P.O. Box 444, Knox, PA 16232, (814) 797–1674, jools160@hotmail.com.

Jessica Wood, 2681 10½ Mile Road, Sanford, MI 48657–9768, (517) 465–6496, Athena2234@aol.com.

TRIBUTE TO EVELYN BANKS NEELY ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished American and proud Californian, Evelyn Banks Neely, on the occasion of her retirement as director of the Income Maintenance Division of the County of San Mateo, CA, Human Services Agency.

Evelyn Banks Neely has served San Mateo County honorably and with distinction for more than 32 years. She has been instrumental in developing and implementing innovative social services, programs, including the homeless General Assistance Program, the Greater Avenues for Independence [GAIN] Program, and the SUCCESS Program, which she piloted in Redwood City. She successfully negotiated San Mateo County's first In-Home Supportive Services contract and has served with distinction as the past president of the County Administrators' Association and the San Mateo County Women in Management organization.

Evelyn Banks Neely has provided great leadership in forming Black Women in County Government, co-chairing the development of a symposium highlighting issues and strategies for preserving black families and serving as a member of the first Affirmative Action Advisory Committee in San Mateo County.

Evelyn Banks Neely has dedicated her leadership skills to many volunteer activities, including serving as past president of Delta Sigma Theta, serving as past president of Links, Inc., a volunteer service organization, serving as fundraising co-chair to provide scholastic benefits to high school graduates, and she has maintained active membership in the National Association of Black Social Workers.

Evelyn Banks Neely's accomplishments have been previously honored by the California State Senate, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame, and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

Evelyn Banks Neely has earned the respect, admiration, and dedication of the hundreds of Human Services staff who have served with her during her progressively responsible leadership positions with the County of San Mateo.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Evelyn Banks Neely for her more than 32 years of exemplary service to the people of County of San Mateo, the State of California and our Nation. Her life of leadership and community involvement is instructive to us all. Her dedication to the ideals of democracy and public service stand tall and it is fitting that she is being honored on the occasion of her retirement. Therefore I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in honoring a great and good woman and someone I'm privileged to call my friend and colleague. We are indeed a better county, a better country, and a better people because of Evelyn Banks Neely.

THE DEDICATION OF THE JOHN D. ONG LIBRARY

HON. TOM SAWYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 10, Western Reserve Academy in Hudson, OH, will dedicate a new building, the John D. Ong Library. I am pleased to note, that it is not a memorial service, but one of celebration. For John Ong, when he is not tending to his Pennsylvania farm, continues to contribute his time, wisdom, and service to our community and to our Nation.

John Ong has described himself as "the World's Most Flexible Man." But that flexibility does not mean inconsistency. Since his college days, John Ong has recognized that a knowledge of history and the humanities is essential for well-rounded citizenship. So, while John embraces change, he values the principles that guide and strengthen our Nation. He understands that committed corporate activism strengthen communities as much as it does corporate ledgers and the national economy. He is a reminder of the good things that come about when businesses and their leaders see themselves as part of the community rather than as self-interested, self-contained entities.

John Ong's career in business is a well documented story of accomplishment and service. A graduate of the Ohio State University and the Harvard Law School, John spent 36 years at the BFGoodrich Company, rising from assistant counsel in 1961 to chairman and CEO from 1979 to 1997. At a time when the tire and rubber industry was buffeted by global change, John Ong demonstrated remarkable vision and leadership as he guided and transformed his company from a tire manufacturer into a leading provider of aircraft systems and specialty chemicals.

Today, as chairman emeritus, John has not rested on his laurels, but looks to the future, most notably through his work with New American Schools, a non-profit corporation dedicated to raising student achievement through comprehensive school reform.

That devotion to the highest values in education also abides in his long relationship with Western Reserve Academy, one of the Nation's oldest and most respected independent schools. The school, like John Ong, reveres and respects the past, while keeping pace with educational innovation. Both John Ong and Western Reserve Academy are committed to excellence and high personal standards.

The founders of Western Reserve Academy hoped to create "the best institution for learning in the world." John Ong has done his part to make that vision a reality. John's service to the academy includes 20 years as a board member and 18 years as board president, directing renovations and chairing capital campaigns. During his tenure as president the school's endowment more than tripled.

For all of his business and civic good works, I think it is especially appropriate to honor John Ong by affixing his name to a library. Libraries preserve the past, the record of our Nation, the fundamentals of our culture and our society. Libraries enable us to share ideas over time and distance with great minds from the past and the present.

Most important, libraries are concrete manifestations of a commitment to our fellow citizens, to learn from the past and to look to the future. We cannot know where we are going as individuals, communities, or as a nation, if we do not first know where we have been.

Libraries today face growing challenges as they continue their honored role as guardians of free speech and inquiry, and as providers of information. The new John Ong Library at Western Reserve Academy answers that challenge—built with an appreciation of the past, but incorporating the digital technology that is daily challenging and changing how we gather and manage information.

No name could be more appropriate for such a library than that of John Ong.

Mr. Speaker, John's own words drawn from a commencement address he delivered at the Ohio State University a few years ago serve well on an occasion like this. Towards the end of his speech, he echoed the timeless words of an earlier age: "My message is . . . ask not what your rights and freedoms are in society, ask rather what duties and obligations you have toward society. Focus not on your rights but on your responsibilities. As graduates of a great university you will have plenty of opportunities for rewarding and fulfilling careers. As you pursue those careers, however, please keep in mind the larger social context in which you will be operating."

Mr. Speaker, John Ong not only spoke those words, he has lived them. His leadership has extended across the nation, but his legacy endures at home. I am proud to call him a friend, and I can think of no more fitting tribute to him than a library, dedicated to learning, dedicated to the community, and grounded in the past but dedicated to the future.

GASTONIA, AN ALL AMERICAN CITY

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Gastonia, North Carolina for being named one of 10 All American Cities.

Gastonia has a unique history, but it won the award because it has some great plans to fight illiteracy, enhance the arts, and provide a safe environment for our kids.

The West Gastonia Boys and Girls Club has created a great mentoring program. College students mentor high school students who then mentor younger kids.

To help the arts, St. Stephen's AME Zion Church has teamed up with the United Arts Council to move into a Historic Baptist church. The church hosts shows and—on Sundays—St. Stephen's holds services.

And, Gastonia has done great things to fight illiteracy. No one demonstrates the impact of the Gaston Literacy Council better than Gary Avery, who says: "Now I can read the Bible at church, I can read with my children and I can even write my wife a love letter."

There is no doubt that Gastonia is a city of hard workers. Now Gastonia has proven to the country that no problem is too big, as long as we work together.

I commend Mayor Jennie Stutz for her pledge to create "City Pride."

As the All-American City logo is placed around town, everyone will know: Gastonia can be proud of its past, but its greatest days are ahead.

HONORING REVEREND RUTH SMITH OF ADDISON, MICHIGAN

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let it be known, that it is with great respect for the outstanding contribution of love, caring and message, that members of Congress join with her many friends and family in honoring the Reverend Ruth Smith. Ruth Smith have served for twenty years as an active minister and approaching twenty years as a retired minister of the East Liberty Church Universalist-Unitarian.

Ruth and Donald Smith have been community leaders. In addition to their church, they have made significant contributions to education through their involvement with Addison Public Schools. Ruth and Donald have contributed time and effort to improve their community, their state, and their country. They have raised four wonderful children and have seven grandchildren.

Reverend Ruth Smith's knowledge, experience and dedication to the church as well as her understanding of humanism and its abiding worth has helped and guided many.

This tribute is made to Ruth for demonstrating her success and caring in helping others along their life's journeys. Ruth Smith's leadership in improving the church in such ways as renovation, being a catalyst for harmony, and developing successful church groups such as the Kupples Klub and an active youth group is recognized.

Therefore, we are proud to join with her many admirers in extending highest praise and congratulations to Ruth Smith for her dedication and devotion to her family, her community and her forty years of association with the Universalist-Unitarian Church of East Liberty. This honor is also a testament to the family members, friends, and others whose personal interest, strong support and active participation contributed to her success. To this remarkable woman, we extend our most heartfelt good wishes for all her future endeavors.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2000

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 4444, a bill to extend normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China. As you know, the congressional district I represent is located in Northwest Iowa. It is one of the most productive agriculture areas in the country and I am very proud of the fact that we export out products all around the world.

We are in the process of debating probably the most important issue facing this Congress this session. This is a debate that challenges us to engage the international marketplace, or to hide behind our borders.

I believe that trade is an integral part of our foreign policy. The more our two nations interact in the marketplace, the greater potential there is for our two peoples to communicate on other issues that will foster democracy and promote values that honor and respect the basic freedoms that we take for granted here in the United States.

In addition, China's $1.2 billion people represent a huge market for American agriculture and manufactured goods and services. Already, China is the sixth-largest market in the world for American agricultural products. The USDA projects that China will account for over one-third of the growth in U.S. agricultural exports over the next decade.

It is my opinion, and those of many of my constituents, that Iowa is better off with a Chinese market economy that plays by WTO rules and is subject to a binding WTO dispute settlement process.

We need to work with the Chinese to end export subsides and quotas that harm Iowa farmers and those throughout the country. Under the WTO agreement, China will lower its tariffs on beef, and pork by 2004. Furthermore, these tariff reductions will enable Iowa's corn growers and over 18,000 hog producers greater access to this important market.

In the end, this debate is not about how much product we sell to China. it is about how we interact with the global community and how we shape the future. Trade will no doubt help both our great countries prosper, but in the end it will have a much more profound effect by forging a relationship that will ensure cooperation and open up Chinese society to new ideas. That is an investment worth making.

TRIBUTE TO LEON BRACHMAN

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Leon Brachman, one of Fort

Worth, Texas' finest sons, in honor of his upcoming 80th birthday.

While he was born and raised in Marietta, OH, Mr. Brachman moved to Forth Worth in 1938. He married a Fort Worth girl from an old Forth Worth family and never left.

Mr. Brachman has served his adopted city in almost every civic capacity imaginable. In his service as a founder of the Fort Worth Symphony and the Fort Worth Chamber Music Society, an original board member of the Van Cliburn Quadrennial Piano Competition, and president of Casa Manana, he has shown his profound love of culture and his belief that all should be able to share in its beauty. By his decades long service as the treasurer, president, and chairman of the board of All Saints Hospital, as well as his chairmanship of the Steering Committee of the Public Health School of the University of North Texas, Health Science Center, Fort Worth, he has shown his devotion to the provision of quality health care to all citizens of our community. As the chairman of the Tarrant County Appraisal District, he devoted countless hours ensuring that Fort Worth and Tarrant County raised their required revenues in a way that was fair to all of its citizens.

To the Jewish community of our city and our entire country, Mr. Brachman has served in virtually every possible leadership role, giving of his time and his resources to keep their institutions strong, their communal needs met, their self-reliance vital. Having served as a vice chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, the president of Ahavath Sholom Synagogue, founder and president of the Hebrew Day School of Fort Worth, and countless other Jewish communal roles, each institution has been positively influenced by his involvement.

Whenever the community has called upon him, Mr. Brachman has never hesitated to take on the most thankless tasks. Wherever there has been an institution in a seemingly hopeless situation, Mr. Brachman has accepted the challenge to nurse it back to health. Our community is incredibly stronger for his presence. We are very lucky that he chose to adopt Fort Worth as his home.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Brachman, his wife of 58 years, Fay, his three children, nine grandchildren, and four great grandchildren and wish them all continued health and success.

It is important that the House of Representatives acknowledge and be thankful for the spirit of community responsibility embodied by Mr. Brachman. His life's work to make our world a better place demonstrates the best our country has to offer.

SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE RESERVE OFFICERS

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on an issue that has been brought to my attention by a constituent of mine in southeastern North Carolina.

My constituent and his colleagues were Senior Foreign Service Reserve Officers, until they were involuntarily converted out of the Foreign Service by the Foreign Service Act of 1980. These officers were, in general, specialists in professional fields other than those commonly associated with overseas assignments.

When Congress wrote the law that was to become known as the Foreign Service Act of 1980 ("FSA"), Members of Congress spent many hours debating the question of providing safeguards for the careers of the Foreign Service Reserve Officers whose personnel status would be most affected by the newly drafted legislation. Therefore, the FSA guaranteed the permanent preservation of the grade and benefits of the employees.

Please allow me to read an excerpt from the Report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, regarding the Foreign Service Act of 1980:

> Converting employees from their present positions to new pay schedules and different personnel systems, including the Senior Service, cannot be accomplished without some difficulties. The policy governing this chapter is to minimize the disruption to the individual employees and to preserve the rights and benefits of employees subject to conversion. The Committee recognizes that minimizing disruption and saving rights and benefits entail cost to the Government. These costs are justified in view of the fact that by forcing conversions the Government, as the employer, is altering the legitimate expectations of the employees. Fairness requires that the Government cushion these employees against the hardships which will come in wake of forced conversion . . . Employees converted are provided with permanent saved grade and tenure rights comparable to what they had.

The Department of State did fulfill their obligation to protect the earned rights of these senior officers from the date of the Act until early 1990. Executive Order 12698 increased the salary of the Senior Foreign Service Officers ("SFS"). However, the Department of State did not adjust the salary of my constituent and his fellow SFS–4 officers. No explanation was given to the affected officers for this arbitrary action of the Department of State.

At about the same time, the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act ("FEPBA") became law. This law eliminated all Civil Service grades above GS–15, substituting the designation of Senior Level ("SL"), and authorized the agencies to pay SL's a salary as high as SFS–6.

Initially the Department of State proposed to designate these former SFS–4 officers as Senior Level 8, at a salary equal to that of SFS–4. Without explanation and contradictory to the intent of Congress in the Foreign Service Act, the Department of State issued personnel actions designating these long-time, professional and dedicated officers as SL–00, at a salary $13,000 below that of SFS–4. This was, and is in my opinion, a distorted interpretation of the Foreign Service Act as passed by Congress and signed into law.

These officers then followed prescribed procedures to effect an administrative correction. The ruling of the Agency's Foreign Service Grievance Board stated that it lacked jurisdiction to interpret Section 2106 of the law, but they then denied the officer's claim, without a hearing.

These officers, frustrated by the Department of State's refusal to uphold the law that protected what they had earned as senior officers of the Department of State, filed an action in the Federal Court for the District of Columbia. The Department of State attorneys with the assistance of lawyers from the Department of Justice resisted to a de novo hearing of the facts. After months of delays, the presiding judge dismissed the case without granting a hearing.

I am equally concerned that the Department of State did not provide a copy of a June 25, 1991, Memorandum from the Office of the Legal Advisor of the Office of the Director General when responding to a request for production of documents by the attorney representing these officers. That document had a direct and dire effect on the status of these officers. The document was kept secret from these officers, and an attempt was made to suppress the document in court. The document, contrary to the clear intent of the law, stated, "Owing to their conversion to the Civil Service, their rights are governed by the Civil Service statutes and regulations." This appears to be the authority used to justify the improper personnel actions that deprived these former Senior Foreign Service officers their guarantees as stated in the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

I seek the support of my follow colleagues, especially those who also have former Foreign Service Reserve Officers living in their districts, to assist me in putting forth an effort to bring about the restoration of the rank and benefits to which officers are entitled.

I hope that Secretary Albright, in keeping with her May 21, 1996 Department Notice to All Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, Ambassadors, Principal Officers dealing with long term employees disputes, will take a direct interest in resolving this matter and avoid the necessity of remedial legislation.

IMPROVING SOCIAL SECURITY'S PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR CLAIMANT REPRESENTATIVES

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that if enacted would update and improve Social Security's payment systems for claimant representatives.

Currently, many would-be beneficiaries hire attorneys to help them file applications for Social Security retirement and, most commonly, disability benefits. That this process is so complex people feel obligated to hire an attorney to help them is in itself a serious problem. It is especially troubling given the expected rapid growth in the number of applicants and beneficiaries with the aging and eventual retirement of the Baby Boomers. So much work remains in the area of simplifying the application process, which will benefit applicants, SSA, and ultimately taxpayers. For now, though, a good start would be finding a better way to pay claimants' representatives and to have SSA process this workload as quickly and efficiently as possible.

First some background. Some Members may be aware that attorneys can choose to have SSA directly pay their fees for representing claimants for Social Security disability benefits. In such cases, when the claimant is awarded past-due benefits SSA withholds the appropriate attorney's fee from the benefits that are owned the claimant, and sends the fee directly to the attorney. Prior to this year, no charge was made for SSA costs in processing, withholding, and forwarding this fee.

This was changed under a proposal originally made by the Clinton Administration that was incorporated in the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Law, which is designed to help disabled individuals enter or return to the workforce. This law provides new medical and employment services to help individuals with disabilities find and keep jobs without fear of losing important benefits once they leave the disability rolls. That's a critical goal, and one that requires additional resources. In determining ways to pay for the added benefits in the "Ticket" law, many people on both sides of the aisle thought that having lawyers—rather than the Social Security trust funds—pick up the tab for Social Security's costs in processing their paychecks was appropriate. Thus a version of the original Administration proposal on attorney fees was included in the final conference agreement on the Ticket bill approved by the House of Representatives 418–2 on November 18, 1999.

As this legislation progressed, several changes were made that improved the original proposal. For example, the General Accounting Office is required to study whether the assessment should be linked to how quickly SSA processes fees and whether the assessment will reduce the number of claimant representatives available to assist these claimants, among other issues.

The legislation I am introducing addresses this issue and thus can serve as the basis for further discussion and possible legislation on this point. In short, my legislation would specify that Social Security could impose an assessment on an attorney's fee only if the fee was processed and approved for payments within 30 days after the Commissioner certifies the payment of the claimant's benefits. This will encourage Social Security to handle this work promptly. If they don's SSA will lose money and attorneys will not be charged their assessment. Hopefully it will not come to that, but in the past SSA has not had a stellar record in terms of processing this workload in a timely fashion.

Introducing this legislation now will serve to further discussion on this topic, especially in anticipation of an upcoming hearing I plan to hold in the Social Security Subcommittee on additional process reforms. Suggested reforms include: the consideration of a flat fee as opposed to a percentage of past-due benefits, the extension of the attorney's fee direct payment provisions to the Supplemental Security Income program, the issuance of past-due benefits and the attorney's fee in a joint check made payable to the beneficiary and the attorney and the application of Prompt Payment Act provisions to past-due benefits and attorney fee payments. These suggested reforms follow this statement in legislative form.

I would appreciate any comments or suggestions for additional provisions my colleagues or other informed individuals may have on this issue, and of course would welcome cosponsors to this legislation. Already we have heard from many claimant representatives, and I would expect to hear from many more as we move on with this issue.

SUGGESTED PROVISIONS FOR ATTORNEY FEE PAYMENT LEGISLATION

STREAMLINING OF ATTORNEY FEE PAYMENT SYSTEM

(a) MAXIMUM LIMIT ON ASSESSMENTS.—Section 206(d)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 406(d)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''equal to'' and inserting ''equal to the lesser of—'';

(2) by striking ''the product obtained'' and inserting the following: ''(i) the product obtained'';

(3) by striking ''subparagraph (B).'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B), or''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new clause: ''(ii) $25.00.''

(b) ISSUANCE OF JOINT CHECKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 206 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 406) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) ISSUANCE OF JOINT CHECKS.—In any case in which a claimant is determined to be entitled to past-due benefits, and such claimant is represented by an attorney for whom a fee for services is required to be certified under this section in connection with such benefits, the payment of such past-due benefits shall be in the form of a joint check made payable to both the claimant and the attorney in an amount equal to the total amount of such past due benefits, which shall be sent to the claimant's attorney. Receipt by the claimant's attorney of the proceeds of such check in an amount equal to the fee for services certified for payment by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(A) or (b)(1)(A) in connection with such past-due benefits shall constitute receipt by the attorney of such fee.''.

(2) ASSESSMENT ON ATTORNEY CONTINGENT UPON TIMELY RECEIPT OF PAYMENT.—Section 206(d)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 406(d)(3)) is amended—Section 206(d)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 406(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Commissioner'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner''; and

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

''(B) IMPOSITION AND COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENT CONTINGENT UPON TIMELY RECEIPT OF CHECK.—The Commissioner may impose and collect the assessment under this subsection in connection with any past-due benefits only if the joint check required under subsection (e) in connection with such benefits is received by the attorney within 45 days after the certification by the Commissioner for payment of such benefits.''.

EXTENSION OF ATTORNEY FEE PAYMENT SYSTEM TO TITLE XVI CLAIMS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1631(d)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(d)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2) and (b)(1)(B)'';

(2) by striking ''section 406(a) (other than in paragraph (4) thereof)'' and inserting ''section 406'';

(3) in clause (i), by striking ''subparagraphs (A)(ii)(I) and (C)(i)'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(2)(A)(ii)(I), (a)(2)(D)(i), and (b)(1)(B)'', by striking ''as determined'', by striking ''1127(a))'' and inserting ''1127(a)'', and by striking ''the parenthetical phrase contained therein'' and inserting ''the phrase 'before any applicable reduction under section 1127(a)' ''; and

(4) in clause (ii), by inserting '', in subsections (a)(2)(B) and (b)(1)(A)(i), the phrase'' after ''substituting'', and by inserting ''the phrase'' after ''for''.

EXTENSION OF THE PROMPT PAYMENT ACT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S CLAIMS AND ATTORNEY FEE PAYMENT SYSTEMS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3901 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) This chapter applies to the Social Security Administration with regard to delays in the payment of claims under Title II and Title XVI of the Social Security Act and to the certification for the payment of fees to attorneys under sections 206 and 1631(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (treating, for purposes of this chapter, the required certification by the Commissioner of Social Security for payment of any fees as a required payment by the Commissioner of such fees).

''(2) In applying this chapter to the Social Security Administration pursuant to paragraph (1)—

''(A) the date of issuance of the award certificate by the Social Security Administration shall be deemed to start the payment period under 5 CFR 1315.4(f); and

''(B) the documentation required by the Social Security Administration to certify a claim or fee payment under title 42, United States Code shall be deemed to satisfy the documentation requirement of 5 CFR 1315.9''.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment on 21st century community learning centers.

I have been involved with education issues for almost 30 years. This experience has strongly reinforced for me that all children, regardless of income level or race have the same potential for high achievement and healthy development when provided appropriate opportunities.

Thus, our goal must be to support the development of quality afterschool programs for all children, but especially those in low-income communities.

Our goal should also be to see the expanded-day programs linked to the core school day.

After-school programs are the best structures for the development of such programs, as well as other services needed in low-income communities. They can serve as pathways to developing strong, sustainable community schools.

We definitely are not utilizing them enough.

More than 77 percent of the 21st century community learning center funding goes to low-income youth. And with the changing new mix of technologies and competitive markets, our economy is increasing its demand for skilled labor and decreasing demand for unskilled or semi-skilled labor. This means we can use these centers to focus on expectations for the core school day and its relation to the changes.

This is important because for the first time in history, the Nation's economic and social well-being requires that all children be prepared for post-secondary education and career attainment.

Although our public education system was never designed to prepare our students for higher education, after school programs seek to provide vital opportunities for children and youth to learn and to prepare for college and careers in the new economy.

After-school programs achieve these goals by providing access to information technology and related learning services for children. This is especially critical because we have an opportunity to support an initiative that is really about local impact and local opportunity.

We must bring balance to our communities! Afterschool programs keep students occupied with productive activities during the hours they are most likely to get into trouble, from 2 to 8 pm.

We can support local and state efforts to sustain a much larger national community school movement than has ever been possible before. New research indicates that after-school programs can make a positive difference in student development and academic performance.

This is especially true for our low-income students. This initiative may be the greatest opportunity to help children at a critical point in their young lives.

I'm particularly supportive of this initiative because it means that children who need extra help will be able to receive more attention. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge members to support this amendment.

TRUBUTE TO MR. BERT M. CONCKLIN

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleague rise to bring to your attention the contribution of a distinguished individual who is returning to government service.

Last month, Mr. Bert M. Concklin announced he was stepping down as president of the Professional Services Council, a national trade association that represents a very large number of our constituents, to return to federal government service. Bert will soon assume the post of Business Systems Modernization Executive at the Internal Revenue Service.

We both know Bert well and are confident that he will be a tremendous asset to the agency. Bert has been a leader in the government-wide reform efforts over the past decade where he has brought his keen insights, strong determination, and balanced judgment to bear on one of the federal government's most difficult undertakings. It is because of this background, as well as his substantial achievements in the private sector, that we feel secure in our prediction that he will positively impact the agency's goals.

Aside from his service as a key advisor to federal agencies and Congress on tough issues, such as contracting reform and government-wide business process re-engineering, and in addition to his having held a number of high-level government positions. Bert has an impressive track record with some of our country's best-known corporate names, including PRC, McKinsey and Company, Computer Sciences Corporation, and General Electric. He also served as chairman of the Governor's Council on Information Management of Virginia. He served in the United States Air Force and graduated from the Unites States Naval Academy.

We are pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the valuable contributions of someone who has clearly demonstrated his passion for reform, government services, and bipartisan cooperation.