SENATE—*Tuesday, March 20, 2001*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on this Senate Chamber. Enter the mind and heart of each Senator and reign as Sovereign over all that is said and done this day. We praise You for the dedication of the Senators and for their earnestness to deal with the crucial issues before our Nation. May these days of genuine exchange of concerns and convictions move the Senate forward to an agreeable solution for the future of campaigning for office in America.

Lord, we are here to serve You and Your best for our Nation. Thank You for all the people who contribute to the Senate with such loyal and excellent service. Today we praise you for the life of John Roberson who worked in the Disbursing Office for 20 years. Now as his family and friends grieve his death, we ask You especially to care for his son Dave who has followed in his father's footsteps with his own 20-year period of loyal service.

Today, we renew our commitment to do all we can to serve the best we can and express Your care for whomever we can. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MIKE DEWINE 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DEWINE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately resume consideration of the campaign finance reform legislation. An amendment regarding self-financed campaigns is expected to be offered, with up to 3 hours of debate in order. It is also expected that some debate time will be yielded back and that a vote will occur sometime around noon today—certainly before the weekly party luncheons. We will be in recess from approximately 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conferences to meet. Amendments are expected to be offered throughout the day and therefore votes on amendments are expected to occur approximately every 3 hours.

I am concerned about the very inauspicious beginning that the Senate had on this legislation yesterday. I had described it as a jump ball, where everybody would have a free and fair opportunity to offer amendments and have debate but there would be votes on those amendments after 3 hours. I expected we would have a vote sometime between 5:30 and 6:30, as we did yesterday, and there would be debate on the next amendment last night and we would be ready for a vote now. That is not the case because of the spectacle that occurred at the end of the vote yesterday.

I thought it did not go well, and I thought the Senate looked very close to being silly on our first amendment on this very important issue. I was stunned, quite frankly; on an amendment as broadly supported as I know the amendment is, to give candidates that are running against superwealthy candidates some way to be able to compete, I can't help but believe that when we get a direct vote on that issue, it will pass overwhelmingly. My assumption was that it got tangled up just because it was the first vote and there was a desire to show that one side or the other was going to win. I was very disappointed in that.

I am also concerned, with the agreement that was reached, in all fairness, on both sides, that we would have amendments and regular votes every 3 hours, we had already slipped 3 hours on that. And also I hope, once again, that objections to Senators amending their own amendments will not be heard. The tradition around here is that we allow colleagues to amend their own amendments. I think that is when the confusion began yesterday in a very disappointing beginning.

But Senators on both sides worked last night and worked this morning, and I understand an agreement has been reached as to the amendment that will be offered in a few minutes. After that is offered, we will come back and have another amendment on this side of the aisle and Senator MCCONNELL and others will have an opportunity.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I tell the majority leader that we have an amendment. I don't believe it will take all 3 hours because it was debated last night. We have an agreement which is being written up now. So I believe that we could, within a fairly brief period of time, have a vote on it and move on to another amendment from the Republican side, thereby sort of catching up from yesterday.

I mention also that we were supposed to start at noon yesterday, but we didn't start until 1. I don't know whose decision that was. That is not important. We can catch up this morning. We met this morning and we are getting the final details, which we needed to do. This is a very complex, extremely complex issue.

The challenges of a millionaire declaring his or her candidacy in Wyoming are significantly different from doing that in the State of California. We tried to accommodate it and, frankly, we have. Those issues were still unresolved last night when the vote was attempted, and all of us were confident that we could work out the differences, bring up an agreement, which will be brought up in the name of Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE and Senator DURBIN, and we can have a relatively brief period of debate and vote on it and then move to another amendment by Senator MCCONNELL, or whoever he designates.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me say to Senator MCCAIN—and then I will yield to Senator REID—I appreciate the fact that something has been worked out which appears to be fair to all sides. And since we already debated it for a time yesterday, it won't be necessary to rehash all of that. Maybe we can make up for some of the lost time.

The clear understanding, when the Senator from Arizona and I discussed this issue, was that we would try to keep it on a steady schedule and get amendments offered and voted on every 3 hours, or less if possible.

I yield to Senator REID.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are hopeful that the first vote is not indicative of what the future is going to hold. I hope that will be the downside of the work on this important piece of legislation. I think yesterday was well spent. There were relatively very few quorum calls, maybe just for brief moments, and I think we were able to accomplish a lot last night and this morning. I also say that during this next day or two, there are a number of Members who wish to give statements about the bill itself. They can do this during the time these amendments are pending. Some of them want to take the full 3 hours. I have already told Senator MCCAIN that I am not too certain that we need to alternate. We don't have many amendments over here. So I publicly advise those on the other side of the aisle who want to offer amendments, they should get them ready because we are not going to have a lot to offer.

Mr. LOTT. If I may respond to the last suggestion, that would be fine. However, we want to make sure that, if we don't alternate, at the end we don't have amendments show up that would be offered, one behind the other, on the other side. I know that is not the Senator's intention. That is one of the reasons why we alternate, so that one side or the other won't have a block of amendments at the end of the process.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the Senator yielding. There are three Republican amendments. There would be one Democratic amendment, and we would go back to the Republican side. That is how we should do it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 27, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 27) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Democratic leader, or his designee, is recognized to offer an amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment Senator DOMENICI is going to offer is not yet ready, but we want to start talking about it, the procedure being at such time the amendment comes from legislative drafting, Senator DURBIN will be recognized when the Chair feels that is appropriate. He will yield at that time to Senator DOMENICI, who will offer an amendment on his behalf, and whoever else wants to be on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he agrees that we ought to begin the 3-hour time limit.

Mr. REID. I agree.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, even though the amendment has not yet been laid down, since we are going to be discussing it, that the 3-hour time limit begin with this discussion. We understand most of that time may be yielded back, but at least this will begin the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I believe the agreement of the Senate as we adjourned yesterday was that the Democratic side, this Senator in particular, would be offering an amendment. I am prepared very shortly to yield to the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Ohio and to acknowledge their leadership on this issue. We are addressing probably one of the most complicated problems we face, a Supreme Court decision in *Buckley* v. *Valeo* which said that a person who decides to run for office and is personally wealthy cannot be limited in the amount of personal wealth they spend in order to obtain this office.

Meanwhile, other candidates who are not personally wealthy face all sorts of limitations on how much money they can raise from individuals, how much they can raise in a given period of time, how much they can raise from political action committees.

The effort in which I have joined Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE is a response to that, I hope a reasonable response to that, which says we know the day will come when wealthy people will run for office, but we also want to say if you are not wealthy, you should have a chance to compete and to deliver your message to the voters and to appeal to them for support.

We have come up with a proposal which Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE will describe in detail. We were having conversations on the floor, up to the beginning of this speech, about aspects of this matter which we hope to address. If we cannot address it particularly in the language of this amendment, we will acknowledge what we consider to be some of the questions that will be raised and try to address it later in debate. We have been in conversation with Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD. They are familiar with what we are doing. I do not purport to suggest they support it. They can speak for themselves. We believe this is a responsible way to address a serious problem we face in political campaigns.

If the Senator from New Mexico is prepared, at this point I yield to him with the understanding that when the amendment arrives, the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and Senator DEWINE, and I will join as cosponsors with others.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator from Illinois, I thank the Senator for his cooperation and help. Obviously, the Senator came on board with the idea encapsulated in the Domenici amendment yesterday, and as we progressed through it, it appeared that a number of Senators wanted some changes. So we set about yesterday evening—and well into the evening—to try to arrive at changes necessary to accommodate a wide variety of Senators and still make it effective.

There is no question, anytime you work on something as complicated as this, although we think we have done a good job, it may very well be in due course, as this bill evolves further, that there may have to be other amendments as people analyze and find other problems that might be inherent in this situation.

I thank in a very special way Senator DEWINE from the State of Ohio. From the beginning, we had hoped that yesterday we would introduce a Domenici-DeWine amendment. I introduced the amendment which was debated yesterday. Many people at least understand what we are trying to do and what the problem is. To the extent we are trying to figure out a solution, Senator DEWINE has been a marvelous partner and an excellent leader.

Today I will briefly explain what we are trying to do and some of the basic fundamentals, and then I will yield to Senator DEWINE.

The way we will determine the trigger for the nonwealthy candidate—that is, the candidate confronted with an opponent who will spend a lot of their own money—will vary in States depending on the voting age population. That is Senator DEWINE's idea. In essence, it says to a Senator in a State such as Idaho, if somebody decides to run and spends their own money in large quantities, that Senator is going to be able to raise money somewhat easier than he or she would have if

they were bound by the 26-year-old law which has $1,000 individual contribution limits per election and $5,000 in money that can come from PACs.

Essentially, once you hit the formula amount, this is what will happen. When you reach the first level, the individual limits are raised to $3,000 under current law. That means you can raise $3,000 in the primary and $3,000 in the general. When you hit the next level, which Senator DEWINE will talk about, the contribution limits for the non-wealthy person are raised six times in the primary, $6,000 in the primary, $6,000 in the general.

Then something new was brought into the discussion yesterday evening, principally based upon Senator FEINSTEIN's discussion, after having faced what one might call a superspender. We have a superspender defined, and Senator DEWINE will define what that is when he speaks.

We eliminate the party coordinated expenditure limits, all hard dollars—until the poor candidate raises up to an amount equal to the self-financing of the superspender. I assume during that period of time they can continue to raise the $6,000 from individuals.

The way it is done, it requires a bit of bookkeeping, but everybody keeps a lot of books now. Everybody has records galore. Obviously, there are floating triggers that will come about based upon when the wealthy candidate, or superspender, starts putting their money into the campaign.

There is one other provision that has been in both vehicles for Senators who spend their own money and get elected, a requirement that they cannot change their mind about how to finance that campaign and start raising money to pay back their debt after they are elected. We passed that around yesterday, and everyone seems to understand it. If you incur debt from a personal loan and then you get elected as Senator, and then you go around and say, now I am the Senator, I want you to get me money so I can pay back what I used of my own money to run for election. It is clear in this amendment that you cannot do that in the future.

All that is future, prospective.

Senator DEWINE will now explain the triggering mechanisms and how this will apply to each State. We will have a chart so every Senator can see how it applies. I thank Senator DEWINE, who has been a real help. To the other Senators on the floor, particularly Senator MCCAIN, thank you for your help. Senator MCCAIN clearly said if we did not win the other one, we would put this together and it would be bipartisan, and he joined.

There are a few things in this amendment we both know have to be ironed out in the future, but I think it is an excellent amendment.

For the first time in history, we think we are legally addressing the issue of a person who asserts their constitutional rights—which the Court said is constitutional—to spend their own money, but they do it in inordinate amounts as compared to what a candidate on the other side could be expected to raise under current restrictive laws, which are 26 years old and ought to be fixed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this chart we will discuss in a moment was prepared last night by my law clerk, Susan Bruno. She has been working on that, and we thank her for it.

I congratulate and thank my colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, and my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, for their work on this amendment. The amendment we have now is the result of weeks of discussions and negotiations among Senator DOMENICI, Senator DURBIN, and myself. That culminated last night in further discussions involving more Senators, both Republican and Democrat.

I thank the members of our staff who worked long into the night after we had set the basic parameters ourselves for what this discussion would be.

The amendment we have in front of us is bipartisan, and it is the work product of a great number of people. But let me particularly thank Senator DOMENICI for taking the lead and for being one who had this idea, frankly, over a decade ago, and who has been talking about this idea year after year. We are now to the point where we have the ability to see this amendment enacted into law.

Let me, again, thank Senator DOMENICI, Senator DURBIN, Senator COLLINS, Senator MCCAIN, Senator FEINGOLD, and others for their input, their suggestions, and their work during these negotiations.

I believe the amendment, with their help, is a consensus approach that will help make our election process more fair and more equitable.

It is unfortunate that we need such an amendment at all. But the sad reality is in campaigns today we are moving down a road where personal wealth is becoming the chief qualification for candidates seeking office. The reality is in the last several election cycles, both parties have looked around the country to try to find wealthy candidates who can self-finance their own campaigns. This is no reflection on those candidates. But it is the reality of life today.

This amendment attempts to bring about equity and fairness and also, quite candidly, to increase the opportunity for all candidates to get their ideas to the public.

This amendment is truly about the first amendment—it is about free speech—and it is about allowing candidates to have the opportunity to take their ideas into the marketplace, to broadcast them, to be able to pay for the commercials, and to have their exchange of ideas in that political marketplace that our Founding Fathers deemed so very important.

The reality is, though, personal wealth has changed the whole dynamic of today's Federal elections. It has changed it in a way that no one in 1976, when the Supreme Court handed down it's decision, could have envisioned. No one could have envisioned the amount of money individual candidates now pour into their own campaigns.

The fact is, as I said on the Senate floor last night, there currently exists a loophole, but a constitutionally protected loophole, for candidates to use their own personal money to finance their own campaigns. This loophole, of course, resulted from the 1976 Supreme Court case, *Buckley* v. *Valeo*. In that case, the Supreme Court reviewed the constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974. In the Buckley case, the United States Supreme Court struck down limitations on the following: One, campaign expenditures; two, independent expenditures by individuals and groups; and, three, expenditures by candidates from their personal funds.

The Buckley decision has effectively created a substantial disadvantage for opposing candidates who must raise all campaign funds under the current fundraising limitations. Current fund limitations, of course, are $1,000 per donor. So you have the situation where the candidate who cannot self-finance has to raise money in a maximum of $1,000 increments but has to then go up against another candidate who can put in maybe an unlimited amount of money—millions and millions of dollars.

The fact is, because of the Constitution, because of the Supreme Court's decision, and because of the statutes we have written, we now have what, for the general public, would appear at least to be a rather ludicrous situation. That situation is that everyone in the country is limited to $1,000 they can put into a candidate's campaign—everybody in the country except one person. That one person who has the ability to put money in, in an unlimited fashion, in an unlimited amount, is, of course, the candidate.

That, I think, to most people would seem to be an absurd situation. But this is a constitutional issue. This is, if it is a loophole, certainly a constitutionally protected loophole—unlimited personal expenditures from rich candidates but limited personal contributions for everyone else. That is the reality today.

This reality has resulted in enhanced personal wealth in campaigns to such an extent that I think no one even 10 years ago could have imagined its importance.

The whole dynamic of political campaigning has fundamentally changed in this country because of this Court decision and because of the ability in the last few years of candidates to self-finance their own campaigns.

It has made it more difficult for nonwealthy opponents to compete and to get their messages and their ideas across to the public.

Our amendment tries in a constitutionally acceptable way to correct this. It would create greater fairness and accountability in the Federal election process by addressing the inequity that arises when a wealthy candidate pays for his or her campaign with personal funds—personal funds that are defined, by the way, to include cash contributions and any contributions arising from personal or family assets such as personal loans or property used for collateral for a loan to the campaign.

The agreement we reached this morning and that was hammered out last night—the amendment we will be offering in just a moment—has very important implications for our democracy, as I will explain.

The basic intent of our amendment is to preserve and to enhance the marketplace of ideas—the very foundation of our democracy—but giving candidates who are not independently wealthy an opportunity to get their message across to the voters as well.

Specifically, our amendment would raise the contribution limits for candidates facing wealthy opponents to fund their own campaigns.

The contribution limit increases are based, as my colleague from New Mexico has said, on a sliding scale depending on the size of each State and the amount of the wealthy candidate's personal expenditures.

The amendment creates a simple three-tiered threshold test to determine the contribution limit increases. This threshold test is based on the individual voting age populations of each state, in recognition that the cost of elections vary greatly between the states. The actual calculation of the thresholds uses a baseline formula and multiples of that baseline. Our population-based calculation allows the individual contribution limit increases to kick in sooner in states with smaller populations, where candidates get more bang for the buck. A half million dollars in a campaign in Wyoming, after all, goes a heck of a lot farther and can buy a lot more television air time and direct mail pieces than it can in Ohio or in California. Simple put, this formula recognizes that a one-size fits all approach won't work for all states.

The baseline is based on the following formula: $.04 the voting age population + $150,000. The first threshold starts at double the baseline.

When a wealthy candidate crosses the first threshold, the opposing candidate's hard money cap for individual contributions, which currently is $1,000, goes up three times to $3,000. The second threshold is a double the first threshold—and the hard money cap increases to $6,000.

So when you get to that second threshold, when the wealthy candidate puts in that second amount of money or hits that level, the second one kicks in, which means then the nonwealthy candidate who was not being self-financed can raise six times what the current law is. The current law, of course, is $1,000. That would take it up to $6,000 you can raise from an individual donor.

Finally, the third threshold begins at ten times the baseline; once a wealthy candidate exceeds the third threshold, it removes the caps for State party coordinated expenditures of hard money.

Our amendment also, as my colleague from New Mexico has indicated, includes a proportionality provision, a provision that means for all cap increases, a less wealthy candidate can use increased caps to raise only—only—up to 110 percent of the amount contributed by the wealthy candidate. This applies to all three of these thresholds.

Proportionality is important because it really helps level the playing field from both directions so the wealthy candidate is not punished or is not inhibited from putting his or her own money into the campaign, which is very important. What this means, in plain language, is that we try to increase free speech; we give that nonwealthy candidate the opportunity to get his or her message out. We do not punish the wealthy candidate. And we take care of that in this well-crafted amendment by saying we will limit how much that nonwealthy candidate can raise above the caps, above the limits, and we limit it to, logically, how much money has been put in by the wealthy candidate.

So the wealthy candidate, again, is not punished, is not inhibited, is not discouraged from putting in his or her own money. I think this makes a great deal of sense. This was a provision that was worked out, again, last night.

Finally, our amendment includes a notice provision. This requires candidates to notify the Federal Election Commission within 24 hours of crossing a threshold. Candidates also must notify the FEC within 24 hours of any additional contributions totaling $10,000, once they are over a threshold.

That is our amendment in a nutshell. The fact is, the Supreme Court has ruled that personal expenditures cannot be limited. Let me say this very clearly: Our amendment is not trying to change nor challenge that. We accept that. It is the interpretation of the Supreme Court, in interpreting the first amendment to the Constitution, which we must and do respect.

This amendment is not an attempt to undo what the Court decided. It is not an attempt to limit personal expenditures, nor in any way to inhibit those expenditures, nor in fact to punish people for making those expenditures. Rather, it is an attempt to correct for the unintended effects of the Court's decision.

Again, no one—no one—when the Buckley case came out in the mid-1970s, could have envisioned what we have seen today. This amendment is based upon our additional experience—25 years of experience—in seeing how this has played out. It is an attempt to correct the inequities in the system and establish fairness in the process.

I believe the courts are likely to uphold this provision because it addresses the public perception that there is something inherently corrupt about a wealthy candidate who can use a substantial amount of his or her own personal resources to win an election—not that there is anything corrupt about that particular candidate. It is the perception. It is the perception that the public looks at this and, frankly, says something is just wrong with this.

The Supreme Court has said Congress has a compelling interest in addressing this perception. This amendment is narrowly tailored, and closely related to such concerns about that perceived corruption. The reality is the courts carved out a constitutional protection for wealthy candidates. Our provision offsets that without infringing on the rights of the wealthy candidates. Our provision expands the rights of the opposing candidate. Our amendment expands free speech. In fact, this sort of approach to campaign financing actually bolsters first amendment rights of candidates who do not have extensive personal resources.

Finally, the proportionality provision is key to ensuring that a wealthy candidate is not punished by the less wealthy candidate's ability to raise funds with lower hard money caps.

Candidly, our amendment does not completely level the playing field. I think in most cases that would simply be impossible. We cannot do that. However, it is a step towards increasing fairness and accountability in our election process. And it is a step, again, to expanding the individual's rights, those who do not have that independent wealth, giving them the opportunity to take their ideas out into the marketplace and to share them with the public, and giving them the resources to share them.

It is a reasonable approach. It is a reasonable thing to do, especially now that we are reforming our Nation's campaign finance laws.

This is a great opportunity for us. We are today, with this amendment, fine-tuning the process, correcting something the Court could not have foreseen 25 years ago in Buckley; and that is that the unlimited personal expenditures can hurt an opposing candidate's

ability to compete fairly. When that happens, when huge funding disparities exist between a wealthy candidate's unlimited personal expenditures to their own campaigns and a less wealthy candidate's limited individual contributions from others, it is the voters and our democracy that suffers the most.

In conclusion, wealthy candidates have an easier time communicating today with voters. That is just the reality of our current process. They have the money it takes readily at their disposal to get their messages out. When running up against such self-financed machines, less wealthy opponents have less chance to challenge those messages, less chance to get their own ideas on the table, less chance to communicate with the voters, and to give them an alternative point of view.

As a result, it is the voters who have less chance to make informed choices in elections. And that is just not good for our democracy. In essence, this struggle between rich and not so rich candidates really is a struggle for the soul of democracy. I say that because the free flow of ideas and information is the basis—the very foundation—of our political system. The exchange of ideas is a prerequisite for democratic governance. And it is ''ideas,'' as John Maynard Keynes once said, that ''shape the course of history.''

The more robust the marketplace of ideas, the better the political process. For our democracy to fully function and thrive, we need many ideas—ideas competing with each other. That is the basis for the critical thinking process, the basis for debate and challenges to societal norms. That is the basis for how we make changes in our society, for how we make the world a better place. When there are fewer ideas being disseminated, there is a greater likelihood of political and societal stagnation. And when there is such stagnation, there is no social change, and the world is worse off for it.

Thomas Mann once said:

> It is impossible for ideas to compete in the marketplace if no forum for their presentation is provided or available.

That, unfortunately, seems to be the case for many less wealthy candidates who face the power of the self-financed candidates. Our amendment is a move away from that kind of inequity. It is a step toward providing candidates the forum for the presentation of their ideas. By taking that step, the free flow of ideas, the spirit, the essence, the foundation of our democracy is preserved and emboldened.

We have charts on the floor which we can share with all Members of the Senate. We have a breakdown that shows State by State exactly where those thresholds are and at what point they would kick in.

We would be more than happy to share those with any Members of the Senate who would like to take a look.

Again, it makes eminent sense to have a distinction between when the thresholds kick in between the State of Wyoming and the State of Ohio. It just makes eminent sense.

Again, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, my colleague from Illinois, and my other colleagues who have worked long and hard on this amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join in the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and my colleague, Senator DEWINE from Ohio, in cosponsoring this amendment. A lot of people listening to this debate can't understand the world we live in here, a world where whenever you decide to be a candidate for the Senate, you face the daunting task of convincing your family that it is a good idea and putting together a good campaign team. Then the reality hits you. Your message, whatever it is, to be delivered to voters across America, is going to be a very expensive undertaking.

I represent the State of Illinois with some 12 million people. How do I get their attention to tell them what I feel, what I would like to do in the Senate? The obvious methods are the use of radio, TV, direct mail, and telephone. All of those are very expensive. All of those are increasingly expensive every 2 years. The cost of television advertising, for example, goes up 20 percent every 2 years. So if you are running for reelection after 6 years, you have to raise some 60 percent more in funds to buy the same amount of television in my State and other States just to deliver your message in a campaign.

When Members of the Senate come to the floor and start talking about raising $1,000 here or $3,000 here or $6,000, I imagine most families across America say: What kind of world do they live in that they would be asking an individual to give them $6,000 of their money for a political campaign? Very few people do that in America.

Thankfully, for a lot of us, we have those who support us and will do it. For the vast majority of families, they must be scratching their head at this debate and saying: Why don't they live in the real world where real people don't go around asking friends or even strangers for $6,000?

If you are going to mount a campaign in the State of Illinois to appeal to 12 million people and some 8 or 9 million voters, you have to raise over $10 million to get your message out.

Let me offer another insight. It costs you 50 cents to raise a dollar, so about half of the money you raise goes into the overhead of a campaign, the administrative costs of staff people, mailing out invitations, following up, making sure people are there. It is an extraordinarily expensive business.

It often puzzles me that people who are not otherwise capable of managing million-dollar companies manage multimillion-dollar campaigns that come and go in a matter of 12 months. That happens in this business of politics. That is the world in which we live.

There are ways to change it. We could change it pretty dramatically. We could say television time is free for candidates. That would really change it in a hurry because two-thirds of the money that most candidates spend is on television. If the television didn't cost you anything, if you had access to it where you could go on and, instead of doing a 30-second drive-by spot, you ended up having 5 minutes to explain your position on tax cuts or Social Security, the voters would have a chance to see you.

Of course, there is resistance to that idea from the people who own the television stations. They make a bundle of money off political candidates. They can't wait for these campaigns to get started because we literally shovel money at them in the closing weeks of campaigns. The managers of these stations have a perpetual smile for weeks on end when they see all the candidates lining up to pay for the advertising on their television stations. So the idea of free television is not one that has gone very far—nor free radio. The idea of free postage is not likely going to occur either.

We live in a commercial world where we are trying to basically deliver our message to the voters in a fashion that is extremely expensive. Now we have the Supreme Court, which 25 years ago jumped into this debate and said, if you are independently wealthy, if you are a multimillionaire, we can't limit how much money you want to spend out of your own pocket.

An individual candidate who is not independently wealthy is limited on how they can raise money. Under current law, I can only raise a $1,000 maximum contribution from each person from my primary election campaign and my general election campaign and $5,000 for each campaign from political action committees. It sounds like a lot of money, until you start adding up the $1,000 contributions it takes to reach $1 million. If you have a $10 or $12 million campaign in Illinois, imagine how many people you have to appeal to, to raise $10 or $12 million.

The Supreme Court, in Buckley v. Valeo, said if you happen to have a lot of money, then you can put all you want into it; you are not limited as to the amount of money you can invest in a political campaign.

We have come down to two categories of candidates in America, the M&M categories: the multimillionaires, and the mere mortals. The mere mortals, frankly, stand in awe of those who can write a check and fund their campaign. What we are trying to address with this

amendment is to level the playing field so that if someone shows up in the course of the campaign who is independently wealthy and is willing to spend $10, $20, $30, $40, $50, $60 million of their own money—I am not making these figures up, as they say; that has happened—then at least the other candidate has a fighting chance. That is what this amendment is all about. I have joined with Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE to try to create this fighting chance.

How do we do it? Currently, you can only accept $1,000 per person per election. We have said: If you run into the so-called self-financing candidate who is going to spend millions of dollars, then you can accept a larger contribution from an individual. The calculation and formula we use is based on the number of people living in the State. Senator DEWINE explained it earlier. For example, in my home State of Illinois, the U.S. Census projected the voting-age population for the year 2000 was 8,983,000 people. We have a baseline threshold plus $150,000 which says that you can put $509,000 into your campaign of your own money. That is your right to do, under the law and under this amendment.

If you decide to put in over $1 million, if you put in $1 million, then the candidate who doesn't have $1 million to put in, whether they are a challenger or an incumbent, can raise up to $3,000 from those who will contribute, as opposed to a limit of $1,000. Furthermore, in Illinois, for example, if you put in $2 million of your own money, then we allow the individual contribution to go up to $6,000.

I am sure most people listening to this can't imagine someone writing a check for $6,000 to a political candidate. The folks who will do that are few and far between. The honest answer to that is, unless you control the overall cost of political campaigns, you have to face the reality: People will show up with a lot of money in the bank, spend it on the campaign, and literally blow away any type of political opponent.

Who loses in that process? The voters lose. If the system works as it is supposed to, you have a choice on election day. In order to have a choice, you have information about all candidates. That means you have an information source not only from a wealthy candidate but from someone who is not so wealthy. This amendment, with its own formula approach, allows people to raise money so that they can keep up with self-financing candidates.

If in my home State of Illinois someone decides to put in $5 million or more, then we allow the Democratic or Republican Party in my State, through their coordinated expenditures, to really reach that same level, up to 110 percent of the amount that is being given by that candidate to his or her own campaign.

This is an imperfect amendment. It is an effort by us to address a serious problem. It has in it an element that is important. It is an element of fairness, an element of opportunity. It basically says that in America we won't let you buy an election. If you are going to come in and try to do that, then you are going to at least give the other candidate a chance to compete.

There is one element in this amendment which I have discussed with the sponsors that I hope we can address either with a second-degree amendment, or a later amendment during the course of our debate, and that is the money on hand. If an incumbent Senator has millions of dollars on hand and somebody walks in and decides to put in a million dollars to oppose them, I think you should take into account how much money the incumbent Senator has on hand. This amendment does not do that. I would like to suggest a modification to it at some point.

But I believe our colleagues in the Senate will have a good opportunity later this morning to cast their votes on this amendment and to basically say that from the Senate's side, we are going to try to level this playing field and try to give a voice to all candidates. We are not going to say this is a system that is open to the highest bidder. It is going to at least allow men and women to compete with some element of fairness.

I thank my colleague from New Mexico, as well as my colleague from Ohio. Both of them, and our staffs, worked late into the night last night to prepare this amendment that will be forthcoming shortly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator DOMENICI, Senator DEWINE, and others. Last night, I believe we could have avoided the vote we had. I hope in the future and during this debate we will make sure we try to handle it in a more sensitive fashion. I will take the responsibility for that.

We probably should have tried to—because we knew there were several areas that needed to be worked out, which have been worked out, and we are just awaiting the legislative counsel's language so we can move forward with the amendment—we probably should have waited until this morning on the amendment. But that is done. The fact is, as we committed last night, we would reach agreement and work out the differences. There were several specific areas that had not been worked out last night, especially proportionality, among others. I am pleased we worked it out and we are now ready to move forward as soon as the language comes over, and we can vote on this amendment and move on to other amendments.

I do believe the principles of McCain-Feingold have been preserved because this deals in hard money. Yes, it lifts some restraints on hard money, but there is no soft money that would be permitted under the Domenici-DeWine-Durbin amendment. So it also addresses, in all candor, a concern that literally every nonmillionaire Member of this body has, and that is that they wake up some morning and pick up the paper and find out that some multimillionaire is going to run for their seat, and that person intends to invest 3, 5, 8, 10, now up to $70 million of their own money in order to win.

So when I see the significant support for this amendment, I think those reflect a genuine concern, as we know both parties have now openly stated that they recruit people who have sizable fortunes of their own in order to run for the Senate.

I don't think this is a new phenomenon, Mr. President. I think it has been going on for years and years. But as money seems to play a greater and greater role in politics, and as television advertising continues to be more and more important, then, obviously, the ability of someone to achieve office with what is apparently an unfair advantage over a candidate of lesser wealth is being addressed, at least in part, by this amendment.

Also, I add to the sponsors of the amendment—and I already discussed this with Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE—this isn't a perfect answer. We all realize that. We know there are some areas that have gone unaddressed, and if there needs to be further addressing, that is why we have another nearly 10 days of debate and amendments. So I am glad we were able to work out the differences that existed last night. Obviously, those negotiations needed to take place, and I hope we can move forward on this amendment as soon as the legislative language comes over from the legislative counsel, so we can move on to another amendment at the earliest moment.

Again, I thank Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE and Senator DURBIN and others for their efforts on this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what are the rules guiding debate at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 hours evenly divided. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. BYRD. What a mess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement——

Mr. BYRD. Without the amendment being offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was stipulated by consent.

Mr. BYRD. All right. Mr. President, when Cineas the Philosopher visited

Rome in the year 280 B.C. as the envoy of Pyrrhus, the Greek general, and had witnessed the deliberations of the Roman Senate and had listened to Senators in debate, he reported that, ''Here, indeed, was no gathering of venal politicians, no haphazard council of mediocre minds.'' This was in 280 B.C.

In 107 B.C., Jugurtha, that Numidian prince, was in Rome. When he was ordered by the Roman Senate to leave Italy and set out for home, after he had passed through the gates of Rome, it is said that he looked back several times in silence and finally exclaimed, ''Yonder is a city that is up for sale, and its days are numbered if it ever finds a buyer.''

What a change; what a change had come over that Senate in less than 200 years! I think we might also, with great sadness, reflect upon the report by Cineas when he referred to the Roman Senate after he had witnessed it—as I say, not as a ''gathering of venal politicians, not a haphazard council of mediocre minds,'' but in reality ''an assemblage of kings.'' What a Senate that was that he reported to Pyrrhus as being, in dignity and in statesmanship, as a ''council of kings!'' It is in even greater sadness that we noted Jugurtha's words: ''Yonder is a city up for sale, and its days are numbered if it ever finds a buyer.'' But that is what is happening in this land of ours and in this body of ours.

When I came to the Senate, Jennings Randolph and I ran for two seats, and we won. He ran for the short term, the 2-year seat that had been created by the death of the late M.M. Neely, and I ran for the full term.

At that time, I ran against Senator Chapman Revercomb, a fine member of the Republican Party, but Randolph and I ran on a combined war chest of $50,000: two Senators on a combined war chest of $50,000. We did not have television in those days, we did not have high-priced consultants, and our hands were not manacled by the shackles of money.

Today what do we find? What does the average Senate seat cost—$6 million or $8 million? Both parties are enslaved to those who give. The special interests of the country are the people who are represented—the special interests, for the most part.

The great body of people out there are not organized, and they are not represented here. We are beholden to the special interests who give us—when we go around the country holding out a tip cup saying, ''Give me, give me, give me,'' they are the people who respond and they are the people for whom the doors are opened. They are the people for whom the telephone lines are opened when the calls come in.

I offered an amendment on this floor one day, and I thought: I will at least get a half dozen votes. I got one—one vote. Those in this body on both sides who were slaves to the particular interest group on that occasion ran like turkeys to the fire escapes. I thought I would get half a dozen votes at least. I knew the amendment would not be adopted, but after hearing all the brave talk of some of the Senators on both sides, I thought: At least I will get his vote, I will get his vote, and I will get her vote. I got one vote, my own.

That is what it has come to in this body. We are at the beck and call, we know the feel of the whiplash when the votes come, and we are owned by the special interest groups.

That does not mean that every Senator does not have a free will. Senators exercise that free will about which Milton spoke in ''Paradise Lost''—freedom of the will. That does not mean that the conscience of every Senator here is bought, that his vote is bought. It does not mean that at all, but it means that in our day and time, it cannot be said of this Senate that it is not a gathering of venal politicians. In Jugurtha's words: ''Yonder is a city up for sale, and its days are numbered if it ever finds a buyer.''

Mr. President, as one who has been in this body now going on 43 years, I mourn the days of old when I came here. We still have good Senators. They are bright, they are dedicated, but the yoke, the Roman yoke that they have to go under to come here, is appalling—appalling. It is sad. I compliment those on both sides who are seeking to do something about it, who are trying hard to deal with reality here and in such a way that the people might still look upon this body with some confidence and respect. Yet, I do not think that they will be overly successful in the effort.

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

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, referring back to the days when he was the leader, does he recall how many times he offered, on behalf of the Democrats, a motion to invoke cloture on campaign finance reform?

Mr. BYRD. I offered a motion to invoke cloture eight times during the 100th Congress.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator recall the motion to invoke cloture being offered so many times to any other measure?

Mr. BYRD. Up to this point, there has been none.

Mr. REID. So if I understand what the Senator has said, when he was majority leader in the 100th Congress, an attempt to invoke cloture was tried eight times unsuccessfully, and that holds the record for any legislative issue of which the Senator is aware.

Mr. BYRD. That is right.

I thank the Senator, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas is here, and I yield her as much time as she needs off our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will be brief.

I know my colleague from New Mexico and my colleague from Ohio have been working very hard on this amendment. I appreciate everything they are trying to do.

I have a separate amendment that has been incorporated into this amendment. It has the same purpose, and I hope when everything is worked out, our purpose will succeed. Our purpose is to level the playing field so that one candidate who has millions, if not billions, of dollars to spend on a campaign will not be at such a significant advantage over another candidate who does not have such means as to create an unlevel playing field.

In fact, I think it was Senator DURBIN who used these numbers: In the 2000 elections, candidates took out personal loans for their campaigns of $194 million for Federal races. In 1998, it was $107 million. In 1996, it was $106 million. That is a lot of strength. We pride ourselves in our country on trying to have a level playing field to keep our democracy balanced.

Under our Constitution, it is very clear that we cannot keep people from spending their own money however they wish to spend it. I will not argue that point ever. That is their constitutional right. They have a constitutional right to try to buy the office, but they do not have a constitutional right to resell it. That is what my part of this amendment attempts to prevent, so a candidate can spend his or her own money but there would be a limit on the amount that candidate could go out and raise to pay himself or herself back.

My amendment and the amendment of Senator DEWINE and Senator DOMENICI is $250,000. If a big State should have more, certainly I would look at what is reasonable. I want a level playing field. I want people to be able to spend their own money, but they need to know they are doing it because that is what they want to do, not because when they win they will be able to go out and repay themselves, so it is not a risk they have to take.

I have put my own money in campaigns in the past and I have taken the hit for it. A lot of people in this body have. It is a risk. It is a risk I was willing to take. It happened to be a risk I lost. Other people have been able to do that. Some have lost, some have won. I never repaid myself the full amount that I loaned. I think we need to have the level playing field.

We have a constitutional right to spend our money. No one argues that. I do believe a retired police officer or retired teacher should be able to run for

public office on a level playing field and get the variety of support from his or her constituents and have as level a playing field as we can have protecting the rights of the wealthy candidate to spend that money, but limiting what could be paid back.

I thank Senator DOMENICI and Senator DEWINE who have worked so hard on their amendment. Their amendment includes other ways of leveling the playing field by letting the other candidates have no limits or bigger limits. I think that is fine, too. The point is, everyone would like to see the most level playing field we can find, the most numbers of contributors who care about this candidate being able to get behind someone and have a fair chance of getting the message out. That is what my part of this amendment does.

I thank all colleagues for coming together on an amendment, an amendment I hope will work. If for some reason this amendment goes down, I hope my amendment, which I introduced as a bill 2 years ago, I hope it prevails and we will be able to work something out as we go through the 2 weeks of debating this bill that will be fair and that will give everyone a chance to have the support of the biggest number of people and contributors in a person's home State, to have the ability to get a message out that the people can decide if they like or don't like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one of the advantages of having been around here a while is I remember when this idea first surfaced by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in the late 1980s. He correctly identified this at that time as one of the significant problems developing. Now, some 13 or 14 years later, we are finally getting an opportunity to address one of the significant issues, one of the significant problems in our current campaign system.

One, obviously, is the hard money contribution money limit being set at $1,000, back when a Mustang cost $2,700 which only exacerbated the problem Senator DOMENICI is talking about because it is harder for a nonwealthy candidate to compete, given the eroding contribution limit.

The other, obviously, is the cost of reaching the voters, the television time. That, I am sure, will be discussed in the course of this 2-week debate.

I thank Senator DOMENICI for his important work on this over a lengthy period of time and congratulate Senator DEWINE for his contribution and the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, for her contribution as well.

This is an important amendment. It will advance this debate in the proper direction, and given the support of Senator DURBIN and others on the other side of the aisle, we look forward to its passage later in the day.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I clarify that our amendment takes place in the future. It does not jeopardize someone who based his or her actions on the law as it is today, but for the future, when everyone is on notice this law would then take effect if the amendment passes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Parliamentary inquiry: Under the unanimous consent agreement, a vote must occur on an amendment, if not this amendment, at 12:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, there are up to 3 hours of debate after which a vote on an amendment in relation to the amendment shall occur.

Mr. DODD. Further inquiry: I presume the time will begin to toll once the amendment is introduced, and the fact there is no amendment pending per se, other than the one we are discussing, the time is not really tolling; is that correct or am I incorrect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By consent, the time has been charged.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The time began to run on the amendment when the discussion began at what time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Nine-fifty.

Mr. DOMENICI. If I could explain.

Mr. DODD. Certainly.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senators involved in this with their staff worked very late last night. The amendment is very complicated and it is being drafted, and it has just been received. We cannot help that. It is now being looked at and it is practically ready. It is a very lengthy amendment. They think they have found some unintended words and they are trying to fix that.

We have been explaining the amendment. Senator DEWINE explained the state-by-state formula very much in detail. I explained the intent and the basic ideas, and as soon as we get it, we will introduce it and then there will be additional time until we vote.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague.

That raises a concern. I have been around long enough to sense when something will happen. I get a sense this amendment will be adopted and maybe by some significant numbers based on the sponsorships and the statements made.

I will oppose the amendment. I may be the only person opposing it, but I am deeply worried about it. The mere fact that we will vote in an hour on a highly complicated, very lengthy amendment that goes to a significant issue in this debate, and I cannot look at it, is an indication of the kind of trouble we may be getting ourselves into.

I appreciate the constraints of the managers and the leadership to move this debate along. However, I am troubled. Let me state why. I have great respect for the authors. We are trying to accomplish something. I have been, myself, a candidate with an opponent who announced they would spend significant millions of their own money against me, so I am not unfamiliar with facing a challenger who has great personal wealth. However, it seems to me this is what I would call incumbency protection. We are all incumbents in the Senate. We raise money all the time during our incumbency. I suspect most sitting Members who have some intention of running again have amassed something between $½ million and $1 million. If you have been here for a couple of years, I suspect you have done that. If you have been here longer, I know colleagues have amounts in excess of $3, $5, and $7 million sitting in accounts, earning interest, waiting for the next time they run.

I don't like the idea of a multimillionaire going out and writing checks and running, I suppose. I understand the law. The Constitution says if an individual in this country wants to spend his or her money that way, there is nothing we can do here to stop them. What you are trying to do is level the playing field.

It isn't exactly level, in a sense, when we are talking about incumbents who have treasuries of significant amounts and the power of the office which allows us to be in the press every day, if we want. We can send franked mail to our constituents at no cost to us. It is a cost of the taxpayer. We do radio and television shows. We can go back to our States with subsidized airfares. We campaign all across our jurisdictions.

The idea that somehow we are sort of impoverished candidates when facing a challenger who may decide they are going to take out a loan, and not necessarily even have the money in the account but may decide to mortgage their house—I don't recommend that as a candidate. But there are people who do it. They go out and mortgage their homes. I presume if you mortgage your house, that is money in your account. It is not distinguished in this amendment. You go into debt.

For people who decide they want to do that and meet that trigger, all of a sudden that allows me as an incumbent to raise, I guess, $3 million at one level, $3,000 at one level, and $6,000 at another. The gates are open, and the race is on.

I am just worried that we are going in the absolute opposite direction of what the McCain-Feingold bill is designed to do.

Again, I find it somewhat ironic that we are here deeply worried about the capital that can be raised and the candidate who is going to spend a million dollars of his own money to level the playing field. But those who oppose this bill don't have any difficulty with that same individual writing out a million-dollar check in soft money, in a

sense. It is somewhat of a contradiction to suggest somehow that we are going to protect ourselves against that million-dollar giver and we don't have anything here to restrain this million-dollar giver in soft money. I find that somewhat ironic.

Again, I respect those who fundamentally disagree with McCain-Feingold. I don't agree with their arguments, but they have an argument to be made.

It seems to me if we are going to go that route to do so, but the idea that all of a sudden we raise the threshold of hard money to $3,000 and $6,000 for an incumbent sitting with a treasury of significant money on hand, even though you may not be personally wealthy, but the fact is that you have this kind of money in your accounts—why not suggest, then, if you are an incumbent and, in the case of Wyoming, you go to $500,000, whatever the trigger is, I say to the Presiding Officer, or the Senator from Connecticut or California—if I have that amount of money in my treasury, why not let the challenger, in a sense, reach the $3,000 and $6,000 level of individual contributions in order to challenge me if I have it not in my own personal account but in my political account?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. First of all, there is no soft money in this amendment.

Mr. DODD. I understand that. My point was those who oppose the bill feel as though individuals ought to be able to make whatever contributions they want in soft money. I was making the observation as a contradiction.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I also say to you, if you are worried about the person who wants to put in their own money, and it will trigger raising the personal caps, you understand that before we are finished with the McCain amendment, it is going to be amended in terms of caps. Caps aren't going to remain at $1,000. You understand the caps are going to be raised.

Mr. DODD. I understand some are going to try to do that. I am not going to support it. But I understand there will be an effort to do that.

Mr. DOMENICI. It will happen because that $1,000 is 26 years old with no interest or inflation added, and it remains the most significant cap on Senators and Representatives. And it is too low. You have to spend all your time raising money, which is the other side of the equation. If it gets raised, also the person who had an idea of putting his own money in can look at it again and say, well, if I can raise $3,000, or $6,000, whatever it is changed to, and the PACs are changed to double, it might be that they will choose not to put their own money in because they could actually have a shot at financing.

When you put in all of the negatives that exist today in terms of the bias of big money, I think this bill is a good effort to try to equalize that. Is it equal in every respect? No, it is not. Does it take care of the fact that an incumbent may have already raised some money? No.

But let me tell you when you have a situation that says to somebody who is, as was defined here, a super spender, who gets up into the 10's, 20's, 30's, 40's, or 50's of the super spenders, to tell you the truth, I don't have an awful lot of concern about them, in fact, not having a fair shake in this election. They are going to spend enough money to make sure they do. They know that. They assess it and their money. They say they are going to put in whatever is necessary to get a fair shake.

I am more worried about them putting in their money and the person running against them, say, in the northeastern United States, is not an incumbent; the person running is a challenger. There is no way, under current law, that person could raise enough money to become known and do what somebody who spends $40 million can. That is the kind of person I am worried about.

Mr. DODD. That very race that I think my colleague is talking about was a fairly close race in the end. I can think of two specifically where, in fact, the individual raising that kind of money became a liability, and they lost.

I would like to reclaim my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would like to ask you about one other subject.

I think you should know what we are doing, respectfully, which is to say that anybody who puts in their own money, however they got their own money, when they get elected, they cannot use their Senate seat to raise money to pay off what they put in an election. You raised one where somebody mortgages their house and puts in the money. If they mortgage their house, they still have to put in this threshold money, which is a lot of money to be from a home mortgage.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that.

I come back to my point. I know there are super wealthy candidates. I guarantee that there are a lot more incumbents sitting with super treasuries seeking reelection than there are individuals with vast amounts of money seeking Senate seats. We have them, but it doesn't automatically mean that they are guaranteed a seat. You see it in several jurisdictions.

My colleagues know what I am talking about and know the races specifically that I am referring to where millions of dollars was spent by individuals who financed their own campaigns, and they lost. In fact, I think they lost in no small measure because people were somewhat disgusted by the fact that they were giving the impression of buying a Senate seat. The mere fact you write checks out of your own personal account does not guarantee you a seat in the Senate.

We are clearly moving in the wrong direction. My issue is not that there is too little money in politics. I think there is too much. I hear my colleagues say the $1,000 needs to be increased. My big worry is what happens to that $25 contributor, the $50 or $100 contributor who we used to rely on and call upon to help support these candidates? We don't pay attention to them anymore. We spend all of our time looking for the large contributors.

By the way, a large contributor is $1,000 in my book or, a person who gives $2,000. Now we are going to raise it to $3,000 and $6,000 with the mere suggestion that you might finance $500,000 or $1 million in a Senate election.

So the doors are open. Now the argument is made that we have done it here and we ought to do it over there for the other side as well. All of a sudden, we have opened the gates, and we are up to $3,000, and $6,000, and forget about that $50 contributor, that small individual we are trying to engage in the political life of America. They are not going to get any attention whatsoever. My view is that is dangerous. I think it is worthwhile that people are invested in the political life of America with their time and their financial resources. I have no objection whatsoever to the idea that people write a check to support candidates of their choice for State, local and national office.

What I find deeply troubling is that they no longer will be solicited because their contribution doesn't amount to anything because we are going to go after the big-dollar givers, the $3,000 giver and the $6,000 giver. What percentage of Americans can actually do that?

If we are financing elections across the board for the House and the Senate by only soliciting those kinds of contributions, or at least the bulk of those people, I think we are putting our democracy in peril.

I understand the concern my colleagues and incumbents have about facing the wealthy opponent. But I don't think that concern should outweigh our determination to try to reduce the amount of money that is entering political life in America.

By adopting this amendment, as much as I empathize and understand the concerns my colleagues have, it looks to me as though all we are doing is trying to protect ourselves rather than trying to level that playing field.

If I am the only one to oppose it, I will do so.

Despite the good intentions of the authors of this amendment, I think it takes us in exactly the wrong direction. I think it makes a mockery of McCain-Feingold. I think we are beginning to just shred that piece of legislation. I know there is a strong determination to get a bill, but a bill that

has McCain-Feingold's name on it, and ends up doing what this amendment would do, I do not think deserves the label it might otherwise get.

With that, Mr. President, I will oppose the amendment and yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, he will not be the only person opposing this amendment. I thank him for his eloquent, extraordinarily lucent description of this amendment and what it may mean. He is right on the mark. I share his sympathy, his empathy, for those who may be faced in the future with the circumstances some of our colleagues already have been faced with—running against a well-financed, independently wealthy opponent.

I think the Senator from Connecticut puts his finger exactly on the problem. This moves us away from limiting the money in the system. This ''cure'' creates even more financial pitfalls and political difficulties than the current system.

This amendment, however well intentioned, has three major problems. First, and foremost, it is an amendment that will create different standards in different States. As a result of the different standards that are created, most likely it will be declared unconstitutional. It will allow different candidates to raise different levels of money in different States depending upon circumstances. I cannot imagine that a system so confusing and biased could be upheld in any court of law. I cannot imagine that any court would look favorably at this inequitable distribution of opportunity.

Secondly, this puts even more political power in the hands of fewer and fewer people. When we began this debate we were trying to address this very problem—the concentration of political power in a wealthy few. Even with the limits as they were in the last election, almost half of all total contributions to Senate candidates came from donors who gave at least $1,000. So if the individual contribution limits now are raised to $3,000 or $6,000, or even higher if the underlying individual limits are changed by this amendment process, we know wealthy donors are going to control the field even more. Why we would want to do that in the name of campaign reform, I do not know?

I heard somebody say this is in the spirit of McCain-Feingold. This flies in the face of McCain-Feingold. There is nothing in the spirit of McCain-Feingold in this amendment. This is not reform. This makes a mockery of reform.

Finally, I cannot imagine why the compromise has not addressed one of the real problems that I see in this approach, which is that if an incumbent has $5 million in the bank or even $10 million in the bank, and his opponent declares that they want to spend some of their own money to mount a vigorous challenge, the incumbent gets to take advantage of the raised individual contribution limits. In my state of South Dakota, if my opponent wanted to spend over $686,000 of their own money, I could take advantage of the new limits even if I might have $5 in the bank myself. If the same forces that want to pass this amendment turn around and triple the underlying contribution limits, I would be able to go out and raise as much as $18,000 from every individual who wants to contribute to my campaign.

How is that fair? Regardless of what money we may have in the bank, how is it we would not look at that? Just because I might have a wealthy opponent, should I be allowed to open up the floodgates here and take whatever money I can raise? How is that limiting the influence of money? No, instead this protects incumbents. How is that in the spirit of McCain-Feingold? How can we seriously look at anybody and argue that this legislation benefits the true spirit and intent of what it is we are trying to do today?

I think the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the Senator from Connecticut, has articulately put his finger on the problem. We have to oppose this if we really want to support meaningful campaign finance reform. Do not let anybody out there tell you that somehow, by supporting this, we are moving in the right direction. This moves us down the wrong track. We ought to oppose it. It ought to be defeated. I support McCain-Feingold, but I do not support this.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Connecticut. I am convinced that if he wants to offer an amendment to the Domenici amendment that says these amounts we are talking about for self-funded candidates also apply to incumbents who have those amounts in their existing campaign funds, I would be happy to support such a modification of the Domenici amendment.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague would yield, my fear is once we have done that, we are raising, of course, the hard limits, which takes us, as far as I am concerned, in the wrong direction with the bill. I respect those who say they are going to be raised anyway. But my concern is that if we keep on ratcheting up those levels, then we are running contrary to what I hope are the underlying motivations behind the underlying bill.

So I merely pointed it out to show the inconsistency in someone's personal wealth and a person's political wealth. We are applying one standard on personal wealth and not the same standard on political wealth.

I appreciate the point. Someone else may offer the amendment. But I thank the Senator for raising the point.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Connecticut is exactly right. The reason I would support that is I am one of those who would increase the limits. So this gives us an opportunity to support the increase in limits in a number of other ways. But I appreciate this debate.

I will repeat what I said yesterday about my own experience, because I ran against a self-funded, wealthy candidate. If I had been under the restrictions of the present law, let alone the restrictions of McCain-Feingold, I would never have gotten anywhere in the primary. The only way I was able to compete in the primary was to spend my own money and match the money that was being spent by a wealthy opponent.

As I said yesterday, and repeat for my friend from Connecticut, who has an interest in Utah politics, my opponent—making the point of the Senator from Connecticut—outspent me three to one and lost. So that the expenditure of huge sums does not automatically result in somebody being elected.

But, nonetheless, his willingness to spend $40 a vote in that primary made it impossible for anybody to challenge him unless it was, as it turned out, a self-funded candidate who would come along and spend $15 a vote. And that is about how it worked out. Actually, I do not think I spent quite that much per vote. But he spent $6 million. I spent less than $2 million. I was able to get enough to get my message out and win, but if I had to raise that less than $2 million, at $1,000 a person, I guarantee you, I would not have been able to compete in any way. That is why I am sympathetic to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to colleagues, I will be relatively brief. I do not have the full context of this amendment and this debate, but my understanding is that this amendment is very similar to the amendment we voted on last night. I would like to repeat some statistics I presented last night that I think apply.

Right now, do you know how many citizens contribute $200—just $200 or more? One quarter of 1 percent. One-quarter of 1 percent of the people in this country contribute over $200. Do you know how many people contribute over $1,000? One-ninth of 1 percent of

the population. Do you know the reason? Because a whole lot of people cannot afford to give that kind of money to campaigns.

What we have here is an amendment that purports to improve the situation by now creating a situation where you have people who are wealthy and have their own financial resources and finance their own campaigns now challenged by people who are viable because they are dependent upon people who are wealthy and have financial resources.

The contest is between the wealthy with financial resources versus the people who have access and are dependent upon the wealthy with financial resources. And this is called a reform? If the first thing we do on the floor of the Senate is pass an amendment to put yet more money into American politics, I don't think people will find that all that reassuring.

I say this because the more I follow this debate, the more convinced I am that public financing is the answer. From the time I came here, this has always been a core question. Bill Moyers, who is a hero journalist to me, gave a speech and sent me a copy of ''The Soul of Democracy,'' in which he argues basically what is at stake is a noble, beautiful, bold experiment, over 220 or 230 years, of self-rule. That is what is at stake, our capacity for self-rule.

If you are worried about what to do about millionaires or multimillionaires running their own campaigns with their own resources, the way to deal with that is to have a clean money, clean election, have a system of public financing. We have seen some States such as Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Arizona lead the way on this, where basically people all contributed to a fund. Then you say, to abide by agreed-upon spending limits, you get public financing. Basically the people themselves, who have contributed $5 or whatever per year in a State or in the country, they control the elections in their government and the capital and all the rest. It is much more of clean politics.

If someone says, no, I won't abide by that because I have zillions of dollars, and I will just finance my own campaign and go way beyond the expenditure limits, then out of that clean money/clean election fund, money is given to the candidate who has agreed to abide by this to match that. That would be the direction in which you would go.

I don't know why Senators are so concerned about wealthy people running for office and financing their own campaigns and basically clobbering everybody else because they have the money. If this is the concern of my colleagues, they should embrace public financing. That is what we want. Then we have a system that is honest, clean, and which basically says all the people in the country contribute a small amount. We are willing to abide by this. As to those candidates who don't, who when they run finance their own campaigns, there is additional money to match that. That is the direction in which we should go.

Before I take a question from my colleague, I want to say that one of the amendments I will bring to the floor is an amendment—it is an interesting proposition based upon an Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Minnesota—that says: You change three words in Federal election law and you make it possible for any State that so desires to apply some system of public financing, whatever the States decide it is, not just to State elections but to Federal elections. If Utah wants to do it or the people in Minnesota want to do it and they vote for it or the legislature votes for it, then they ought to be able to do it. We don't tell them what to do. We just say that if a State wants to apply some system of public financing, some kind of clean money, clean election to Federal races, they should be able to do so. That would be an amendment that goes in the direction we are going to have to go.

McCain-Feingold is very important and should not be watered down because I think it is an important step in the right direction. However, I cannot believe that what we have here—and I am very worried this is a harbinger of what is to come—is an amendment that says we are going to vote for reform. We are going to now put more money into politics. Those of you who run for office, here is the way we will create a level playing field. You can be even more dependent upon the top one-quarter of 1 percent that now you can get $6,000 from or $5,000 from, or wherever you want to take the spending limit, in which case we are even more dependent on those folks; they have more clout, even more power.

And that is called reform. I just don't get it. Later on, there is going to be an amendment to raise campaign limits from 1 to 3 and 2 to 6—unbelievable.

One more time—then I will take a question from my colleague—one-quarter of 1 percent of Americans made a contribution greater than $200 in the 1996 cycle—probably about the same in the 2000 cycle—.11 percent, one-ninth of 1 percent of the voting-age population, gave $1,000 or more. We are not talking about the population but the voting-age population. Now you are going to give wealthy citizens even more clout? You are going to give them an even greater capacity to affect elections and call this reform?

I yield for a question from my colleague.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank my friend. Since he has raised the issue of public financing in the campaign, I ask him if he would explain how the public financing would work with respect to special interest groups that raise their own money and run their own ads. We saw in the last election, for example, groups such as the Sierra Club and the National Rifle Association become very active in politics. We are no longer in a position where it is just Republicans running against Democrats, as far as the airwaves are concerned, but a whole host of groups.

I ask the Senator, would he support public financing for political ads for even the Sierra Club or the National Rifle Association?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I appreciate the question. There is a three-part answer. You know I am long-winded. The first part is that you could have additional public financing to match that. The second part is that the amendment we are talking about here doesn't deal with that problem either. My colleague is raising yet another issue. I agree, it is a serious issue, but this amendment doesn't address that problem. My colleague can raise this question, but it doesn't make a lot of sense in the context of this amendment. That is yet a whole separate issue with which we have to deal.

My third point concerns another amendment I am thinking of which gets at part of the problem he is raising. I am very worried that what we are going to have is a bigger problem with the Hagel proposal. As much as I respect my colleague from Nebraska, I plan to be in vigorous opposition against it. I am worried that if you do the prohibition on the soft money, it is going to shift to the sham ads, whoever is running those ads. The Senator mentioned some organizations. I could mention others. I am worried about that. It is like jello; you put your finger here and it just shifts to over here.

In the McCain-Feingold bill, you deal with labor and you deal with corporations. I am very worried that there will be a proliferation of all sorts of organizations, and labor and corporations with good lawyers will figure out basically how to make sure that their soft money also goes into this.

I would like to go back to the original McCain-Feingold formulation, which was in the bill that passed the House, to say that you have that 60-day prohibition on soft money applied to all those sham ads, which I would say to my colleague from Utah would be a very positive step.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator for his response. I agree with him that my question didn't have anything to do with the amendment. It was stimulated by the Senator's endorsement of Federal funding. I thank him for his response. I am prepared to debate the other issues he raises in the appropriate context. I think we are both getting far away from the amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I don't think the first 75 percent of what I said was at all far away from it. Again, we have an

amendment that purports to be reform. The message to people in the country is, we are going to spend yet more money. Now we move from millionaires who can finance their own campaigns against people who are dependent upon millionaires who can give them ever larger and larger contributions, with the top 1 percent of the population having more clout, more influence, more say. I don't view that as reform.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I can remember the first time I went to New York City—amazing things to me—those tall buildings, those people—you know, being from Nevada—teams of people milling around. But I have to acknowledge probably the most fascinating thing I saw was these people on the street playing these games. They would try to entice people to play. I learned later it was a shell game. I watched with fascination because nobody could ever win. No matter what you did, you always picked the wrong place for that little object they were trying to hide.

I say that because I think that is what is happening with campaign finance reform. In 1987, I came to the Senate floor saying: We have to do something about campaign finance reform; we can't have another election like I have just been through.

Well, I have been through two subsequent elections, and each has been progressively worse, as far as money.

Over these years, each time we were going to bring up campaign finance reform, I looked with great expectation for the system to be made better. But like the shell game I saw in New York, you never picked the right spot. It was always gone when you got there, and we never did get to campaign finance reform. I can see that is what is happening today.

All last week, I was kind of elated because Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD had worked to get their legislation on the floor. I felt there was movement and that we could finally do something—if nothing more, get rid of soft money. Based on what happened last night, and I see what is happening today, I am very disappointed. I can't see, with all due respect to my friends—and they are my friends, the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Arizona—how in the world they could support this amendment. If we are talking about campaign finance reform, this is going in the opposite direction, as has been so well put by the manager of the bill on our side, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the senior Senator from Connecticut.

The shell game is being played here. This is not campaign finance reform. I may not think the underlying campaign finance reform bill of McCain and Feingold is perfect, but it is something I can support. The Senator from Connecticut is not going to be alone. We already know he has a vote from the Senator from South Dakota, the Democratic leader. I acknowledged last night I wasn't going to vote for this thing. If we are going to have campaign finance reform, we are going to have campaign finance reform.

As the Senator from Connecticut said, just because it has the name ''McCain-Feingold'' on it doesn't mean it is campaign finance reform. We keep moving away from it. I don't know how anybody can support the underlying bill. I want to support campaign finance reform. I have wanted to support it since 1987. I have spoken on this floor as much as any other person about campaign finance reform. But today, again, I see the shell game. I hope that I am wrong.

Yesterday, I acknowledged the great work of the Senators from Wisconsin and Arizona in moving this bill forward. I don't, in any way, want to imply anything negative other than disagreeing with the point of this legislation. But I want to say that I think the senior Senator from Kentucky has been masterful. I say that in the most positive sense. He has been one of the few people who has been willing to stand up and speak his mind. We have a lot of people who are doing things behind the scenes to try to deep-six this bill, but the Senator from Kentucky has never backed down a second, and I admire him. I disagree with him, but I admire him for what he has done. In my estimation, I think he has done very good legislating. I don't agree with him, but I have the greatest respect and even admiration for the way he stood up when few people would oppose this legislation, and he did that. I respect that.

Mr. President, we should acknowledge what is happening here. This underlying McCain-Feingold legislation is slowly evaporating, and we are going to wind up with something else. It may have the name, but it is not going to be what I wanted to vote for.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that time be equally charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me briefly respond to my friends and colleagues from Connecticut, South Dakota, and Nevada in regard to this amendment. I certainly respect their opinions and respect their comments.

Mr. President, the fact is that this amendment will enhance free speech. It is true this amendment will move toward a more level playing field and does address a problem that has arisen in the last few years when, because of a constitutionally protected loophole, the wealthy candidate is the only person in the country who can put an unlimited amount of money in a particular campaign—his or her own campaign. Everybody else is limited to $1,000 but not the candidate. So what has happened is there has become a great search every election cycle, where both the Republicans and the Democrats go out and they don't look for people with great ideas. Some mechanics may have great ideas. They don't look necessarily for people with a great deal of experience or who bring other attributes, although a mechanic may have all of those things. What they look for and what the great search around the country is for is people who have money—the more the better. If you can find someone who has that money and is articulate, and they are from a key State or from a State that is getting ready to elect a U.S. Senator, then you have found what you were looking for.

There is an inequity in the current system. But that is not why this amendment is being offered, and that is not why we should vote for this amendment. We should not be concerned about the candidate who is running against the millionaire, not directly concerned about that candidate. It is not just to level the playing field or to make it more equal. What we should be concerned about is the public and whether the public will have the benefit of a free debate, free-flowing debate, a debate where both candidates have the ability to get their ideas out.

This amendment enhances free speech, and it does it in a very rational way. Again, I point out to my colleagues who have come to the floor to criticize this amendment, this amendment does not allow soft money. This amendment deals with very regulated, very much disclosed hard money. It basically builds on the current system. Where there is the most accountability in the system today, and where we have had the fewest problems today is with hard money and with individual donors.

That is what this amendment builds on. It simply says that a person who is faced with a millionaire putting his or her own money into the campaign has the opportunity, because of this amendment, to go out and raise money from many people. When they raise that money, in each case it will be disclosed very quickly. It will be open to public scrutiny. It will all be very much above board, and the end result will be not that the candidate who is the millionaire will have a smaller megaphone—that millionaire who is putting in his or her own money will have the same megaphone they had before this amendment—but what it

means is that the candidate who is facing that multimillionaire will also have the opportunity to have a bigger megaphone, to grow that megaphone if, in fact, he or she can go out and convince enough people to make individual contributions. That is what this amendment does.

Will it put more money into the political system? Yes, it will put more money into the political system. I maintain, however, that the effect of that money will be to enhance the first amendment and not diminish the first amendment. It will be to enhance people's ability to communicate and get a message across without in any way hurting someone else's ability—namely, the millionaire—to get their message across.

My colleague and friend, the minority leader, talked about the differences between the States. I understand what his perspective is, but I think, based upon the State he is from, he understands there is a fundamental difference between the expenditure of $1 million, or let's say half a million dollars, in South Dakota and a half a million dollars in the State of Ohio. The half a million dollars in South Dakota has a lot more impact than a half a million dollars in the State of Ohio. It seems to me it is incumbent upon us to make that distinction.

How do we do it? First, I will talk about how we do not do it.

We do not make any difference in regard to whether there is a multiple of three or multiple of six. We do not change that among the States. We do not change the categories among the States, but what we do say is that in a smaller State, when the millionaire puts in a certain amount of money, that money does have more of an impact in that smaller State than it has in a larger State and, therefore, we start the process earlier and we kick it in earlier.

For example—and this is the chart my colleagues have—I will take the first State, and that is the State of Wyoming. Recognizing the difference that money has in Wyoming versus Ohio, we provide that the first threshold, which means you can raise $3,000 from a donor instead of $1,000 from a donor, that is triggered in Wyoming when the millionaire, the person who is self-financing their campaign, puts in $328,640. The candidate who is running against the millionaire in Wyoming would then have the opportunity to raise three times the limit for each donor, which is $3,000.

In Ohio, we do not reach that threshold until that self-financed candidate has put in $974,640. There is a difference in the impact that money has in one State versus the impact in another State. We do not even kick that in until that person has put in close to $1 million in the State of Ohio.

It makes eminent sense to do it this way. It has been well thought out, and, frankly, it enhances the chance that a court will look at this and say, yes, that is a rational approach.

Again, this is an amendment that has a lot of protections built in, and probably the most important one was added last night. That was the concept that a wealthy candidate should not in any way be disadvantaged by the fact that he or she is exercising their constitutional right to put their own money into a campaign.

How do we ensure that? We ensure it by simply saying that the amount of money the nonwealthy candidate can raise above the normal caps will be limited to the amount of money that the wealthy candidate puts in. If the wealthy candidate puts in $5 million, the nonwealthy candidate can only raise, with the enhanced caps from individuals, a total of that up to $5 million.

It guarantees the wealthy candidate will not be disadvantaged, that he or she will not have a smaller megaphone and there will not be a disincentive for them to actually put their own money into the campaign.

They will still have the ability to do that. They will not be penalized if they do that, but what it says is when that does happen, when the wealthy candidate does contribute a significant amount of money to his or her own campaign, then the nonwealthy candidate can go back, as a practical matter, to previous donors and try to get them to give an additional $1,000, $2,000, or $3,000, depending on where they are.

It is a lot of work. It is something that is not easily done. It is something that will make sure there are more and more people involved in giving money, will involve more people in the process, and will enhance freedom of speech.

In summary, this is a well-crafted amendment. It is an amendment that deals in a constitutional way with a problem of perception, and that perception is that someone today who is wealthy enough can buy a seat in the Senate. We know that may or may not be true in a particular case, and we also know that many people who are wealthy and who are self-financed are fine people and fine candidates. That is not the issue.

What this amendment is aimed at dealing with is the perception, and the perception that someone can buy a seat in the Senate with their own money. It begins to level that playing field. It makes it more competitive. It enhances free speech, and it does not diminish in any way what that wealthy candidate can say or do or their ability to get their message out, but enables the person who is not wealthy to also get their message out. We have done it, I think, in a rational way.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, after a long night and legislative counsel drafting this amendment and then all of our collective staffs working on it to make sure we had a draft we could offer, we are now at that point. This amendment may need some technical and drafting changes as we move through this process, and that will be done.

Essentially, Senator DEWINE has explained the technical part of this bill. I want to, once again, talk about why this bill is imperative for the United States.

While we are here on the floor debating a McCain bill to change the campaign laws of America because we are concerned about excess money coming from sources—soft money, hard money, too much of this, too much of that—and I am not sure I agree with everyone, but I am saying where we are there is a new and growing situation that involves this amendment and what we are trying to do. That is the right of wealthy Americans, men or women, to spend as much of their own money as they desire in a campaign. Nobody is going to change that. This amendment cannot change that. The Supreme Court has said that is a right.

That right is being exercised in growing numbers by those who put not a few thousand, not a few million, but tens of millions of dollars of their own money into campaigns.

What is wrong with that is not that they can put up $10 million, but their opponent is bound by 26-year-old caps that are so low that to match somebody who puts $10 million of their own money in, in a middle-size State, the opposition must spend days upon days seeking $1,000 contributions per election and seeking $5,000 per election from political action committees.

I never have figured out how much a person would have to spend of their time to match a $10 million contribution from a wealthy person or superwealthy contribution. It is an enormous amount of time. It is frequently fruitless because you can't raise enough money to match.

I am not concerned today about making sure the candidate who puts up millions is treated precisely as the person running against him, whether the person is incumbent or otherwise. However, what we do is say the man or woman running against the big contributor—the $5 million, the $3 million, the $20 million, we even had over $50 million of their own money spent—the opposition candidate has to have a change in those $1,000 cap restraints and the $1,000 has to be raised substantially. The hard money that can come from parties has to also be changed substantially so the person running against a wealthy candidate who spends a lot of their own—and I just described that; the other side of the aisle described it also, somebody on the

other side of the aisle said as much as $50 million—in a simple way raise the level of funding that the opponent can raise from the American people, citizens of their State and from their party. That is fair. If it turns out in the process you do not match equal dollars, that is all right with this Senator. We tried very hard to make sure the person running against the wealthy candidate gets a fair share.

AMENDMENT NO. 115

I send an amendment to the desk for myself, Senators DEWINE, DURBIN, ENSIGN, FEINSTEIN, and COLLINS, and I ask it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 115.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe we have agreed we will vote at 12:15.

Mr. DODD. If I can make a point, my concern is that I don't know if I have the final version of this amendment. I gather still technical changes are being made as we stand here. I count 20 pages to this amendment. Am I right, roughly 20 pages?

Mr. DOMENICI. It is 12 pages.

Mr. DODD. We are just getting an amendment that raises hard money caps, based on triggers and formulas from 50 States. I am uneasy about this body taking on an amendment such as this without knowing the implications and going directly contrary to the thrust. While the bill focuses on soft money, many believe the issue of the amount of money in campaigns, raising this limit makes it that much easier later on for people to raise the caps on hard dollars. Nothing in here provides for the challenger who faces the incumbent with how many millions they may have in their own political account.

I am troubled by this body on a matter such as this, when hardly a speed-reader would have time to read this amendment, understand it, digest it, and adopt it all in the next 10 minutes. It is troubling to me. I understand the need to move along. I oppose this amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Connecticut, the choice is between 12:15 and 12:50. We debated it 3 hours yesterday and we debated it for 3 hours this morning. We can agree to vote at 12:15 or vote at 12:50.

Mr. LEVIN. When he says ''agree to vote,'' are you assuming there is a vote to—a motion to table either side?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am not assuming anything.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me say the current version of this amendment represents a significant improvement over where it was last night for a number of reasons.

First, last night's version did not keep a cap on contributions once the trigger was triggered. The extra contributions triggered on but did not trigger off. This version intends to trigger off the extra increased contributions when the limit of the declaration of the wealthy person is reached. That is a significant improvement. That is consistent with the purpose of McCain-Feingold—limits, trying to hang on to limits for dear life.

Those limits have been blown by the soft money loophole and this current version—and it is an improvement over the earlier version—at least restores limits because you are not just triggering on the increases from $1,000 to $3,000 or $1,000 to $6,000. You then trigger off the increases when the declared amount by the wealthy self-financed person is made or is reached, either one. That is an improvement.

Second, I think the variation among the States is an improvement.

However, there is still a major problem, and I will address my friend from New Mexico and Ohio on this problem. In the effort to level the playing field in one area, we are making the playing field less level in another area under this language. As the Senators from Connecticut and Nevada, and the Democratic leader, have pointed out, the playing field will be less level for the challenger. For instance, the challenger, who might want to put $1 million into the campaign, is self-financed to that extent. He or she may mortgage a home to get the $1 million so that he or she is able to compete against the incumbent, where the incumbent has $5 million in a campaign account. We make that situation less level, not more level, because the incumbent is able to then raise money at the higher contribution levels.

It seems to me that is a significant flaw which we should attempt to address, and we should attempt to address it in this amendment before we vote on it.

Now, the only way we can offer a second-degree amendment to a pending amendment under our unanimous consent is if the motion to table is made and fails. That is the only way in which a second-degree amendment can be offered. Since this is complicated language which is being presented to the Senate at this hour with very little opportunity for many Members to read it or think through it, I suggest we do one of two things. We either amend the unanimous consent in this case so we can vote after we have had a chance to second degree it, or at least consider the language so we can determine if we want to second degree the amendment. If that is not acceptable to the proponents, it seems to me we should move to table, the motion to table will be defeated, and then it will be open to a second-degree amendment. Since that is the only way in which anybody who wants to offer an amendment in the second degree can offer it, it seems to me that is an appropriate way to proceed.

Let me summarize, I think this amendment is an improvement over what we began with in a number of ways. We have a trigger off as well as a trigger on. That is a plus. And there is variety among the States. That is a plus. However, it creates an unlevel field. As the Senator from Connecticut pointed out, along with the Senator from Nevada, there is an unlevel playing field which is created, a greater lack of a level playing field in the case of the incumbent who has that campaign fund, who is then being challenged by somebody who can self-finance to the extent of $½ million or $1 million. The incumbent who already has the financial advantage and the incumbency advantage is then also given the advantage of having the higher contribution limits.

The effort to level the playing field in a very appropriate way, as the Senator from Ohio is doing, makes the playing field less level against the challenger.

This would be up to the managers of the bill. But I suggest that the Members of the Senate be able to read this amendment, either delay the vote, or make it open to a second-degree amendment. Or, in the alternative, I suggest that we have a motion to table, which then presumably would be defeated, but which would open up the amendment to being read and considered and to a second-degree amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was talking to the assistant Democratic leader. We agreed that we ought to have this vote at 12:15. It is my understanding, I believe, that he is going to propound a consent agreement for that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this has been cleared with Senator DODD and managers of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that we have a vote on or in relation to this amendment at 12:15, and following that vote, our party recesses would take place. We would be in recess and reconvene at 2:15 today. The next amendment being offered would be a Republican amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean an up-or-down vote on the Domenici amendment?

Mr. REID. No, it doesn't. We are under a unanimous consent agreement. Whatever happens happens.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me raise the issue. If the Democrat amendment is

not tabled, then it is open to second degrees. So the next amendment is not necessarily a Republican amendment.

Mr. REID. The unanimous consent request indicates that if a motion to table is not offered, then it is anybody's opportunity.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If a second-degree amendment were a Democrat amendment, from a parliamentary point of view, we would be potentially in an extended discussion, which is what I see my friend from Michigan smiling about.

What we feared when we entered into this consent agreement in the first place was the potential for anybody who wanted to kind of work mischief and to filibuster a second-degree amendment. I ask my friend from Michigan, is it his intent, then, to second degree the Domenici amendment once it is not tabled, thereby preventing Republicans from offering the next amendment?

Mr. LEVIN. No. I am not intending to prevent Republicans from offering the next first-degree amendment at all. I am not sure I want to offer a second-degree amendment. With an amendment this complex, I want there to be an opportunity for Members to read it, consider it, and decide whether or not to offer a second-degree amendment. I may try to offer a second-degree amendment along the lines that we talked about. In no way am I trying to prevent Republicans from offering amendments.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I don't know whether this is acceptable to the Senator from New Mexico. Since we were debating this issue all day yesterday and have been all day today, there are some Senators who, in order to make progress on the bill, might want to go to another amendment. I am wondering about temporarily laying it aside or staying on this with a motion to table.

Mr. DOMENICI. What would be the status of the Domenici amendment? If we would set it aside, it would be an amendment that has not been tabled, and that is subject to amendment pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. No. Wait a minute. Reserving the right to object, my point is that under the unanimous consent request a pending amendment cannot be a second-degree amendment unless there is a tabling motion. If there is a tabling motion, and that does not prevail, then that amendment is subject to amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I assume we are going to do that right now. Are you going to try to table it? You are going to lose.

Mr. DODD. It can be done in a number of different ways: withhold and lay the amendment aside; then bring up a Republican amendment after the recess lunches and work on this amendment; or vote on this amendment; or have a tabling motion; and, if you do not prevail, then the amendment is subject to future amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, let's continue the discussion for a moment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to proceed. I believe it is 12 pages long. We have counted it. We have had hours in that Cloakroom with staff from every Senator who is interested. The amendment we started with was rather lengthy. We just added to it. But we have added what all of these Senators wanted as if they were sitting in there in terms of modifying the Domenici amendment to make it a real Domenici-DeWine amendment which includes the state-by-state formula that he wants as well as proportionality that other Senators sought.

I want a vote up or down when the time comes. I hope it will come quickly. If it doesn't, we will vote at whatever time this time expires. If somebody wants to table it, I would now, here and now, urge that we not table it. It is a very good amendment. If you want to fix it up, you can fix it up a little bit. It still has to go to conference. But essentially a vote to table this is a vote not to do anything about the growing situation of extremely wealthy Americans using their own money while, for the most part, the person running against him is encumbered by statutes in terms of what they can raise that are totally unreasonable versus a candidate who puts in $10 million, $20 million, $30 million, or $40 million. That is the issue.

At this point, I yield the floor and hope we will vote soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, I say in all due respect to my good friend from New Mexico that you have provisions in here, as I look at this thing, where you have inserts that I can't even find. Insert 301 in someplace, insert from 301—I am looking at an amendment that I can't even follow. With all due respect, this is pretty serious stuff. I need to have a guide to get me through this. You are asking me to vote in a couple of minutes on a 12- or 15-page amendment that is very important. This is a significant amendment.

It seems to me that we ought to take a little time either to get this right or not. But if you are going to rush this thing through without any explanation, I say to colleagues who want to, come over here to see an amendment insert that I can't find.

We ought to vote to table it, or take a little time and then sort this out so at least Members know what they are voting on. But to vote on this right now under these circumstances would be a travesty. It is not the way to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, Mr. President, let me point out a couple of things.

One is we have spent a long time on this issue. Negotiations included virtually every Senator who was interested in this amendment. There are two parliamentary procedures. If the motion to table fails, yes, a second-degree amendment is in order. But a tabling motion to the second-degree amendment also is in order at any time. There is no timeframe.

It is also available to further amendments in the future which could be designed to affect the Domenici-DeWine amendment as well. If this issue is to be revisited with another amendment, it could be done as well. You don't necessarily have to go to a second-degree amendment.

I point out to my colleagues that we have 2 weeks. We have now been on this amendment for a number of hours, depending on at what they are looking. We ought to be able to get this issue resolved quickly and move on to other amendments.

I can understand the frustration of the Senator from Kentucky because he was under the impression that the next amendment would be his amendment, or one of the supporters of his position on the overall bill.

I hope we can have an up-or-down vote with the full and certain knowledge that another amendment to clarify or to change the underlying amendment would be in order at any time, and by having an up-or-down vote, we can move on with the amending process.

I hope my colleagues can understand the logic of that. There is a limitation of time. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the vote will be at 12:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be at 12:15.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Mexico yield 3 minutes?

Mr. President, first, I say that if this amendment is adopted, I want to make it clear, given the concerns raised by the Senator from Connecticut, which I think are legitimate, that we have agreed on working together to work out a technical amendment package that is agreeable to all of us.

We have an agreement as to the concept of the amendment, and we will make sure that if the amendment is added to the bill it reflects our agreement. Without that, I certainly agree with the Senator from Connecticut that there will be problems.

There needs to be changes, and there needs to be some time to evaluate and make the changes.

I thank everyone for all the hard work that was put into this. It is a very complicated issue. Senators have very strong feelings on it. Ever since the Buckley case held that Congress cannot restrict a candidate's spending of his or her own personal wealth, we have struggled and struggled with how to handle the situation where candidates have such disparate, unequal personal fortunes. Understandably, there is a great concern among Members of this body about the possibility of facing a very wealthy challenger. Many of us have had that experience, including myself. To the extent that an incumbent Senator is wealthy, it is very difficult to find a viable challenger.

The amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI yesterday was certainly well intentioned, but it had at least two significant flaws. First, it allowed candidates who faced a wealthy candidate to raise unlimited funds from their contributors under increased limits. It even permitted, in my view, a very serious problem. It even permitted parties to pump unlimited funds into a race based on a situation where somebody would put over $1 million of their own money into a race.

Secondly, it did not recognize the obvious fact that $500,000 of personal spending in Maine is much more significant than $500,000 of personal spending in a State such as California or New York.

I am pleased that we have addressed both of these problems in this compromise. I am not happy with the idea that we are raising individual limits in this way. I believe this sets a dangerous precedent both for the future of this debate and for future debates, but the amendment is much improved, and in the spirit of compromise, I intend to support it.

However, this is not an amendment that I believe is essential to reform. In fact, I would rather see that we address this problem in a different way. But this is a process in which we have to show some flexibility. So while I will vote for it, I fully understand that some very strong supporters of our bill must vote against it. That is fine. I want to assure those who are watching that a vote against this amendment is not, to my mind, an antireform vote.

I also add that with regard to those who have worked so hard on this amendment, especially on the other side of the aisle, if they are successful, I hope those Senators will be part of our reform effort and will join us as this process proceeds with the common goal of passing—I ask for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask the Senator, are you in favor of the amendment or against the amendment?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Let me conclude and say it is essential that those who are a part of adding these items and these new considerations to the bill be part of the solution, which is to pass this legislation without too many amendments that would actually undercut its ability to get through this body and be a good piece of public policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

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

The other side has time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DODD. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I want to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. Would the Senator be open to a question?

This amendment will create a less level playing field in one area; that is, when the incumbent has the large campaign fund, say, of $5 million, and the challenger then puts in $1 million of his own, this opens it up to the incumbent to have the higher contribution limits, which is a tremendous advantage, on top of the incumbency advantage.

Is the Senator from Wisconsin committed to an amendment which would try to correct that deleveling of the playing field that is created by this amendment?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Michigan, I think that is a problem that should be addressed.

Mr. DODD. I yield back whatever time we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 115.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Allard	Collins	Harkin
Allen	Conrad	Hatch
Baucus	Corzine	Helms
Bennett	Craig	Hollings
Bond	Crapo	Hutchinson
Boxer	DeWine	Hutchison
Breaux	Domenici	Inhofe
Brownback	Durbin	Jeffords
Bunning	Ensign	Kerry
Burns	Enzi	Kohl
Campbell	Feingold	Kyl
Carnahan	Feinstein	Landrieu
Chafee	Frist	Levin
Cleland	Gramm	Lott
Clinton	Grassley	Lugar
Cochran	Gregg	McCain
McConnell	Sarbanes	Stevens
Miller	Schumer	Thomas
Murkowski	Sessions	Thurmond
Nelson (FL)	Shelby	Torricelli
Nelson (NE)	Smith (NH)	Voinovich
Nickles	Smith (OR)	Warner
Roberts	Snowe	
Santorum	Specter	

NAYS—30

Akaka	Dorgan	Lincoln
Bayh	Edwards	Mikulski
Biden	Fitzgerald	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Reed
Byrd	Hagel	Reid
Cantwell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Carper	Johnson	Stabenow
Daschle	Kennedy	Thompson
Dayton	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden

The amendment (No. 115) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived——

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, may I make one brief announcement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the next amendment will be offered on the Republican side. I had indicated to my colleague, Senator DODD, it will be either in the area of soft money or an amendment concerning lobbyists. We are going to work that out during lunch. It will be laid down at 2:15 p.m. Of course, the amendment will be laid down at the beginning. We will not have the confusion that surrounded the last amendment, and everyone will be fully apprised of what is in it.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before adjourning, I ask our colleagues, if they have amendments on this bill, to get them to us, and those who are interested in having amendments offered, let us know so we can start to line up these amendments and make sure all interested parties are aware of what amendments are coming. It would be very helpful.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

AMENDMENT NO. 117

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] proposes an amendment numbered 117.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit separate segregated funds and nonconnected political committees from using soft money to subsidize hard dollar fundraising)

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. PROHIBITING SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS FROM USING SOFT MONEY TO RAISE HARD MONEY.

Section 316(b)(2)(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(2)(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that the costs of such establishment, administration, and solicitation may only be paid from funds that are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act''.

SEC. 306. PROHIBITING CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES FROM USING SOFT MONEY TO RAISE HARD MONEY.

Section 323 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) OTHER POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—A political committee described in section 301(4)(A) to which this section does not otherwise apply (including an entity that is directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such a political committee) shall not solicit, receive, direct, transfer, or spend funds that are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act.''.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It is very short. I hope it is very much to the point. I refer to it as a consistency amendment; that is, it brings a degree of consistency to McCain-Feingold that has not been there before.

I must confess I didn't read McCain-Feingold all that carefully in previous debates since I was opposed to it and I was convinced it was going to fail. I opposed it on constitutional grounds. I still feel that way about McCain-Feingold, but there is now a prospect that it might pass. That being the case, I think it appropriate we address some aspects that we perhaps did not look at before.

The fundamental proposition within McCain-Feingold, as I understand it, is that soft money is evil, soft money must be banned, soft money leads to the appearance of corruption, and therefore McCain-Feingold is drafted to eliminate soft money.

As we went through McCain-Feingold carefully, we discovered it does not eliminate all soft money. So my amendment, to be consistent, does eliminate all soft money. Let me be specific as to that which is not eliminated under McCain-Feingold and would be eliminated under my amendment; that is, the use of soft money to pay the administrative expenses of PACs, or political action committees.

I have something of a history with PACs by virtue of the fact at one point in my career I worked for the late and legendary Howard Hughes. Mr. Hughes, or Mr. Hughes' executives, rather, constitute the fathers of PACs because in California, where Mr. Hughes had his operations, they initiated what was at the time a whole new idea in politics. Mr. Hughes' executives were tired of California politicians coming to them and saying: We want political contributions. So they said: Let's do something different. Come to our plant and address our employees, and when you have finished addressing our employees, we will pass out envelopes and pledge cards to our employees and they can pledge money to you or to your opponent, depending on how they received your presentation when they were there.

To my knowledge—and I can be corrected on this—this was the beginning of a political action committee. I can remember when I was employed by the Hughes organization, every politician in California wanted to take advantage of this opportunity. They all wanted to come by the Hughes companies, address the Hughes employees, make their points, and then walk away when it was over with a single check that represented the aggregate of the commitments the employees had made to that particular candidate.

It was considered at the time to be individual participation in politics at its finest, and it became, I believe, the pattern for the political action committee that we now have.

But it is very different from what we now have in that now instead of simply inviting the candidates in and letting them speak to the employees and then inviting employees to make contributions in whatever fashion and whatever amount the employees may want to do it, in today's political action committee, the organization—be it a union or a corporation—goes out and actively raises the funds itself. It doesn't involve the candidate in any way except when it gets to the point of disbursing the funds.

It has become a major business activity—I say ''business activity''—a major campaign activity on the part of corporations and unions.

The administrative costs of running this activity are traditionally borne by the corporation and union. In other words, this is a soft money contribution on behalf of the corporation or the union which is not disclosed in any way.

Let me share with you some numbers that come from the summary page of reports filed with the Federal Election Commission.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Committee on Political Education reported that they raised in the calendar year $2,653,257.29. That is a high enough figure to get everybody's attention. What were their operating expenditures? Zero.

Mr. President, you and I and every other person who is in this body knows that you don't raise $2.6 million without having any overhead. Indeed, the rule of thumb is that you spend a minimum of 25 percent of your receipts in raising the money, and sometimes it can go as high as 45 percent.

If we simply take that kind of rule of thumb and say a third of $2.650 million is $700,000, or $800,000, that means this report is prima facie evidence of an $800,000 soft money contribution to this PAC by the overhead of the union. It is not just unions. There are businesses that do it. I will give you some summary data with respect thereto.

For example, Bank One had receipts of $2,378,211 on their FEC report, and they showed operating expenses of $259.46. Again, we know that couldn't possibly be true if you take the rule of thumb and apply it. It is somewhere, once again, between $700,000 and $800,000 that it would cost to raise that amount of money. This is an effective soft money contribution of between $700,000 and $800,000.

Let me be clear. Based on my past history and my voting prospects, I do not object to Bank One doing that. I do not object to the soft money that they contributed.

But McCain-Feingold, as a bill, does. If it passes, I believe it should be consistent because this soft money contribution, unlike the others that we have heard so much about on the floor, is not disclosed. This soft money contribution must be devised by the kind of mathematical analysis I have just applied to it. I could be completely wrong. I do not know that it is $700,000 to $800,000 that Bank One put into rates raising that much money because it is not disclosed in any way. This is not to imply any wrongdoing on Bank One's part because the present law does not require it. They are abiding by the present law in a perfectly legitimate and proper way.

The same thing can be said of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Committee on Political Education. The present law does not require them to disclose the amount of soft money they put into raising the $2.6 million that they report on their FEC report.

But if we are going to be consistent, if we are going to say that soft money is bad, this amendment that I am offering will close a significant soft money loophole. It will close the loophole where soft money is currently being spent by both corporations and unions and is not being disclosed in any way.

I don't know how controversial this might be. But I offer it because I think it shines an appropriate spotlight on an aspect of the McCain-Feingold bill that has not been discussed in the past.

I have no desire to take the full hour and a half. I see that there doesn't seem to be a great deal of interest one

way or the other on this. But I will be happy to yield for questions or comments by any Member of the Senate who wishes to discuss this amendment.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky correct that the principle involved in the amendment of the Senator from Utah is that if all Federal political parties, and State and local political parties in even numbered years have to operate in 100-percent hard dollars, then those organizing political action committees which are the possessors of 100 percent of the hard dollars must raise their money through 100 percent hard dollars as well? In other words, the administrative costs of the parties that engage in 100-percent hard dollars would also be applied to corporations and unions. Is that the principle established?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. All of us are familiar with the requirement to cover our administrative costs for fundraising out of the proceeds of that fundraising effort. The Senator is correct that this amendment would simply put PACs on the same course as individual candidates. A PAC could not raise money with the advantage of soft dollars any more than a candidate would.

The Senator from Kentucky is further correct in that it has an impact on what happens at the State party level because I understand now that a State party can use soft dollars to do certain kinds of things unconnected with advertising or direct contributions to candidates. They would say: No, you can't do that if there is a fundraising effort. The fundraising expenses must be paid out of the fundraising receipts and cannot be solicited in soft dollars.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is the principle of the Senator from Utah that even though he, like the Senator from Kentucky, does not oppose non-Federal money, if such a standard of Federal money only is established for the national political parties, and State and local parties in even numbered years, then that same principle should apply to everyone participating?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. That is exactly the position I have taken.

In the interest of full disclosure of motive, I know there is some conversation on this floor about raising the limits for hard dollar solicitations. I am solidly and strongly in favor of raising the limits on hard dollar solicitations. I recognize if this loophole for soft dollars—as I have pointed out—is, in fact, closed it will increase the pressure when we get to the appropriate amendment to raise the hard dollar limit because it will shut off one significant source of soft dollar contributions that is currently in the bill.

I don't want to fly under any false pretense. I am hoping that by the passage of my amendment we will not only achieve the intellectual consistency I have been discussing with the Senator from Kentucky, but, quite frankly, it would create some political pressure to raise the hard dollar limits because I think raising the hard dollar limits is a salutatory thing to do.

So let there be no mistake that that agenda is in my mind as I offer this amendment. But nonetheless, I think the amendment has an intellectual sustaining consistency to it because it takes the position that if, as McCain-Feingold says, soft money is inherently corrupting, or gives the appearance of corruption, this is a form of soft money that is even more the appearance of corruption because under McCain-Feingold it is, A, allowed and, B, not disclosed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Then as a practical matter, just sort of putting it another way, the treasury funds of unions and corporations cannot be used to underwrite fundraising or administrative costs in political action committees?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Kentucky is exactly correct.

If this amendment passes, treasury funds in the union, treasury funds in the corporation, cannot be used to pay the expenses of political fundraising in a political action committee that is organized by either the union or the corporation.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Utah for the answer.

Mr. BENNETT. As I said, the amendment is very short. It is very straightforward. It does not require the kind of complex analysis that went into the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, which required an entire evening to review and rewrite. I think it is very straightforward. I am not anxious to prolong the debate, but I will, of course, be here to respond to any comments anyone might have one way or the other.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at the appropriate time I am going to make some comments about the pending amendment. But as has been the custom over the years, our distinguished former leader, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, makes it a point, at the change of the seasons in our country, to remind us of the importance of transition, hope, and promise.

In the midst of this debate, I would like to yield whatever time the Senator from West Virginia may need for some remarks that do not pertain directly to this amendment but do pertain to the spirit in which this body ought to consider legislation in any season.

So with that, Mr. President, I yield whatever time the senior Senator from West Virginia may need.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

MILLENNIAL SPRING

Mr. BYRD. In the midst of this very important discussion on a very serious subject, if we could take just a few minutes to call attention to the coming of spring.

It used to be that Senators would take note of these things years ago when I first came here. They would talk about Flag Day, Independence Day, Easter, the Fourth of July—I already mentioned that—and the coming of spring, the coming of summer, the coming of fall, the coming of winter, and so on. Those things do not seem to be of great interest around here anymore. But as one who has been here a long time, I still like to hold on to the old ways.

Percy Bysshe Shelley said:

> Oh, Wind, if Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?

Well, spring is here. I was asked by my friend from Nevada, Senator REID, if I might think of a poem that could be appropriate for this occasion. I have thought a little bit about it, and the words of William Wordsworth come to mind. I hope I can remember them. He said:

> I wander'd lonely as a cloud
> That floats on high o'er vales and hills,
> When all at once I saw a crowd,
> A host of golden daffodils;
> Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
> Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.
>
> Continuous as the stars that shine
> And twinkle on the Milky Way,
> They stretch'd in never-ending line
> Along the margin of a bay:
> Ten thousand saw I, at a glance,
> Tossing their heads in sprightly dance.
>
> The waves beside them danced; but they
> Out-did the sparkling waves in glee:
> A poet could not but be gay,
> In such a jocund company:
> I gazed—and gazed—but little thought
> What wealth the show to me had brought:
>
> For oft, when on my couch I lie
> In vacant or in pensive mood,
> They flash upon that inward eye
> Which is the bliss of solitude;
> And then my heart with pleasure fills,
> And dances with the daffodils.

Mr. President, today is the first spring day of the third millennium. We have survived the great change of the calendar, and the world did not end. We endured the buffeting of a winter of uncertainty, with skyrocketing fuel bills—and we are still very much engaged in that matter—threats of nor'easters—I wonder why these television people always say ''nor'easters.'' They just are trying to join in the spirit of things, I suppose. But I still call them northeasters—threats of nor'easters and even earthquakes now behind us.

The NASDAQ, the New York Stock Exchange, the Dow, the S&P 500—all

have been on a roller coaster ride of short heights followed by heart-stopping plunges. The uncertainties of last year's Presidential election have become a comedic staple of dimpled, pregnant, and hanging chads, the punch lines obscuring the gravity of ensuring the stable transition of government power. But today, it is spring—it may not be the first spring day, but it is the first day of spring—and it is a good time to pause, and take a deep breath—ah—and savor the moment.

The change of seasons is a reassuring constant in our lives. The slow swing of the celestial clock chimes in close harmony with our deepest nature. It is as deep and calm as our own mother's, keeping time with the lullabies she used to lull us to sleep with, as infants. Today, the peals ring in the spring.

Across the country, warm days call us forth, out of our stale houses, away from our rumpled, dormant winter hibernations in front of yammering, yakking television sets. As we rake the drifts of dead leaves from the sheltered corners where they have gathered, we stir up the sweet perfume—ah, the sweet perfume—of the awakening earth. Under the cold brown coverlet of dirt, spring's life-force is beginning to stir. The dainty crocus sparkle amid the straw colored remains of last year's lush lawn.

I was commenting to my wife Erma about those crocuses outside, just beside the front porch of our house. Gaudy daffodils, about which Wordsworth wrote, reward the early bumblebee. Young squirrels are chasing—and they like peanuts. I have several squirrels at my humble cottage in McLean, and each night I take a handful of peanuts and put them under a table there just outside the door that goes out into my backyard. Those squirrels, by the time I rise in the morning, by the time I have a chance to take my little dog Billy Byrd out for a walk, sneak away, taking those peanuts from underneath the table. Then I will, a little later, open the door, and there are two, three, four, five, or six squirrels, and I toss them out a handful of peanuts.

Those young squirrels are chasing each other up and down and around tree trunks in a three-ring circus display of acrobatics. Talk about acrobatics, they can put on a show. Already, the first robins have returned, and birds are warbling their finest arias in between the labors of nest building. The turquoise skies of autumn faded to the pale aquamarine of winter, but now glow as vibrantly as a star sapphire.

Again rejoicing Nature sees
Her robe assume its vernal hues,
Her leafy locks wave in the breeze,
All freshly steep'd in morning dews.

So wrote the poet Robert Burns. With all these signals, I do not need a calendar to tell me that the vernal equinox heralding the official arrival of spring is at hand.

In the rejuvenating warmth of the spring sun, the dot.com die-off no longer looms as threateningly as the extinction of the dinosaurs. It is possible to view the stock market correction—I say to my dear friend from Connecticut, Senator DODD—with equilibrium, if not with enthusiasm. We have made it through another winter, a winter of our discontent, to paraphrase Shakespeare. The great Bard also said—and truly—''Daffodils, that come before the swallow dares, and take the winds of March with beauty.'' With the daffodils, hope also blossoms.

Mr. President, I hope for a spring of millennial proportions—a spring of renewed vigor and energy in this nation to tackle the challenges ahead. I hope for new growth in our economy. Over the past weeks, the Senate has been debating the budget and tax cuts. It has been a difficult task, made more so by the lack of detail provided by the administration. The size of the tax cut promise has been clear, but the spending plans to accompany it have been vague. The administration is asking us to trade our cow for a handful of magic beans but, unlike Jack in the fable, I am not so sure that this fairy tale will end well. It may be that the giant comes crashing down on us in the form of large future deficits. After all, these projected surpluses are based upon projections of economic growth that have not, and may not, materialize.

Every good gardener knows, especially in springtime, that garden plans made in the glow of a winter's fireside do not always pan out when faced with the vagaries of late frosts, early droughts, or insect infestations. Indeed, one fierce storm can lay low all of one's efforts in a single blow. A wise gardener dreams big but takes care of the basics first. He builds rich soil, clears it, weeds it well, plants strong seedlings, and tends to them carefully. Patience and a long viewpoint are the watchwords. On the national economic level, that means paying down the debt and maintaining the economic infrastructure that is the soil for our current and future economic growth. Just as a garden needs hoses to carry water and flats in which to tend seedlings, so the nation needs transportation networks to carry commerce and schools in which to nurture and teach our children. Then as prosperity blossoms can some blooms be harvested in the form of targeted tax cuts, leaving most of the plant intact to set seeds and prepare for the coming winter. But one certainly does not pull up the entire plant at the first sign of fruit! That is short-sighted and imprudent. It leaves nothing to carry the family through the winter that will surely come.

But now, Mr. President, it is springtime and everything feels possible. Let us rejoice—my dear friend, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator DODD, an equally dear and trusted friend—let us rejoice in the new growth and in the growing strength of the brightening sun. Let us take up with patience the gardener's hoe and weed the row before us. Our diligence and care now will bring us rewards later. Let us savor the moment and rejoice in the first day of spring. Who knows whether we shall see another, so let us rejoice in this one. I close with the words of the poet Robert Browning that have always captured for me the spirit of this time of year:

The year's at the Spring,
And the day's at the morn;
Morning's at seven;
The hillside's dew-pearled;
The lark's on the wing;
The snail's on the thorn:
God's in his Heaven—
All's right with the world!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from West Virginia. In the midst of a debate on campaign finance reform, this was a needed respite from the minutia of fundraising, attempts to modify the present system. His words of eloquence are always welcome in this body but never more so than in the midst of the debate today.

I appreciate his quoting of Robert Burns and Browning and Wordsworth, but listening to him describe the arrival of spring and the departure of winter is poetic in itself. I can see one day people quoting ROBERT C. BYRD, the poet, when they welcome the spring at some future year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for his overly gracious comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BYRD for his annual admonition to all of us to conduct ourselves in a way that reflects the dignity and comity of this institution and reminds us of the transience of all this and the importance of friendships and relationships that are established in this very unique organization.

There is a time for us to pause and reflect. There is no one in this body who gives us a more enlightening opportunity than the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

So I thank Senator BYRD. And I also admire the vest he is wearing today as well. I thank the Senator and I will speak on the pending amendment.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is kind of obvious what the strategy is that is going to be employed here, and that is to sort of love this legislation to death. In other words, let's not leave

any stone unturned; let's make sure this is a perfect bill, and anything less than that is not acceptable. So let's have a series of amendments, which I certainly admit are very clever, including this one.

I want to point out that this bill says, basically, ''except that the cost of such establishment, administration, and solicitation may only be paid from funds that are subject to the limitations.'' In other words, only hard dollars can pay for a political action committee's establishment, administration, and solicitation.

Well, Mr. President, we try to help PACs. We try to help political action committees because they provide us, generally speaking, with small donations that are an expression of small individuals' involvement, as opposed to the so-called soft money, which we are trying to attack. So we have tried to, in the past, make it as easy as possible for political action committees to function, rather than make it difficult.

Also, the Senator from Utah interprets this as some way to put pressure on to increase hard money limits. Hard money limits will be debated, and I am confident, to some degree, that hard money limits will be raised. But here is the situation: We have a company, a corporation, in Salt Lake City, UT, and it has a PAC. Where is the office of that PAC? Generally speaking, they don't go out and rent a building or a home or something. They set up a PAC in one of the offices in their building. Usually, the person who administers that PAC—it is not their sole job. It is something that they many times do on a voluntary basis and many times with small compensation for their time, and they are located usually in the building. That is generally the way PACs are administered. So how do you get money for your PAC? You probably put it in the company newsletter, where you say, ''All employees who want to contribute to Acme PAC, please do so,'' and then that money comes in and the individual puts it in their account, et cetera.

How do you assess the cost of that? Who pays for that? The CEO, probably on an annual basis, calls the senior managers together and says: I want all you guys and women to contribute to our political action committee. It is that time of year. We are in an election year and we want to support good old BOB BENNETT. He has always been a friend of business.

What is that worth? How do you assess the cost of that good friend of Senator BENNETT's soliciting money for his political action committee so he can support him? Does a notice of contributions in an internal newsletter have a value? What is the value in a newsletter?

What about the electricity costs of the office that houses the PAC of the employee who does it on a part-time basis? Well, what we need, obviously, is a new arm of the IRS, or the FEC, or maybe a new organization that we could call the ''PAC police,'' who say, aha, you spent 2 hours today, and that, at your hourly salary, is so much money, and that has to come from hard money donations. Clearly, my friends, this is not an amendment that would have an effect that we could ever enforce, that we could ever make a reasonable kind of a thing. Obviously, it would have some debilitating effects on PACs.

The authors of this amendment could not really understand too well how political action committees—particularly the small ones—operate, and think somehow that we could assess the costs and then take that out of hard money and put it into some kind of payment or payback.

So I have to oppose this amendment. I think it is not workable. I don't think it is logical or reasonable to do so. The Senator from Utah mentioned the fact that this is soft money and that we are banning all soft money. Well, as the Senator from Utah knows because he mentioned that he read the bill, we don't ban soft money in a lot of areas such as for State parties, or we don't ban soft money in some other areas. But we certainly are banning soft money for the use in Federal campaigns.

So I have to oppose the amendment. I hope that my colleagues will understand that this amendment is not an acceptable one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my good friend and colleague from the State of New York, Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for yielding. I thank all of my colleagues—the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Connecticut for leading this debate, as well as, of course, my colleagues from Arizona and Wisconsin for their leadership on this issue, which is something I believe in, as they do.

As we go through this debate on campaign finance reform, I guess there are two ways to look at it. They are the larger picture and the smaller picture—the forest or the trees. When you look at the trees, it is awfully difficult to come up with a perfect bill. I think every one of us has found numerous objections to any proposal that is made. None of them works perfectly. None of them is without flaws. Much of what we will talk about today and over the next two weeks will be in discussion of those trees: It will be better to do something this way or there is an inequity when ''A'' is put slightly disadvantaged to ''B.'' I can figure out a scheme that will work for my State better than the present one. Over and over again, we can hear arguments just like that. And because of the fragility of campaign finance reform, because it has taken so long for it to come here, because it is not easy for people to reform themselves, which is basically what we are doing, any one of those arguments, those trees, could end up ruining the whole forest.

The other way to look at this is as a forest, Mr. President. Our system is simply a mess. I say this to my colleagues on my side of the aisle particularly but to everybody here as well: We believe in Government. We don't believe Government is an enemy. We believe Government is something to do good, to improve the lives of people. We believe it is basically a necessity. And this system of finance so erodes confidence in this Government that we have all dedicated our lives to seeing that something has to change.

The forest is the right argument here—looking from 10,000 feet at the landscape is far more important than looking from 100 feet above the landscape on this issue. It may not be true of all issues, but it is true of this one. So if I had a plea to make to my colleagues, who I know are torn on this bill, who I know are ambivalent about whether this provision or that provision not only affects them—those who write and say, well, they are just interested in their own survival, hegemony, that is really not fair because we all live with this system. We all have ideas about it, like a carpenter would have better ideas about how to carve a chair, or a doctor might come and tell us how to design a better medical system. I say to my colleagues who do care about this Government, and we have devoted our lives to it, that if there were a watchword for this debate, it would be a simple one: Do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good because if there was ever a place where the perfect or the desire to attain perfection could kill the good that would come about, it is in campaign finance reform. That is what we have seen over and over.

I know there are some, such as my colleague, my friend from Kentucky, who are just opposed to this bill in broad concept. He believes it violates the first amendment, and he has put his money where his mouth is and his courage in supporting the amendment against burning of the flag. So I do not begrudge his point of view; I disagree with it. We are not going to win him over.

The worry I have is with many of my colleagues who are unsure, who look at one imperfection or another in this bill and let it be, let those imperfections prevent us from moving forward at all, as move forward we must.

When the Founding Fathers put together our Government and when you read the Federalist Papers and some of the commentaries, the thing they probably worried more about than anything

else, even more than the overarching power of a central government, was the apathy of the citizens, the lack of involvement by the citizens. They wondered if people would put themselves forward for public office, and they wondered if people would participate in a government where they had control.

For quite a while, in the flush of democracy and with so many of the early issues, those worries subsided, but since World War II, they have come back at us larger than ever in the history of our country.

The percentage of people who vote, the percentage of people who regard the Government with only cynicism, the percentage of people who believe they do not have any power, even the brief antidote of the Florida election has not stemmed that tide.

One of the main reasons people have that apathy, that cynicism which is so corrosive to democracy, is the way we finance our campaigns. They know they cannot write out large checks, and they believe, rightly or wrongly, that those who can have far more weight than they do. I think most of us in this body have to say certainly that appearance is there, even for those who do not agree that the reality is there.

We are here really not just to fix a system, not just to tinker and say we can make it a little better here, a little better there, not just to smooth off the surface; we are here in an attempt to revitalize our sacred democracy.

I say to my colleagues, that is what is at stake, no less. If we pass up the opportunity to pass a bill, if each of us has to have his or her own way and say, I want it my way or no way, we are not just changing the balance of power between the parties or how this candidate or that candidate might run in a new election. We are passing up an opportunity to stem the tide of negativity toward our Government which at least, it seems to me, is probably the greatest problem this Government faces as we move into the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to summon forth and see the big picture. I urge my colleagues to not get mired in every single detail because there is no perfect system. There is certainly no perfect system with *Buckley* v. *Valeo* as the supreme law of the land, and there is probably no perfect system without *Buckley* v. *Valeo* as well. We are not going to achieve perfection, and none of us is going to be 100 percent or even 90 percent happy with the bill, but the alternative, which is we do nothing—this is our last chance, that is for sure—the alternative of doing nothing and allowing the mistrust to continue, the alternative of throwing up our hands, which is what the public will think, in deadlock and not reforming is too great a danger and too foreboding to the Republic to entertain.

I urge my colleagues, again, to keep their eye on the ball, keep their eye on the big picture, keep their eye on the problem we face and make sure we pass McCain-Feingold because it is so important to rejuvenating the democracy we have.

There is one final point I will make on an issue I will be speaking a lot about the following week, which is the Hagel amendment and soft money.

I have seen, during the brief time I have run for higher office, how dramatically this has changed, not only the amount of soft money but the restrictions on soft money. It is such that in the 2000 elections, one could do virtually the same thing with soft money as one could with hard money. Yes, there may be a little sentence put in the commercial that says, ''Call up so and so,'' or even some words that are put at the bottom of the ad that can hardly be seen, but the bottom line is that the ability to spend soft money on virtually everything has made a mockery of the original law we passed in the seventies.

The Hagel amendment, which will allow lots of soft money to continue to cascade into our system, is, in my judgment, a killer amendment. It is a killer amendment not simply because of what it means for McCain-Feingold in terms of how many votes it has, but it is a killer amendment in the sense that the whole idea behind McCain-Feingold—which is to limit the influence of large contributions—would be thrown out the window.

When it comes to the Hagel amendment—and he is a good friend of mine and I respect completely his sincerity in offering this amendment—but when it comes to the Hagel amendment, we would end up being a little bit pregnant and that just does not work.

I thank my colleagues for their efforts. I say to my friend from Wisconsin, he has done a marvelous job on our side. I say to, again, my friend from Connecticut that he, too, has led the early hours of this debate extremely well and extremely fairly, and that also goes for the Senator from Kentucky.

I hope in this body we can debate the issue as seriously as we can, and then my sincere hope is that at the end of the day, we emerge with the same basic bill that the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin introduced.

I yield back whatever time remains to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. His comments are among the most important comments that have been made so far in this debate and, frankly, on any other debate we have had on campaign finance reform in the last 6 years. That is because he has identified the real issue.

When the Senator from New York was in the other body, he was part of the solution there. He was part of the effort to get through a similar bill in the House where people did see the forest for the trees, exactly the point the Senator from New York is making.

There are so many amendments that are attractive to us, including many provisions that Senator MCCAIN and I have offered in the past, having to do with free television time, having to do with other improvements in the system that many of us would like to see. We have to keep our eye on the ball, as the Senator from New York has suggested. I don't know if he is a Mets or Yankees fan.

Mr. SCHUMER. Yankees.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Yankees.

Keeping the eye on the ball is the final goal and the central issue. I am grateful after all these years of the frustrating process of coming to the floor and having a few speeches and a cloture vote and having to shut it down, we can have a Senator from New York talk about something real, about a process that can have an end and actually work. It will require the kind of unity and discipline of reformers on both sides of the aisle that has been demonstrated in the other body on a number of occasions.

My hat is off to the Senator from New York, but also the reformers in the other body, particularly Representatives SHAYS and MEEHAN, who have shown the way. Now it is up to the Senate to do what the Senator from New York suggested. There will be attractive amendments on aspects of public financing which I would like to see that could upset the balance we have. There will be poison pill amendments to try to embarrass one particular series of interests such as unions, to try to kill the bill, and then there will be so-called alternatives, as the Senator from New York has suggested—in particular, the Hagel alternative offered by a colleague we all respect—which is, in fact, worse for the current system because it will put the stamp of approval on the soft money system once and for all.

I think the Senator from New York is right. I don't think we will ever be able to change it if we adopt that kind of amendment. I am grateful to him for his work in the House, especially grateful to him for his work with a small group of Members who have been working on this for over a year, and particularly grateful for his leadership that has started today and will continue through this process of pointing out that the Hagel alternative is, frankly, worse than no bill at all. My thanks, again, to the Senator from New York for his leadership and his commitment to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to the Senator from New York and will respond in a moment. We are on my amendment so I

would like to talk about the details of my amendment. Before I do, the Senator from Arizona gave an example of volunteer activity, all of which is currently exempted under Federal law and which would continue to be exempted under Federal law.

My amendment goes to organizations such as those we have all seen in the field where there are a number of paid employees devoted full time to PAC activities, occupying dedicated facilities that can be easily identified, running up travel expenses that are clearly billed to that activity. There would be no difficulty on the part of the cost accountant, be it in a union or a corporation, to identify that kind of PAC activity. There is no question that the sort of informal activity of people talking in the workforce, saying they want to support Senator BENNETT or Senator MCCAIN, does go on, is voluntary, is completely exempted from all law now, and would continue to be exempted. My amendment would not apply to that.

I also point out McCain-Feingold has some of the same aspects of how to anticipate time because, as currently drafted, in Federal election years, McCain-Feingold requires State, district, and local parties to use 100-percent federally regulated hard dollars for the entire salary of any State, district, or local party committee employees who spend 25 percent or more of his or her time in a single month in any of the above-mentioned Federal election activities. If it will be difficult, as the Senator from Arizona described, to figure out what constitutes volunteer activity on behalf of a PAC and what constitutes activity that should be reimbursed out of the hard dollar profits of the PAC, it will be equally difficult, if not more so, for some Federal official to determine what constitutes 25 percent or more of an individual's time in a single month on a particular Federal activity. There will be hairsplitting in that regard that will go further than the hairsplitting to which the Senator from Arizona objected as he made his comments about my amendment.

Let me respond in a different way to the comments of the Senator from New York when he said we should look at the forest. I agree with him absolutely. We should look at the forest. I have tried to do that in all of my activity with respect to campaign finance reform since I first came here in 1993.

The forest I look at, that must be preserved and protected—indeed, that which I have taken an oath to preserve and protect—is the Constitution of the United States. I do not want to be part of a Congress that dilutes the freedoms that are outlined in the Constitution of the United States and, specifically, the first amendment thereto.

We are in the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison, little Jimmy, as he was called by his contemporaries, because he was short. That seemed to be the kind of nickname that stuck with him. I make this interesting point about Madison before I go on. This comes from an article on money and politics that was printed in the Wilson Quarterly in the summer of 1797. Reference has been made to the Founding Fathers. The Founding Fathers were geniuses, the Founding Fathers gave us an incredible legacy, but the Founding Fathers were also very practical politicians or they wouldn't have been in the positions where they were.

Quoting from the Wilson Quarterly:

> George Washington spent about 25 pounds apiece on two elections for the House of Burgesses, 39 pounds on another, and nearly 50 pounds on a fourth, which was many times the going price for a house or a plot of land.

Going back to the debate we had with the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, George Washington was a wealthy man, trying to buy his election, if we use today's rhetoric.

Washington's electioneering expenses included the usual rum punch, cookies and ginger cakes, money for the poll watcher who record the votes, and even one election eve ball, complete with fiddler.

Now it talks about James Madison and money:

> James Madison considered the ''corrupting influence of spiritous liquors and other treats'' ''inconsistent with the purity of moral and Republican principles.'' But Virginians, the future president discovered, did not want ''a more chaste mode of conducting elections.'' Putting him down as prideful and cheap, the voters rejected his candidacy for the Virginia House of Delegates in 1777. Leaders were supposed to be generous gentlemen.

Madison's attempt at purity, though futile, signified the changing ideological climate. Madison obviously learned elections cost money, even in the days of the Founding Fathers.

The one thing that Madison guaranteed would happen in every election was that there would be complete freedom of expression at every place and at every point.

Since this is the 250th anniversary of Madison's birth, may I, with the suspension of belief, resurrect James Madison and place him in the gallery, if you will, in the press gallery, because James Madison has a history of being an author and a journalist, being the author of much of the Federalist Papers. Let us have Madison up there, listening to this debate. Now, he would turn to one of his friends in the press gallery to have him explain terms that would be unfamiliar to him. He would say: What is hard money? What is soft money? What is the difference?

What is it used for? He would have explained too much hard money is this and soft money is that. He might have a little trouble understanding the difference because he would say: Wait a minute. In the first amendment that I authored you were free to speak in whatever way you wanted. You could be like Washington and buy rum punch and ginger cakes, if that is what it took to get the voters to listen to you; or you could run an ad. You could print a pamphlet. That is what Hamilton and Jay and I did. We went out and raised money and printed our own pamphlets and circulated them. Maybe you have seen them.

Madison's friend up there in the press gallery might say: Yes, I have seen them.

We call them the Federalist Papers today. But we must remember that when they were written, they cost money. Madison could not have spoken if he had not raised and spent some money. Money was speech all the way back in James Madison's time.

As James Madison sits there in the gallery, and he hears the details of McCain-Feingold, James Madison says: Wait a minute. You are telling me that there will be limits on how Americans can participate in the political process?

Yes. There will be limits.

James Madison asks: Who is in charge of this outrageous idea?

You see the handsome young fellow from Madison, named after you, from Wisconsin, his name is RUSS FEINGOLD. He has been pushing for this.

James Madison says: I must do something about this. I must express my opinion with respect to Senator FEINGOLD.

He snaps a finger and gets his partner, Alexander Hamilton, to join him.

He says: Alexander, look what is happening. There is that fellow down there from Wisconsin. He comes from a town named after me. He is trying to limit Americans' ability to speak in politics. What do we do about it?

Alexander Hamilton says: You do whatever you always do when you want to make a statement. You write a letter to the New York Times.

James Madison says: Great, Alexander, let's do that.

Alexander Hamilton and James Madison sit down and write a letter to the New York Times protesting the activities of Senator FEINGOLD.

The editor of the New York Times says: We are not going to run it.

Madison says: Well, Alexander, you certainly lost your cachet. There was a time when anything you said in New York automatically was run in any newspaper. What do we do?

Alexander Hamilton says: Well, we are going to have to buy an ad in the New York Times. That way they cannot censor our speech. Money is required. How much money do you have, little Jimmy?

Madison puts his hands in his pocket, and he pulls out whatever money he brought with him from the 18th century. And he says: Ready cash, I have $7.23. How about you, Alexander?

Alexander Hamilton says: Don't get into the issue of money. I don't want to talk about the blackmail payments I have been making. It is a very sore political point. I can't help you. But maybe the amount of money you have will do the job.

So they call the New York Times and say: How much is the full page ad in the New York Times?

The New York Times says $104,000.

I have $7.23. I can't speak unless I raise some money. Who do we know that knows how to raise money?

Snap of the finger and Benjamin Franklin appears.

Benjamin, you were one of America's good businessmen. He said: Yes. And I put mine in a CD that has been accumulating interest ever since I died in the 1700s, and I have enough for an ad in the New York Times. But let me be practical with you. Not only am I a practical businessman, but I recognize that most of the people in Madison, WI, don't read the New York Times. That is going to come as a great shock to you, Alexander Hamilton. You think the whole world reads the newspapers in New York. The fact is, if we are going to have an influence by running our ad, we are going to do it in Madison, WI.

They contact the Madison, WI, paper, and find out that the cost of a full-page ad is 10 percent of the cost of the New York Times; $14,000 on a Sunday gets you a full-page ad in the newspaper in Madison, WI.

Let's do it.

But while they are debating, while they are doing this— again we are compressing time—McCain-Feingold passes and is the law of the land, and it is within 60 days of the election of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and Benjamin Franklin walk into the newspaper and say: We want to buy an ad urging people to vote against Senator FEINGOLD.

The editor of the newspaper says: In the name of campaign finance reform, we will not permit you to buy that ad. We will not permit you to express your opinion about Senator FEINGOLD or any other candidate. We will forbid you from speaking.

As they turn to walk from the editor's office, with Madison and Hamilton disconsolate about the fact they cannot speak their mind, Benjamin Franklin says: I can fix it.

How can you fix it, Benjamin? He says: I told you I put my money in a CD, and it has been accumulating interest ever since the 1700s. I have enough to buy the newspaper. I don't have to buy the ad. I have enough to buy the paper. Once we own the paper, then we will have unlimited free political speech because, you see, the impact of McCain-Feingold means the people who have the most speech are the people who truly have the most money—the people who own the newspapers, the people who own the television station, and people named Turner who own networks. They have complete freedom of speech because they have enough money. And it has taken almost 250 years for me to accumulate enough. But I, Benjamin Franklin, have enough that I can buy their newspaper. And then I can run an editorial attacking Senator FEINGOLD every day of the week, if I so choose.

At that point, there are absolutely no limits on any speech. But you, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, there are limits on your speech placed there by McCain-Feingold saying that there will be no political speech from you during the 60 days before the election.

We come back to reality. James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin are not available as witnesses in this particular debate, even though I called them up rhetorically. But I am moved to do that by the comment of the Senator from New York who says we must look at the forest and we must protect the big picture. The big picture, as we are debating McCain-Feingold, has to do with freedom of speech. It has to do with robust debate of the American economy. It does not have to do with getting money out of politics because the reality in the big picture is that we never have had money out of politics, starting with George Washington and his rum punch and his ginger cakes. And we never will have money out of politics. Somebody will find a way to do it.

I am a cosponsor with Senator ALLEN who has offered the Virginia Plan. I am not sure it is going to be offered on this floor. But it is offered in the arena of public opinion. I hope it gets offered.

Historians will recognize that the Virginia Plan was James Madison's plan for the Constitution.

What is the Virginia Plan for campaign finance reform? Two sentences. The first one, worthy of James Madison, says: No American, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, shall be prohibited from expressing himself or herself in any way in any arena or any contribution to any party or any candidate.

That sounds like first amendment language to me. That sounds like James Madison language about which he would be very comfortable.

Then the second one, recognizing where we are in technology, says—I am not quoting the legal language, just the effect of it—every one of those donations will be in the modern world disclosed, using the technology that is available to us.

This means in all probability, 48 hours, and it is on the Internet for everybody to see. Forty-eight hours, and electronically the contribution is there. That is the Virginia plan.

When I discuss this with people outside the Senate, they all say: Gee, that makes a lot of sense. Why don't you start voluntarily disclosing within 48 hours right now? If you are such a great campaign finance reformer, why don't you do that immediately?

I say: You know, there was one candidate for President who did that.

It is a very interesting thing to do. I recommend it to all of you in your town meetings.

I say: There was one candidate for President who did, in fact, disclose every one of his donors within 48 hours.

Question: Do you know who it was?

I did this to a group of political science students the other day.

The first answer I got back was Ralph Nader.

I said: No, Ralph Nader did not do it.

Then someone answered: Well then, was it JOHN MCCAIN?

I said: No, it was not JOHN MCCAIN.

Then someone answered: Gee, Al Gore?

I said: No. The candidate who did it is now sitting in the White House. His name is George W. Bush. He got little or no credit for doing it from those who sit in the press gallery because they do not want to admit that he was on to a good idea—in my opinion, a better idea than the bill we are debating.

None of this has had anything to do with my amendment, and I recognize that. But none of the debate on the other side has had anything to do with my amendment either. And, if I may, if the Senator from West Virginia can talk about spring, I hope the Senator from Utah can talk about the Constitution.

I remain ready to answer any questions about my amendment or respond to anything about my amendment. But, so far, there has been little or no debate about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Does the Senator from Utah yield the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I congratulate the Senator from Utah for a brilliant discourse on the importance of the first amendment through the course of the debate and in all of our discussions on campaign finance reform. He has made it so clear and understandable for all of our Members. I congratulate him for his contribution.

With regard to his amendment, I am told we will be prepared on both sides to vote at 4 o'clock. I will enter that consent in a moment.

But let me say, with regard the Senator BENNETT's amendment——

Mr. REID. Why don't we do that consent request now?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote on the Bennett amendment occur at 4 o'clock.

Mr. REID. A vote on or in relation to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. It is my understanding, talking to the Senator from

Nevada, it was going to be an up-or-down vote.

Mr. REID. I do not know of anyone who wishes otherwise. I think it will be an up-or-down vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL: On or in relation to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the only request I have is Senator FEINGOLD wants 5 minutes and Senator LEVIN wants 5 minutes and Senator DODD needs 5 minutes. The time will be a little uneven, but if the Senator will agree to that.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say, having been involved in this debate over the years, I have frequently heard the words, ''Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.'' My friend from Utah recalls that we hear that from time to time.

I have taken a look at when that comes up, ''Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good,'' and every single time those words come up—''don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good''—is in relation to an amendment that might have some impact on organized labor—some impact.

I have watched this carefully now for some 10 or 12 years, and every time the words ''Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good'' are expressed, it is because there is an amendment pending that might have some impact—ever so tiny—on organized labor.

Now, the Bennett amendment is very evenhanded. It is not targeted at organized labor, by any means?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is that correct? I ask the Senator from Utah, this is not an amendment targeted at the heart of organized labor?

Mr. BENNETT. The amendment deals with activities on the part of corporations every bit as much as on the part of labor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Utah.

So this is not about organized labor. It is about how you raise money for political action committees.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate that a political action committee cannot get started without expenditures of soft money. We all know that is not true. There are a number of leadership PACs formed by Members of the Senate and the House. We do not spend soft money to get those leadership PACs up and running. You get a few hard money checks. You file with the FEC. You get a few hard money checks and you are up and running.

Believe me, it is possible to start a PAC without the expenditure of soft money, I say to my friend from Utah. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have never started a leadership PAC because I have never been in a leadership position. But I understand that it is, indeed, easy to do; and it is done only with hard money. There does not seem to be any difficulty in keeping track of who is volunteering and who is being paid.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Utah.

So this is really an amendment that is quite simple. The principle of the underlying bill, which I, as the Senator from Utah, do not support, is that Federal elections should be conducted in Federal money, hard dollars. And in pursuit of that principle, McCain-Feingold requires the national political parties to operate in 100 percent Federal dollars, so-called hard dollars—100 percent.

And in even numbered years, it essentially requires all the State and local parties in our country to operate, similarly, in Federal hard dollars.

So in the name of fairness, we ask the question, Why should labor and business be allowed to, in effect, subsidize their hard dollar activities, which are their political action committees—100 percent dollars—and why should they be allowed to subsidize the raising of their hard dollars when America's political parties can't do it, and when America's State and local parties can't do it in even numbered years? Where is the fairness?

If the idea is that Federal elections should be conducted in Federal dollars, why is that principle only going to be applied to the Nation's political parties?

The Bennett amendment is quite simple. It is easily understood. For those who believe soft money is a pernicious thing undermining our democracy, then why should they think it would only be pernicious when raised and spent by political parties but perfectly OK when raised and spent by labor and business?

That is the heart of this amendment. That is what this vote will be all about. We will have that vote at 4 o'clock. I think that pretty well adequately describes our side of this amendment.

I will be happy now to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I very much oppose this amendment. The Supreme Court has told us over and over again that the standard for contribution limits that is constitutional is the appearance of corruption, the appearance of impropriety, and the appearance of undue influence, that large contributions or the solicitation of large contributions can create.

There is no such appearance problem with these expenditures. In fact, the expenditures which the Senator from Utah would require to be paid for out of hard dollars has explicitly been excluded from that requirement by law since 1974. So since 1974, the statute under which we have all operated has excluded:

> . . . the establishment, administration, and solicitation of contributions to a separate segregated fund to be utilized for political purposes by a corporation, labor organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock.

The administrative expenses, the establishment expenses, and the solicitation of contributions to a PAC have not been considered to be limited by the hard money restrictions of law since 1974.

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

Mr. LEVIN. If I could finish my remarks.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Just a quick question: Isn't that precisely the point? That is precisely the point of the Bennett amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. That is exactly the point of the Bennett amendment: to repeal a law which has been in place since 1974 and has created no harm. Sometimes we say around here that the cure is worse than the disease. This is a cure looking for a disease. There is no disease here that has been shown.

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

Mr. LEVIN. If I could continue, this is just an effort being made to try to say: Oh, you guys over there who are trying to ban soft money, you are not being perfectly consistent because, look, you allow the establishment, administration, and solicitation of contributions to a PAC to be paid for out of treasury dollars. You are not being totally consistent.

The answer to that is, wait a minute, the law of 1974 also says that communications by a corporation to its stockholders and executive administrative personnel and their families or by a labor organization to its members and their families on any subject, that is not subject either.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I will in a couple of moments.

Here we have a cure looking for a problem. There has been no problem on this. There is no practical way to keep track of these expenses, no practical way to do this. A corporation sends out a newsletter to its stockholders or to its executives saying: Which of the candidates out there should our PAC contribute to? Now someone has to sit and figure out: What is the cost of printing that newsletter; what page is that notice on; is that on page 1 where it has the biggest impact or on page 4 of the newsletter; what part of the postage of that newsletter goes to that issue; how much of the time of the secretary who

took the minutes of that meeting where we discussed that issue can be attributed to that request.

You have a bookkeeping nightmare that you are creating for no problem. There is no problem, that I know of, that has been shown over these almost 30 years. Yet in order to try to show some kind of a flaw, looking desperately for a flaw in the ban on soft money, the proponents of this amendment say: Aha, you are not being consistent.

Well, we are being consistent because in the case of banning soft money, there is a disease that needs a cure—unlimited contributions to political campaigns that are being accomplished through soft money.

The Supreme Court said: We can prohibit that constitutionally. That is what the Supreme Court has said.

I don't know of any evidence that this particular provision in law, which has been in place for 26 years now, has created a problem. I say to my good friend from Utah, this amendment is not needed. It has not been shown to address a problem in the law. It will create a bookkeeping nightmare to try to in any way comply. It will put people into an illegal netherworld for no good reason that has been demonstrated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. DODD. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. The appearance of impropriety, the appearance of corruption, which is the only basis on which we can act as a justification for limiting contributions of a large size to candidates, that justification does not exist here with corporate or union treasury money being spent to administer a PAC.

I urge that we either table this amendment or defeat this amendment. I am sorry my friend from Kentucky did not have a chance to ask me the additional question. I would be happy to try to answer it, if our good friend from Connecticut wants to yield the time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I think our colleagues have covered this. I think we can get to a vote fairly quickly. As my friend from Utah knows, I think of myself as the third Senator from Utah. I am not sure Utah thinks of me as its third Senator, but he and I have a wonderful relationship and have worked so closely together over the years that I am not comfortable disagreeing with him on his amendment. I admire him immensely.

In addition to what my colleague from Michigan has said about the 1974 law, there is also a restriction in the 1974 law which doesn't pertain to any other kind of activity that has otherwise been described. Under the 1974 act, unions, corporations and membership organizations can only solicit their own members and stockholders, unlike other organizations which can solicit from the universe within the country. Under the 1974 act, as you are establishing your PAC, you can only get the support from your own organization's membership. That is a significant restriction which applies to them which does not apply to others.

In addition, there is this balance that was written into the law in 1974, as the Senator from Michigan properly points out, where there has not been any identifiable abuse of this exception in the law whatsoever here.

Secondly, because of the universe to which they are restricted in soliciting dollars, they then have allowed, in a sense, their general treasuries to be used in order to communicate with their restricted class and membership—not with people outside of that restricted class membership but with their own membership. Were they communicating to the universe at large, then I think the point the Senator from Utah has raised would be appropriate. But when you are restricting, under the 1974 act, the audience to which they can communicate, it seems to me this balance is appropriate, narrowly tailored and proper. To disrupt that now would be a mistake.

The point the Senator from Arizona made is also worth repeating; that is, this is awfully difficult. One of the things we don't want to do is create situations which make people potential targets of indictment. This gets pretty amorphous, as to what constitutes an expenditure of soft dollars in order to solicit hard dollars for your PAC.

Again, the Senator from Michigan and others have made this point. When you get into this area in trying to identify how much has been committed or whether or not it was committed at all, a simple address by the CEO or the president of a local to the membership of that community—how would you put a value on that? Your inability to do so or to provide a proper accounting of it exposes you then to the potential of indictment. I don't think anyone in our interests here should try to necessarily do that. It is so difficult to write that into law, even when the law has only civil jurisdiction.

I urge a rejection of the amendment. A communication which is specifically protected by the Constitution and recognized by Buckley, where it is involved in a significant balance between the ability to communicate with your restricted class or membership and only that group, then the resources of that organization to do so are appropriate and proper. To upset that balance would be a mistake.

The law has worked well for 26 years. We ought not to change it at this point. For those reasons, I respectfully urge our colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield whatever time my colleague from Wisconsin so desires.

Mr. FEINGOLD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I thank the Senator from Michigan especially for his excellent remarks on this amendment, and also the Senator from Arizona. We are united in our opposition to it. I, too, as the Senator from Connecticut, find it a little bit unpleasant to oppose the Senator from Utah. We have thoroughly enjoyed working together and share quite an affection for his beautiful State and appreciate those opportunities. On this one, we really have to call this amendment what it is. It is simply another attempt to change the subject.

Somehow it doesn't trouble the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Kentucky that soft money to the parties was $82 million in 1992, $260-some million in 1996, and is now approaching $500 million in the year 2000. That doesn't bother them. That is just fine. What does bother them is somehow trying to undo a reasonable balance that was created back in 1974 in the law at the time after Watergate and in the Buckley decision.

The problem is not PACs. The problem isn't how PACs raise their hard money contributions. We used to think PACs were the problem. I hope the American people now realize that PACs are limited to giving $10,000. We used to think that was a lot of money. Unfortunately, given this insane soft money system, it is starting to look as if it is spare change. But that is what the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Utah want to change the subject to: Worrying about how union members and perhaps corporate entities get their people together and spend a little money in order to raise the modest amounts that can be contributed through PACs. It is a blatant attempt to change the subject.

It does not relate at all to the real abuse in the system, the horrible situation where huge contributions on the very day that votes are made are given to the political parties, and then legislation passes creating an appearance of impropriety or corruption that is very disturbing to the American people.

To reiterate, the 1974 act that created PACs had an explicit tradeoff. Separate segregated funds that are connected with the union or corporation can use their treasury funds for their administrative costs, but they can solicit only their members or executive and administrative personnel for contributions. On the other hand, nonconnected PACs must use their PAC money for the costs of administration, but they can solicit the general public. That was the tradeoff.

That was the balance to which the Senator from Connecticut referred. As he said, this amendment would disturb

the balance. That tradeoff has been a part of the law for 25 years. It is not a loophole. It is not a cesspool of soft money. It is working. It may not be perfect, but it is the very thing that, along with other things, survived after the Buckley case. We have a fairly decent, but not perfect, system of campaign financing in this country. That is what is falling apart.

There is also a constitutional dimension to this amendment. The law allows corporations and unions to communicate with their members when a union or a corporation solicits members for a PAC contribution. That solicitation is a communication. We cannot interfere with that communication without running afoul of the first amendment. I would think, given the frequent speeches by the Senator from Kentucky on the first amendment, that would concern him as well.

Let me say that I, as well as my lead author, Senator MCCAIN from Arizona, oppose this amendment. It may be particularly targeted at unions because they have less money and may be perceived that way. As the so-called paycheck protection amendment, this is an attempt to cripple a labor union. It is a poison pill amendment targeted at labor unions and perhaps at corporate PACs, as well, and is not reform.

Corporate labor PACs have been permitted to use treasury funds for their administrative costs since the passage of the 1974 act. As the Senator from Michigan said so well, there has been no showing of abuse of this narrow exception—the prohibition of corporate and union spending of treasury funds in Federal elections—and yet these two Senators have virtually nothing to say about the enormous abuse of the gaping loophole of soft money that has destroyed the reforms after the Watergate era. All those supporting McCain-Feingold should strongly oppose the Bennett amendment. We strongly oppose it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I had not realized, until I heard from my friend from Michigan, that the Federal Election Campaign Act was so sacrosanct that it should not be changed. If that is the case, I don't know why we are here at all because the whole purpose of the McCain-Feingold bill is to change the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974.

Further, it is suggested that this is not an abuse. Well, what we do know is that organized labor spends essentially no hard dollars at all raising hard dollars for their PACs. Now, as a defender of soft money, I must tell you I am not troubled by that in principle any more than I am troubled in principle by the political parties having nonfederal money. It has been suggested on the other side that this would be an inconvenience for organized labor or corporations. What about inconveniencing the parties—by taking away 40 percent of the budget of the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, and 35 percent of the Republican Senatorial Committee and the Democratic Senatorial Committee, and federalizing State and local parties for even-numbered years? What about the inconvenience to them? Why is it only political parties that it is OK to inconvenience and no one else?

I repeat, every time you hear the argument, ''don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good,'' you can be sure the subject being debated on the Senate floor at that time is an amendment that might have some impact on organized labor. Virtually every time you hear the words ''poison pill,'' you can be assured the subject matter we are debating at that time will be an amendment that might have some impact on organized labor.

The reform industry, led by the New York Times and the Washington Post, has been allowed to get away with defining what reform is. In fact, reform is what the New York Times and the Washington Post and Common Cause say it is, and everything else is a poison pill.

Now, the underlying bill is designed to reduce the effectiveness of America's great political parties—the one entity that will always be there for a challenger. Here Senator BENNETT is just trying to say, look, let's have a level playing field. If the parties are going to have to operate in 100 percent hard dollars, why not the unions and the corporations? Why not? Why not, I ask? What is so pernicious about the influence of Federal, State, and local parties that their resources have to be taken away, their voices lowered, their efforts inhibited, and no one else?

This is not a ''level playing field,'' as often is said by the other side. I have heard the argument over the years that we need to have a level playing field. If hard dollars are to exclusively be the future of the parties, why not for business and labor?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Michigan said this is a solution looking for a problem, that there has been no abuse of this in the past. I was interested and pleased to hear the Senator from Wisconsin say we used to say PACs were a problem. I remember when the Senator from Kentucky and I were lonely voices here defending PACs as being a legitimate thing in the face of those who were attacking it in the name of campaign finance reform. So at least that debate is over and now PACs are good.

To the point the Senator from Michigan raised, would the Senator think this exception—I will call it an exception—could, in fact, become a major loophole in the future if McCain-Feingold passes, and that some clever lawyers could sit down and figure out a way to create something that came under this exemption that could raise significant amounts of hard dollars, funding them with soft dollars that are totally undisclosed, unlike the other soft dollars to which they object—soft dollars that would be totally undisclosed, finding a way to turn this into the next monster that we hear about in campaign finance reform debates 5 to 10 years from now?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend, he described the situation today. That is the situation today. We have unlimited and undisclosed soft dollars—we don't know how much—underwriting the PACs of corporations and unions. That is the situation today. All I believe the Senator from Utah is doing is trying to create a level playing field of hard dollars. If hard dollars are good for parties, why not for companies and labor unions?

Mr. BENNETT. It is my thought, I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that the reason we have not considered this as an abuse in the past is because there have been other things at which we have been looking. But if McCain-Feingold outlaws those other things, there is no reason to believe that this will not become the target of campaign finance reformers in the years ahead, and we will see at that point their thundering rhetoric about how terrible it is.

Today, they have no rhetoric and they say it is no problem. Of course, I say to the Senator from Kentucky, knowing how he feels, I think the thundering rhetoric is overheated as to the problem on the other side, but corruption becomes ultimately in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If the Senator from Utah will yield, I had an opportunity to listen to some of his comments about the Snowe-Jeffords provisions. They were amusing, but far from accurate.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to be corrected.

Mr. JEFFORDS. First of all, there is nothing in Snowe-Jeffords that prohibits or prevents ads to be purchased in newspapers. There is no problem there.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it only television?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Television and radio, probably.

Mr. BENNETT. So by choosing gentlemen who like the print media rather than the electronic media—I miss the point?

Mr. JEFFORDS. He misses the point that all that it requires is disclosure. We would like to know who it is making the ads on television. It is a simple disclosure provision that says people ought to know, if somebody is making accusations, who is doing it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there no prohibition for ads 60 days prior to the election?

Mr. JEFFORDS. There is no prohibition 60 days prior to the election.

Mr. BENNETT. I stand corrected. It was my understanding that there was a prohibition 60 days prior to the election. Can the Senator from Kentucky help us out on this?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Utah, we are looking up the language. I say to my friend, unless the Senator from—I thought the point of the Snowe-Jeffords language was to make it difficult for——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, Senator BENNETT.

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allard	Frist	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hatch	Shelby
Burns	Helms	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Craig	Hutchison	Stevens
Crapo	Inhofe	Thomas
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Ensign	Lugar	Voinovich
Enzi	McConnell	
Fitzgerald	Murkowski	

NAYS—63

Akaka	DeWine	Lieberman
Allen	Dodd	Lincoln
Baucus	Dorgan	McCain
Bayh	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Edwards	Miller
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Boxer	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Byrd	Hagel	Reed
Cantwell	Harkin	Reid
Carnahan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Carper	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee	Jeffords	Schumer
Cleland	Johnson	Snowe
Clinton	Kennedy	Specter
Cochran	Kerry	Stabenow
Collins	Kohl	Thompson
Conrad	Kyl	Torricelli
Corzine	Landrieu	Warner
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dayton	Levin	Wyden

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say briefly that the vote which just occurred is instructive in that I would predict that any amendment between now and the end of the debate that might have any adverse effect of any kind on organized labor is likely to be defeated.

Senator BENNETT can speak for himself, but my understanding of the purpose of that amendment was to point out the imbalance between taking all non-Federal dollars away from parties at the Federal level—the State and local level in the even-numbered years—making the parties operate 100 percent in hard dollars, and yet no one else who expressly advocates a candidate through a PAC is required to do that.

We have carved out an exception for corporations and unions so that they can continue to use millions of dollars in corporate and union soft money to underwrite the expenses of their political action committees.

Having said that, the next amendment will be offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. SMITH, who will be here momentarily. Senator DODD and I would like for that vote to occur at 6:15 or 6:30. We will lock it in, in a few moments. It is my understanding that that will be followed by an amendment by Senator TORRICELLI.

Mr. DODD. The idea would be I think at that point, depending on what leadership wants, to lay down the Torricelli amendment. I gather there is some event this evening that people believe they are obligated to attend. The Torricelli amendment will be laid down, and we will begin debate on that in the morning at whatever time the leader wants to come in. We might get a time agreement in the morning on that. I have several amendments I am lining up for tomorrow afternoon. So we will have a clear flow by tomorrow morning as to the amendments we will be proposing tomorrow during the day.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, point of inquiry: Did I understand from the floor managers that there would be a vote at 5:30?

Mr. MCCONNELL. No. It is probably at 6:15.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Many of us are going to this March of Dimes event tonight. I think it starts at 6.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think many Members are going to that event.

Mr. DODD. The March of Dimes event I know is very important. Maybe we can aim for 6 p.m.

It will obviously depend on what Senator GORDON SMITH wants to do.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I certainly concur with that because many of us have to cook.

Mr. DODD. In that case, knowing that my colleague from Alaska may be doing the cooking, Members may want to stay until 10 tonight.

Mr. MCCONNELL. After listening to the persuasive speech of the junior Senator from Alaska, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur at 6 p.m. on or in relation to the Smith amendment shortly to be laid down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, without knowing what the subject matter of the amendment is, I object until we are able to determine that.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senator SMITH will be here shortly. Hopefully, we can lock in the vote.

Mr. DODD. In the meantime, Mr. President, if I may, Members who want to be heard on the bill itself should take advantage of the time. I suspect the Smith amendment will not consume all of the hour and a half. We urge Members who want to make statements on the bill to please come to the floor.

I see now our colleague from Oregon is here. While he is getting organized, let me in response to my friend from Kentucky regarding the last amendment that it was not just about labor unions.

This last amendment also covered corporations and membership organizations, among a few others. The 1974 law made it very specific. We said that general treasury funds from those organizations could be used to establish, administrate, and solicit contributions to be used for political purposes, such as communicating only with their restricted class or membership. That makes them distinct and different from the other organizations which can communicate with the universe. But these organizations can only communicate with their members. For that reason, the 1974 law specifically wrote into the law that general treasury funds, if you will, could be used for the purposes of communication.

So it was not just about labor unions, it was also about corporations, membership organizations and other such entities that are confined to communications with their own members.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is my understanding the Senator from Oregon is prepared to go forward with his amendment. It is a pretty simple amendment. It is a fairly straightforward amendment. I think we could get a time agreement, if the Senator from Kentucky is agreeable, say, for a vote at 6 o'clock. After that vote we could lay down another amendment. So we will be ready to go on that, if that is agreeable.

Mr. DODD. That is agreeable. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that is acceptable to the Senator from Oregon.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 6 p.m. be divided in the usual form, and at that time the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the amendment about to be sent forward by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. SMITH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Therefore, the next vote will occur at 6 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 118

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] proposes an amendment numbered 118.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit candidates and Members of Congress from accepting certain contributions while Congress is in session)

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS WHILE CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 324. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS WHILE CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—During the period described in subsection (b), a candidate seeking nomination for election, or election, to the Senate or House of Representatives, any authorized committee of such a candidate, an individual who holds such office, or any political committee directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such a candidate or individual shall not accept a contribution from—

''(1) any individual who, at any time during the period beginning on the first day of the calendar year preceding the contribution and ending on the date of the contribution, was required to be listed as a lobbyist on a registration or other report filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

''(2) an officer, owner, or senior executive of any person that, at any time during the period described in paragraph (1), employed or retained an individual described in paragraph (1), in their capacity as a lobbyist;

''(3) a political committee directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by an individual described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

''(4) a separate segregated fund (described in section 316(b)(2)(C)).

''(b) PERIOD CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.—The period described in this subsection is the period—

''(1) beginning on the first day of any session of the body of Congress in which the individual holds office or for which the candidate seeks nomination for election or election; and

''(2) ending on the date on which such session adjourns sine die.''.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, this amendment is a very simple one but one that I believe will go a long way toward restoring public confidence in elected leaders and alleviating the perception that politicians are beholden to special interests.

My amendment simply prohibits Senate and House candidates from accepting campaign contributions from lobbyists when Congress is in session.

The amendment is fair and it is balanced. It applies to both incumbents and challengers. Since the danger of corruption or the appearance of corruption applies with equal force to challengers and incumbents, Congress has ample justification for imposing the same fundraising constraints on both incumbents and challengers.

This is not new. This is a law that currently operates in many States. In my own State of Oregon, we have long had just such a law on the books; one that I was proud to stand squarely behind as a State legislator. The Oregon law first enacted in 1974 has been in effect for 27 years and has been integral to ensuring Oregonians' confidence in the integrity of their political system at the State level.

The core tenet and assumption behind the McCain-Feingold legislation is that money in politics corrupts elected officials. Backers of the McCain-Feingold bill often use catch words and phrases, such as ''quid pro quo,'' to suggest that money can buy not only legislative action but legislators themselves.

This is not my view. It is my belief that the vast majority of the men and women with whom I serve in the public process and in this body possess the highest degree of professional and personal integrity. However, if the public perceives that campaigns are corrupt, that money talks, then I think we owe it to the public to allay those concerns.

Prohibiting contributions from registered lobbyists to candidates and Federal officeholders while Congress is in session will go a long way toward quelling the perception that we are bought and sold. My amendment addresses the public's fears directly by eliminating what they view as the disease rather than trying to just treat the symptoms.

We are not breaking new ground because we will be doing what other States have done. Oregon is joined by at least 10 other States with laws just like this that prohibit candidates and officeholders from soliciting or accepting contributions while their legislatures are in session

In 1999, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in North Carolina Right to Life v. Bartlett, upheld the constitutionality of North Carolina's law prohibiting lobbyist contributions and solicitations while its general assembly is in session, stating that the law ''serves to prevent corruption and the appearance of corruption.'' The Fourth Circuit concluded that ''in the end, North Carolina law does nothing more than recognize that lobbyists are paid to persuade legislators, not to purchase them.'' Last month the Supreme Court agreed by denying the petition for review of this very case.

So I am confident that my amendment will withstand judicial scrutiny. My amendment only restricts a candidate or officeholder from accepting contributions at a certain time and place, not if they can eventually. This is no different than time and place regulation of other first amendment issues.

Furthermore, I think it is important to point out that my amendment is narrowly crafted to prohibit candidates and officeholders from accepting contributions from lobbyists and the political action committees that employ them.

My amendment does not place the burden on lobbyists offering contributions to candidates but, rather, squarely and more fittingly on the candidate. The onus, therefore, is on the candidate or officeholder, not the lobbyist.

In closing, let me emphasize that the touchstone issue is the appearance of influence pedaling and corruption and the role that money plays. If money in the system corrupts, then my amendment lessens its role. Diminishing the role of money is also one of the stated goals of the McCain-Feingold bill. But unlike the McCain-Feingold bill, my amendment does so, I believe, in a constitutional way.

Again, my amendment merely prohibits House and Senate candidates and officeholders from accepting political donations from lobbyists while Congress is in session.

My amendment is evenhanded, it is constitutional, and it addresses the perceived problem that politicians can be bought and sold, and my amendment does so in a way that does not shut down the entire universe of citizen participation in our political process.

I hope my colleagues will unanimously support my amendment, following Oregon's lead, and that of other States, to restore confidence in the integrity of our political system.

Finally, some of my colleagues will worry that this includes the public generally. It does not. It involves registered lobbyists, PACs, and all special interest groups. A citizen can send in a contribution to a candidate. That is fine. But what is disturbing to people is the nexus that exists between legislating in the morning and fundraising at night with the very same industries. This will prohibit that. We will separate these two activities and restore some confidence that people are entitled to have in their political process.

Some people will say this just isn't possible because the Congress is always in session. There may be an unintended

but beneficial consequence. We may have shorter congressional sessions. We may get our work done more quickly, and we may be able to thereby provide the American people a little less rhetoric, a lot more action, a lot more voting, getting their job done and getting home to be with the folks and ultimately to meet with these interest groups. If they want to support you, fine, but they can't do it while you are about the people's business in making law.

I encourage a unanimous vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Inevitably, I would say to the Senator from Oregon, there is going to be a question of constitutionality. It is my understanding, from my informed staff, that there was a case in North Carolina that was upheld but it has never gone any higher than that.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. The Supreme Court, I understand, denied certiorari, thereby upholding the fourth circuit decision that allows for this kind of prohibition of fundraising from special interest groups while the North Carolina legislature is in session.

Mr. MCCAIN. What about the fact that you are clearly saying to an individual that because you are in a certain line of work, you are not going to be able to do what other citizens do? How do you respond to that?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I respond to that by saying that this is not unlike other time-and-place regulation of speech issues. People come to this building all the time and would love to come in this Chamber and protest from the very seats above us. They are not allowed to. They are given a place to protest but not to disrupt the public's work.

What I am saying is, this is a time-and-place regulation of speech. I admit that. I am saying it passes the smell test far better than our current system.

Mr. MCCAIN. But the Senator does admit that there might be some question of the constitutionality of this issue raised.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Clearly, there will be, but ultimately the issue of constitutionality is for the Court across the street to decide. It does not prohibit them from making a contribution later. It just says there is a time to do it and there is a time not to do it.

I think what disturbs all of us is the notion of holding a hearing on an industry in the morning and then going to their fundraiser in the evening. That is the nexus that is wrong. That is what, I agree with the Senator from Arizona, we ought to do away with. This works in my State. It works in your State also. Arizona is one of those States that has this restriction. It works. It smells better. It doesn't violate constitutional rights, but it does vest us with more of a process of integrity.

Mr. MCCAIN. Clearly, Arizona has the finest State government of any of the 50, I am sure the Senator from Oregon would agree.

Again, I ask the Senator from Oregon: There is going to be some question in people's minds about the constitutionality of this amendment; you would agree?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. Therefore, it would seem to me that the Senator from Oregon would understand that the whole issue of severability in this bill would then take on increased prominence. It is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon may be in support of nonseverability. I don't get the logic there. You are clearly supporting an amendment that has constitutional questions associated with it, and yet at the same time you would not understand that this bill may have portions of it, particularly during the amending process, that the U.S. Supreme Court would deem unconstitutional, including this one which, even if made unconstitutional, would not affect the thrust of the bill.

I am hopeful that the Senator from Oregon will see the logic here—I am dead serious—because it is going to be a big issue, the fact that there should be, as there have been in all but 12 bills passed by the Congress in the last 10 years, a severability clause in this legislation.

I would give a lot more credibility to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon if he believed, as he has stated, that there will be constitutional questions, that this bill should not rise or fall based on a decision concerning what a lobbyist does because there are much greater issues at stake. I certainly hope the Senator from Oregon understands my logic in that argument.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I do understand that logic. I would be happy to include this in any nonseverability amendment that I would propose. As a practical matter, as the Senator knows—and I have said this to him and Senator FEINGOLD—I have legitimate questions as to the constitutionality of McCain-Feingold. I am not a judge. We get really angry at judges who act as legislators. We are often acting as a bunch of judges. We have a responsibility to uphold the Constitution. It is their responsibility to interpret it.

I don't know how all this will cut. My concern about the severability clause or a nonseverability clause, which I will be happy to include this in, is that we will leave our country worse off rather than better off if we say to the political parties: You can't have a role any longer in elections, but the folks who will go into the smoke-filled rooms, who are not disclosable to the American people or accountable to the American people, will then be the ones who have the power because they will run campaigns about candidates.

Frankly, I have seen this happen with a campaign finance issue in Oregon. It was not pretty. It was an ugly situation because the citizen and the candidate were disenfranchised by it and were the victims, along with democracy in Oregon, because of a system that would empower those who are nondisclosable and unaccountable to the American people. They get all the power.

That is my concern, Senator. That is why I have believed a nonseverability clause is important in order that we not leave our country worse off.

With that, I am telling you and the whole world, I am prepared to vote for your bill, but I think that that is an essential ingredient, as I have told you privately. I really believe without it we will leave our country worse off based on the experience of my State of Oregon.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator will agree to one more question, I want to get back on the bill. First, I hope we will be able to convince the Senator from Oregon that any provision in this bill, if passed, would make us better off than we are today—any provision, including the Senator's. Any part of it that would stand would improve the present situation where, indeed, the case exists, and you have heard my argument about that before.

The amendment talks about registered lobbyists, but does it also add people who are in charge of political action committees and run PACs? Are there additional individuals covered by this amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It does not.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is simply people who are registered lobbyists, who have voluntarily decided to register as a lobbyist under the law.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I have enjoyed this chance to pose questions to him. I appreciate the courtesy of his response and look forward to working with him on this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank the Senator also.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. First of all, I appreciate the spirit of the amendment. Our two States, Oregon and Wisconsin, are

very similar in our pride and our reform history. Obviously, this amendment is offered in that spirit. I appreciate that.

My questions are similar to those of the Senator from Arizona, but I believe the Senator from Oregon indicated he would consider a severability provision with regard to this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I have so much confidence in its constitutionality based on its judicial history already, I would be happy to include it in a severability clause because I think everything we are doing here has a reasonable constitutional question. We ought to ask the Supreme Court to rule on it. This could be among them in terms of any nonseverability, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I was interested in the Senator's remark that we shouldn't act as judges here; we should act as legislators. I agree. I ask the Senator if he is aware of how infrequently legislatures, in particular the U.S. Congress, have actually had a nonseverability provision. Does the Senator realize that it is incredibly rare, something that is rather unlikely for legislators to do?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am aware of that, but I think what we are debating here is of so fundamental a nature to our liberty—that is, our speech; our most important speech being our political speech—that I have no doubt this would make it to the U.S. Supreme Court because this would fundamentally affect the future of our country.

Mr. FEINGOLD. One other question: Is the Senator completely opposed to the notion of having the entire bill be severable?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am prepared to include the soft money ban to the regulation of the outside groups. And if we want to include this as well, I am comfortable with that.

Mr. FEINGOLD. The reason I am asking this question—the spirit of this amendment is very positive, as I have indicated. But what I am trying to determine is whether we would have a fair chance to send a bill over to the Supreme Court where, if for any reason you were right about the constitutionality about this, the rest of the bill could still stand. Is that something the Senator is open to?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am open to discussing it with the Senators.

Mr. FEINGOLD. One other question. I want to follow up on the scope of this amendment. I have the amendment in front of me. Under section 324, there are several different paragraphs relating to who is covered. It refers to "any individual who, at any time during the period beginning on the first day of the calendar year preceding the contribution and ending on the date of the contribution, was required to be listed as a lobbyist. . . ."

Under section (2), it refers to "an officer, owner, or senior executive of any person that, at any time during the period described in paragraph (1). . ." is a lobbyist.

And then in (3), it says, "a political committee directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by an individual . . ."

And finally, (4), a separate segregated fund.

I ask the Senator how he can say it only refers to registered lobbyists when it has three other categories of people listed in the face of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. This is referring to a registered lobbyist or those who employ them.

Mr. FEINGOLD. What about a political committee?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If they employ them, they are covered by this amendment.

Mr. McCAIN. If the Senator will yield for a question, it counts not only registered lobbyists, but it is a person who employs that lobbyist as well. In other words, I am the CEO of a company back in Arizona, or I am a president of a union back in Arizona, and I am not allowed to contribute while Congress is in session because I have employed that lobbyist?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Under that guide, that is correct. However, if you sent that person a solicitation in the mail asking for a maximum hard money contribution as a private citizen, they would be allowed to make that contribution. But what I am trying to do is stop us spending time, while we are lawmaking, down at the RSCC and the DSCC, spending hundreds, even thousands, of hours raising money.

Mr. McCAIN. Well, if the Senator will yield further, I agree with what he is trying to get at. I think that, frankly, also during the campaign of President Bush, this was part of his campaign finance reform proposal, as I remember. But I think we have to worry about this language because if I am the senior executive of a company or corporation away from Washington that employs a lobbyist, and I am not allowed to contribute at that time, that could be a very large number of people. I wonder if we can work on language with the Senator from Oregon to achieve this goal, without throwing a pretty wide net here. If I am thinking through this legislation, which I am looking at for the first time——

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I am happy to work with the Senator on an amendment to this amendment. I am not locked down. It is offered in the spirit of my experience as an Oregonian. I believe Wisconsin and Arizona have similar laws. It works. It will be more difficult for Congress, but it ought to be done in Congress.

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator will yield for a further question, I will tell you one thing: This certainly will shorten legislative sessions, which is a wonderful aspect, as the Senator from Nevada pointed out. Under sub (4), it refers to a separate segregated fund. I am advised that this basically would include political action committees.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Is it the Senator's intention to prohibit the lobbyist from giving individual contributions, but also PACs during this period?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. That is correct, during a legislative session. When we gavel the session in, you can't do it until you gavel sine die. If the world of special interests wants to evaluate what they think of your performance and help you in your election, fine. We are segregating the function of lawmaking and moneymaking. I think that goes a long way to fixing what you think and feel, rightfully, is broken in this country.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Does the Senator believe it could be unconstitutional to prohibit PAC contributions?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I don't believe so. It doesn't prohibit them. It regulates them in terms of time and place.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I suggest that the effect of this is to unconstitutionally prohibit PAC contributions, and I would be concerned about that.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. REID. There is nobody in this body for whom I have more respect. Would this amendment not give a tremendous advantage to wealthy people who are members of the national legislature?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I don't believe it would. They can give a hard money contribution of $1,000 per campaign.

Mr. REID. No. What I am saying is, if you are a Member of Congress, would you not have an advantage over everyone else if you were rich because it would limit so much of the time for people to do the fundraising?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. There is no question but that this amendment will do more to drive money out of politics than anything that has been proposed yet. There is no question about that. But we have just passed an amendment that doesn't give a perfect playing field to the challenger against the multimillionaire, but it gives them a better playing field than we have had before.

Mr. REID. My friend has not answered the question. Would this not give an advantage to a Member of Congress who is rich, because during the period of time that Congress is in session, basically, there would be a tremendous inability to raise money, whereas if somebody finances their own campaign, it doesn't matter to them?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I would concede the point. But I would simply say

that what this does is prohibit the challenger or the Member of Congress from being involved in this. I think it is a heavy restriction, but I think it is the right restriction, and I think if we can go to this kind of a standard, it is going to look better to the American people and, frankly, it is going to drive a lot of money out of politics and clean up our day by making us spend time lawmaking instead of fundraising. And at the end of the day, if somebody wants to spend their own money, they are going to have to comply with the law or the amendment we just passed, and it will equalize it somewhat.

Mr. REID. One more question. While the Senator's amendment bans contributions during the time we have talked about, it doesn't ban solicitations during that time; is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It does.

Mr. REID. It does ban solicitations?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It bans accepting them.

Mr. REID. It would not ban solicitations. You could go to the NRA, or whoever gives money, and you could ask them for money at that time, and they would have to give it to you at a subsequent time when we were out of session?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. It doesn't prohibit that. I don't know how to prohibit that constitutionally, but I do know how to constitutionally prohibit the time and place in which these activities are engaged. But the Senator, in his earlier point, said: What does this mean to a Member of Congress? You don't have to be a millionaire to have an advantage by being a Member of Congress. You probably have a large campaign war chest already carried over from your last campaign, if you are a safe incumbent. So these are just the facts of life. I don't know how I can make it perfect, but I know this amendment makes it better.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the Senator will yield, the Senator is doing an excellent job taking on these questions from all corners. But it is a very interesting amendment. I think my own State of Tennessee has a similar amendment. I think what happens is anybody comes to town a couple days sooner to collect the money.

Other than that, my concern, as we consider these amendments, has to do with constitutionality issues. I want to make a couple comments and then ask a question. Obviously, none of us is going to be able to tell what is constitutional or not. But if we have a nonseverability clause—and we don't know whether or not we will—after we have a vote, any amendments that turn out to be not constitutional bring the whole bill down. Some people think that is good. I think we will wind up with a hard money increase, which I think is good, and doing something about soft money, which I think is good. So I think that would be a bad result if that happened.

Personally, I think this so-called millionaire amendment we just passed is of very doubtful constitutionality. That is the reason I voted against it. I don't see how you make the kinds of distinctions that that amendment made when you have free speech protection with regard to his spending his own money, how you then favor one over the other, and what you do about the person who wants to make a contribution, and he can give up to, say, $5,000 to candidate X, but to candidate Y he can only give $1,000.

We already have an amendment that has been adopted with questions about its constitutionality.

With regard to your amendment, my question is this: Will the issue not be resolved on the basis of whether or not there is a compelling State interest? It seems to me that is the question, and if that is the question, if that is the issue, then I look at it to see whether or not what we are doing is of sufficient compelling State interest to overcome the first amendment problems.

Obviously, we are impinging on the first amendment. The Supreme Court has said in some cases we can impinge on the first amendment. That is what we are doing when we put hard money limits on people. We impinge on the first amendment, but the Supreme Court says there is a compelling interest to doing that, and that is the appearance of corruption.

The question is, it seems to me, are we doing enough? Is there sufficient, compelling State interest for us to do this? Is it really helping the system that much in this time-place-manner amendment in order to impinge on the admitted free speech rights of a potential contributor?

I take it the Senator thinks we would be doing enough to help the system, to help the Nation by placing these kinds of limitations on people to overcome an impingement on their first amendment rights. Does my colleague agree that is the issue with which we are dealing?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I agree with the Senator. Let me read the exact wording of the Fourth Circuit's response to that very question.

A unanimous Fourth Circuit found the restriction was narrowly tailored and served the compelling interest.

> The restrictions are limited to lobbyists and the political committees that employ them, the two most ubiquitous and powerful players in the political arena.

They found the restrictions cover only that period during which the risk of an actual quid pro quo or the appearance of one runs the highest risk.

Again, it is a time-and-place regulation. I suspect people in North Carolina, just as the people of Oregon, have a lot more confidence in hearings going on in the morning and know there is not a fundraiser going on in the evening.

Mr. THOMPSON. I say to my colleague, that does carry a certain amount of logic to it, but we all know that some of these bills carry on for a long period of time, and these big issues where people are greatly interested and their businesses are greatly affected sometimes go on for a period of years and we have fundraisers interspersed with them.

I do not know that I agree the greatest danger has to do with the time proximity of the contribution, but I ask my friend if the rest of his bill tracks what they were doing in that Fourth Circuit situation in terms of the people involved, in terms of the places limited, in terms of the time restriction?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. We have tailored this amendment after the North Carolina one in order to make sure it passes judicial muster. I believe it does. I am willing to put it as part of a nonseverability clause.

I say to the Senator, my concern about the absence of nonseverability is not to every component of this bill. It is the banning of soft money, whereas I would limit it, as the Hagel proposal. It is the banning of soft money if you do not also include these outside groups.

The Senator knows firsthand, I am sure, as a Republican, when it comes time that you are under attack, you have some very powerful and effective groups against you. You have the Sierra Club; you have the trial lawyers; you have labor unions, and on and on. They are very good at what they do. They hit and they run and are accountable to no one. They do not even have to tell the truth. But the only rescue for a Republican is the Republican Senate Campaign Committee.

Just in fairness, if you are going to empower such groups, if you are not going to include them, then, frankly, I think we do great damage. To Democrats who may say this is to our advantage, let me say what will happen.

The day this is enacted and soft money is banned and held constitutional, every Republican dollar flowing to that Senate committee is going to find its way immediately into a Republican Sierra Club, and all of this will not be disclosable, it will not be accountable, and we will have dumbed down America's democracy.

That is the point I am trying to make. That is why those two components, soft money versus regulating outside groups, have to be tied together if we are to make our country better instead of worse.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator said there would not be fundraisers held. There would be nothing wrong. You could have fundraisers and solicit the money. You just could not collect it; is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. If you wanted to tighten up the bill even more on that account, I would be happy with an amendment you might offer to that effect. I am trying to go as far as I can constitutionally and say there can be no exchange of cash when you are in a legislative session because it does not look good. It does not smell good. We ought to change it, and a lot of States are cleaning up their State governments with this very kind of law. We should do no less in this Congress.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the point. I wanted to make sure the record reflected, in response to a question from the Senator from Tennessee, that there would not be any fundraisers. There may not be as many, but certainly you could have as many fundraisers as you wanted and solicit the money at the fundraisers. You just could not collect the money that night or that day.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I guess my question is, Would the Senator like to amend the amendment to include the prohibition of these kinds of solicitations?

Mr. REID. Of course, we cannot amend anything the way the unanimous consent agreement is in place. I think the Senator from Arizona wishes to discuss possible amendments with the Senator, and that would be something.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Would it be appropriate to call for a quorum call to work it out?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I realize there is a time constraint here because, under the UC, we have a vote at 6 o'clock. We have been trying to work out an agreement on this amendment. We have been unable to do so. We will go ahead and have the vote at 6. I will make a tabling motion, but I am committed to working with Senator SMITH to see if there is a way that we can work it out to his and everyone's satisfaction. It is overly broad in its language at this time, but we have not been able to reach a conclusion.

I regret that because I agree with Senator SMITH's intent, and I think he is trying to do something that would cure a very bad perception that persists in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is out of time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut controls the remainder of the time, 16 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to my colleague for a couple minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. That would be all I would need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank Senator DODD. I know this is not easy. I know Congress meets for a long time. I know State legislatures are different just in terms of time. In every other respect, this law is as valid here as it is other places, in my view. If we are worried about appearance, if we want to move soft money, if we want to move money out of politics, nothing will do that better than this amendment. Nothing will shorten congressional sessions more than this amendment.

In my opinion, we ought to vote on it. We ought to pass it. I will pledge my best efforts to work with Senator MCCAIN to get it in a shape that wins his support as well. It is consistent with the spirit of McCain-Feingold.

I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, following up on my earlier comments, I am concerned about this amendment because I fear it may very well be unconstitutional. If one of these amendments is unconstitutional and the reform side does not win on the severability issue, the whole thing falls. Obviously, the question of constitutionality is always important, but it is even more important now.

My concern is this: We have to clearly have a compelling governmental interest to override the first amendment rights of people to give money to candidates. They clearly have that right here. We are clearly overriding it. The question is whether or not there is a sufficient governmental interest.

The case that was cited from the Fourth Circuit—and that case was in North Carolina—pointed out that it only covered a narrow area and that the Legislature of North Carolina only met for a few months out of the year.

This body sometimes meets the entire year. There is no way a person could raise any money at any time during the year under those circumstances. Clearly, the Fourth Circuit is not authority for the constitutionality of this bill. It might be wrong. The Fourth Circuit might be incorrect in its analysis that it should be narrowly tailored. But that causes me a great deal of concern and difficulty. As well meaning as this amendment is, and in many ways as much as I would like to see it, it causes me great concern to vote for an amendment with what I believe raises pretty serious constitutionality questions.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it is not pleasant to oppose this amendment. The Senator from Oregon is a wonderful Senator. We have worked together on a lot of issues, in the Foreign Relations Committee, the Budget Committee, and the like. We do share a great progressive tradition in our two States of Wisconsin and Oregon. That is the spirit of this amendment.

I have to agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. This does raise some real questions because it doesn't apply to State legislatures. It applies to this Congress. It may make sense for State legislatures that convene for a few months every year, but it doesn't make sense for this Congress. In the year 2000, this Congress went into session in January and, as we painfully remember, did not adjourn until December. There was even a possibility that we were going to go up to New Year's Eve. So it is not realistic to have this kind of limitation that we have in States such as Wisconsin and Oregon at the Federal level.

The cost of campaigns is regrettably high. Obviously, future reforms should address this problem. As has been said by other speakers, this amendment is overly broad in its attempt to prohibit congressional candidates from accepting contributions while the Congress is in session from all the following individuals or entities. It is not just registered lobbyists, as some thought when the amendment was first described. It is much more than that. It is registered lobbyists that are affected, PACs, senior executives, officers, or owners of any organization that employed or retained a registered lobbyist during a calendar year preceding the contribution.

It would prohibit not just contributions from lobbyists but, as the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, contributions from executives of any company that employs a lobbyist—the executives of General Motors, of Federal Express, and every other company. It would prohibit all union and corporate PACs from contributing basically almost all year-round because, as I pointed out, we are in session so much of the year.

I am afraid this amendment also gives a huge advantage to wealthy incumbents or any incumbents who have a substantial war chest. Under the Smith amendment, while challengers are unable to raise funds from those listed above throughout this very extensive time period in a year, the incumbents who have a lot of resources would be able to rely on their existing war chests or personal wealth. That concerns me as well.

Finally, as the Senator from Tennessee has focused on, there is a serious question of the constitutionality of this amendment. This is one of the reasons I asked the Senator from Oregon at the beginning about whether this affected PACs. He conceded that banning

PAC contributions does raise constitutional questions. It calls into question the whole bill.

Of course, if the Senator from Oregon, as we proceed with this bill, is willing to work with us on making sure this entire bill is severable so that each provision can stand on its own and the Court can determine each one, that could be a different story with regard to that argument, but that is the kind of discussion we need to have.

I want him to know I am eager to have those discussions. I appreciate his attitude toward reform, and I hope that in the end perhaps we can work something out relating to this, but even more importantly, he can be part of our efforts. In light of these concerns, I will urge that all those supporting the McCain-Feingold bill should oppose the Smith amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I don't know if others want to be heard on this. If my colleague would like to rebut, I will be willing to yield some time to him.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I recommit to work with Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD and see if we can narrow this down. We worked on this a long time. It is hard to do. We are intruding upon speech, there is no question about it. The question is whether this is a permissible time-and-place regulation and is there a legitimate State interest. Absolutely, because you are separating the fundraising from lawmaking. That not only will drive money out of politics, it will help us to focus more on lawmaking and less on fundraising.

There is a time and a season for everything. That season is after we do our business. Everybody can have their say and make their contribution. You just can't do it when we are doing the people's business.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if I may, I will take a couple minutes to conclude. I have great respect for my friend from Oregon. We serve on committees together, and I enjoy working with him on numerous issues. There has been a lot described as to why the amendment is troublesome. There is one element not included in the language that I find appealing, and the public might be attracted to the fact that this may have the net effect of abbreviating sessions of Congress. That may have some appeal to a certain number of Americans. If you can only fundraise when Congress is not in session, we might be through with business in April or May. Seriously—I am not being facetious in those comments—this is a provision that concerned me a little bit. It goes back to the debate we had earlier in the day about the nonincumbent. I understand the effort may be to modify this amendment and bring it back at a later time as a modified amendment. But it also affects the nonincumbent.

As I understand the last provision of the bill, ''beginning on the first day of any session of the body of Congress to which the individual holds office, or for which the candidate seeks nomination for election or election,'' and it could be, of course, that someone in a larger State would begin to challenge one of us as incumbents 2 or 3 years out, which is not uncommon today in larger States, and if we are in session in those years, obviously, a challenger who wants to be heard, where you have a State such as California, or Texas, or Illinois, or New York, you may want to begin that process earlier and they would be restrained from raising any money if this amendment were adopted as presently crafted.

So I, too, respect immensely my colleague's motivations. We talked over the last 2 days about the fact that under present circumstances in an average Senate race of $6 or $7 million—that is what an individual has to raise in a contested race—a Member would literally have to raise thousands of dollars every day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, for the entire 6-year term. Somebody pointed out that in the State of California that number is more like $10,000 a day every day when you start talking about $20 million or $30 million. Obviously, for any Member of this body who is raising $10,000 a day every day for 6 years, there is a portion of your responsibilities, to put it mildly, as a Member of this body that is suffering.

It goes to the very heart of what Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD are trying to achieve in this legislation. I don't subscribe to the notion that it is an inevitability that campaigns should increase in cost exponentially as they have been. I think you can put on the brakes. And what Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD are doing is trying to put the brakes on a bit in the area of soft money. Our colleague from Oregon is also trying to put on some brakes, and I respect that.

For the reasons articulated by Senators MCCAIN, FEINGOLD, THOMPSON of Tennessee, and others, I reluctantly oppose this amendment, and I will look for an opportunity when a modified version may come back. I thank our colleague for raising the subject matter. I urge rejection of the amendment.

I don't know if any more time is being sought. We can yield back the time left. I think our colleague from Arizona may want to make an appropriate motion. We are prepared to yield back time on our side.

Mr. MCCAIN. Would the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to Senator GORDON SMITH what I said to him before. We have our staffs working. I believe I will be able to table this amendment, but if not, he wins. If it is tabled, we want to work together with him. It is the unseemly appearances the American people don't like. We ought to try to fix it. I think there should be both time and effort in the consideration of this legislation to narrow this amendment so it does meet constitutional concerns expressed by Senator THOMPSON and others.

I thank Senator SMITH not only for his involvement in this issue but in the entire issue of campaign finance reform. I know he comes from a State where there is a lot of interest in this issue, as there is in mine—the ''clean campaign'' State referendum. I think he is representing his constituents when he is heavily involved in this issue. I look forward to working with him not only on this one, but as we approach some of the more important issues in the coming days. I thank him for his efforts.

Mr. President, if it is an appropriate time, I move to table the Smith amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Akaka	Dodd	Lieberman
Allard	Dorgan	Lincoln
Allen	Durbin	Lott
Baucus	Enzi	McCain
Bayh	Feingold	Mikulski
Bennett	Feinstein	Miller
Biden	Fitzgerald	Murray
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Byrd	Hagel	Reid
Cantwell	Harkin	Roberts
Carnahan	Hatch	Rockefeller
Carper	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Inouye	Schumer
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Specter
Cochran	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Thomas
Corzine	Kohl	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Torricelli
Crapo	Landrieu	Voinovich
Dayton	Leahy	Wellstone
DeWine	Levin	

NAYS—25

Brownback	Helms	Smith (NH)
Bunning	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Burns	Hutchison	Snowe
Campbell	Inhofe	Stevens
Collins	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	McConnell	Warner
Edwards	Murkowski	Wyden
Ensign	Santorum	
Gregg	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—1

Daschle

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as I understand it now there will be no more votes today. The intention is to lay down an amendment to be offered by my colleague from New Jersey, and that debate tomorrow will begin at whatever time the majority leader brings us into session. Hopefully, we might even complete the debate in less than 3 hours.

I ask my colleague from New Jersey if that were possible. In which case, the very latest would be somewhere around 12:30, if we follow today's pattern at all. After that, I understand our colleague from Mississippi has an amendment, and after that I think Senator KERRY of Massachusetts has an amendment, as do Senator WYDEN and Senator WELLSTONE. We have not worked that out yet, but it will be one of those three amendments to be offered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Connecticut, since Senator COCHRAN is aligned with your side on this issue, we may want to talk about who comes after Senator TORRICELLI.

Mr. DODD. OK.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We will discuss that and get the lineup set.

I have been told the majority leader would like us to come in at 9:30, so we can anticipate a vote on the Torricelli amendment at 12:30 or before, depending on what time is yielded back.

Mr. DODD. I yield whatever time the Senator from New Jersey would care to take for the purpose of introducing his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 122

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORZINE, and Mr. DORGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 122.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require television broadcast stations, and providers of cable or satellite television service, to provide lowest unit rate to committees of political parties purchasing time on behalf of candidates)

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. TELEVISION MEDIA RATES.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE.—Subsection (b) of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) The charges'' and inserting the following:

''(b) CHARGES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the charges'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) TELEVISION.—The charges made for the use of any television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office in connection with the campaign of such candidate for nomination for election, or election, to such office shall not exceed the lowest charge of the station (at any time during the 365-day period preceding the date of the use) for the same amount of time for the same period.''.

(b) RATE AVAILABLE FOR NATIONAL PARTIES.—Section 315(b)(2) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(2)), as added by subsection (a), is amended by inserting '', or by a national committee of a political party on behalf of such candidate in connection with such campaign,'' after ''such office''.

(c) PREEMPTION.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) PREEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a licensee shall not preempt the use of a television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, by an eligible candidate or political committee of a political party who has purchased and paid for such use pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

''(2) CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL OF LICENSEE.—If a program to be broadcast by a television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, is preempted because of circumstances beyond the control of the station, any candidate or party advertising spot scheduled to be broadcast during that program may also be preempted.''.

(d) RANDOM AUDITS.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315), as amended by subsection (d), is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) RANDOM AUDITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 45-day period preceding a primary election and the 60-day period preceding a general election, the Commission shall conduct random audits of designated market areas to ensure that each television broadcast station, and provider of cable or satellite television service, in those markets is allocating television broadcast advertising time in accordance with this section and section 312.

''(2) MARKETS.—The random audits conducted under paragraph (1) shall cover the following markets:

''(A) At least 6 of the top 50 largest designated market areas (as defined in section 122(j)(2)(C) of title 17, United States Code).

''(B) At least 3 of the 51–100 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(C) At least 3 of the 101–150 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(D) At least 3 of the 151–210 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(3) BROADCAST STATIONS.—Each random audit shall include each of the 3 largest television broadcast networks, 1 independent network, and 1 cable network.''.

(e) DEFINITION OF BROADCASTING STATION.—Subsection (f) of section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315(f)), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, is amended by inserting '', a television broadcast station, and a provider of cable or satellite television service'' before the semicolon.

(f) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''IN GENERAL.—'' before ''If any'';

(2) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, by inserting ''DEFINITIONS.—'' before ''For purposes''; and

(3) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by inserting ''REGULATIONS.—'' before ''The Commission''.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, tomorrow I will join my colleagues, Senators DURBIN, CORZINE and DORGAN, to support an amendment designed to reduce broadcast rates for political candidates and parties. This will be discussed at length tomorrow. For this evening's purposes, it is probably best to introduce the amendment with the words of David Broder today in the Washington Post who writes the current campaign finance debate:

. . .focuses too much on the people who write the checks. It's time to question, as well, where the money goes.

There remains no greater factor in the astronomical expense in political campaigns than the rising cost of televised political advertising. Nearly $1 billion was spent on political advertising in the 2000 Federal campaign, a 76 percent increase since 1996. As demand for advertising time rose, advertising rates have risen as well.

In Philadelphia and in New York City, the cost of some political ads increased 50 percent between Labor Day and Election Day. Political candidates were held hostage by the calendar and the television networks took full advantage. By law, candidates are supposed to pay the lowest unit rate for a station's most favored commercial advertisers.

That is the law.

The problem is that to ensure their advertisements do not get displaced, candidates often end up paying the highest rates available.

This Congress had an intent, and it wrote a law that Members of the Congress have available the lowest unit rate available by station. But it isn't happening. That is the purpose of this amendment.

In Detroit, 88 percent of the advertisements at one television station were sold above the lowest rate. In Minneapolis, 95 percent of all the advertising sold was above that minimum rate. The lowest unit rate has become

a fiction. Political candidates are competing with General Motors, Procter & Gamble, Ford, and the greatest advertisers in the Nation. We are in a bidding war against commercial interests in order to communicate public policy issues with the American people.

There is no greater hypocrisy in our time than the television networks that have maintained the need for a change of a campaign finance system at the same time they are increasing rates during the fall campaigns and gouging political candidates for more and more money. Indeed, political advertising is now the third greatest source of revenue for the television networks behind retailers and the automobile companies.

The Torricelli-Durbin-Corzine amendment prevents broadcasters from gouging candidates and parties into paying the highest rates for fixed time by:

One, requiring stations to charge candidates and parties the lowest rate available throughout the year;

Two, ensuring that candidates and party ads are not bumped by other advertisers willing to pay more for the time in the bidding war in which we are now engaged with commercial parties;

Three, requiring the FCC to conduct random checks during the preelection period to ensure compliance with the law.

Candidates in markets of all sizes would benefit. A candidate in Alabama could save at least 400 percent on one station alone. We have calculated that a candidate in Los Angeles could save 75 percent at one station by having this lower rate available.

This amendment does not require broadcasters to allocate candidates free time, as indeed is done in almost every other industrial democracy in the world. Many of my colleagues believe such free time is the answer. We are not requiring that in this amendment.

We are not altering the content of their programming nor charging a fee for use of the public spectrum. All we are doing is requiring what we required so long ago, but now enforcing it —now ensuring that it happens in practice; that is, that the lowest unit rate be made available.

This will be discussed in length tomorrow. But it is eminently reasonable that in a public policy debate, in choosing leaders of this country, the public airwaves provided on license to the television networks not be a financial opportunity for the networks to get candidates in a bidding war against commercial advertisers, and not taking advantage of those weeks before an election when advertisers, by necessity, must be placed and, therefore, an opportunity for the networks to increase their rates to take advantage of the calendar.

This simply assures fair access at a fair price. It is a necessary component of campaign finance reform. If we are to reduce the amount of money that is available as part of the effort to perform, reduce the amount of political money in this system in order to ensure the integrity of our Government and increase public confidence, and if we are to reduce these expenditures without reducing the cost of advertising, there is only one possible result: Less campaign fundraising will result in less communication, less informed voters, and candidates unable to bring their message to the people.

There is only one way to avoid this eventuality: Reduce the amount of campaign money by reducing campaign costs. That is at the heart of the Torricelli - Corzine - Dorgan - Durbin amendment.

I will return tomorrow morning with my colleagues. We will present our case at length and I think make a real and lasting contribution to the fight for reform.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I yield to Senator ENSIGN of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I have been in four very tough campaigns in the last 8 years. I have a lot of experience buying television time. Being a small State, the State of Nevada, in which we only have two media markets, it is a lot less expensive than in the State of my good friend from New Jersey.

In 1994, our television time was a lot less expensive. Just in the last 8 years, television has literally at least tripled in price in my State. At election time, when the Senator was talking about the gouging—whatever term you want to use—by the station, there are so many independent expenditures and so many candidates advertising on television that the price goes up. As a matter of fact, at the beginning when you are doing your budgeting for your campaign and you are trying to get the lowest unit rate, it is supposedly going to be at the end of the campaign so that you can determine how much money you will be able to spend on television and how much you will be able to put your message out to the voters.

I remember asking my people: What about this lowest unit rate we heard about? I always hear about that in every campaign. My campaign people say that is really a farce, because the lowest unit rate is something that is preemptible time, so we don't recommend that you ever buy the lowest unit rate. I think we bought a few spots at the lowest unit rate. But other than that, we had to buy nonpreemptible time so we would make sure we had the slots and our message would get to the people to whom we wanted to get.

Mr. TORRICELLI. If I could interrupt the Senator, on tomorrow we will present to the Senate correspondence illustrating exactly the phenomenon to which the Senator from Nevada was speaking. Political candidates will place an ad for $20,000 in compliance with Federal law at the lowest unit rate, and the television station will write back and say: You have an advertisement placed at $20,000, and you should know there is a commercial buyer for that time. If you do not send us another $20,000, you will lose the slot. We will move your ad where we intend to move it, which means the middle of the night.

In fact, they take a candidate's time trying to communicate to the American people in accordance with Federal law at the lowest unit rate, and then you get into a bidding war with the commercial interests because the station is trying to take advantage of the time. They know you advertise in October and September.

Tomorrow we are going to have a complete example of what the Senator is discussing.

Mr. ENSIGN. If the Senator will yield again, my personal experience with this has gone on. We just had the broadcasters from Neveda in our office last week. I don't blame them for wanting to make a profit. That is their business. I don't blame them at all. But we have to spend a lot more time and effort raising money. And this drives up the cost of all of our campaigns simply because of what has happened in the last few election cycles. This phenomenon we are seeing has really happened in the last three or four election cycles—this bidding up of the prices right before election day.

As a matter of fact, when I first got into this in 1994, the television stations didn't like the political season because it was the time when they lost money because they used to give out a lot of low unit rates. But today they love the election cycles. It is one of their highest profit margin times—at least that is what they tell me—simply because there are so many people trying to get on the air to advertise. Candidates cannot get the lowest unit rate. They don't choose to do it anymore. And they have to bid up this time.

So I applaud the three Senators for bringing this amendment up. I think it is the right thing to do. I do not know whether the amendment is going to be adopted, but I certainly think it is the right thing to do. I will be joining with you tomorrow in voting for this.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank the Senator for his help. I believe we will succeed tomorrow on a bipartisan basis. I think people recognize the purpose of campaign finance reform is not that the United States have less political debate, not that the American people will be less informed, but that there will be less money in the system. If we are to achieve both—and that is, to have people to be well informed but have less money in the system, and build confidence—we have to lower the cost of campaigns. This is the way to do it—on the public airways.

Unfortunately, we are not doing what is done in Britain or France or England, which is providing this time free because they are public airwaves. We are taking a very modest step. Indeed, we are only putting into law what really, in fact, was in the law but now is being evaded, and that is this requirement of lowest unit rate.

Indeed, the Senator's experience in Las Vegas is not unusual. He has seen a 300-percent increase during this decade. As I pointed out, the national average, in just 4 years, is 76 percent. There is no cost of business for any industry I know of that is rising faster than the cost of advertising for a political candidate. But what is unbelievable is, in the entire national debate on campaign finance reform, this has largely been absent.

It is as if candidates are raising money because they enjoy it, that somehow people like to raise money because it is entertaining. People are raising these phenomenal amounts of money for one purpose: to feed the television networks that are demanding it, and holding the political system hostage.

So I suggest that tomorrow Mr. Brokaw and Mr. Jennings and Mr. Rather, who have led this campaign for campaign finance reform—we are joining them and going to make the point that rather than being a critic of it, you can make a contribution. This is their way of making a contribution. We are going to lead them to do so tomorrow.

Would the Senator like to add a point?

Mr. ENSIGN. If the Senator will further yield, to just give the American people a little bit of insight into how campaigns work, when you are setting up your budget, in the beginning you set up your TV target market and how much you want to advertise—not how many dollars you want to put into it but what level of penetration into the market you want to get, something called the gross rating point. And we determine each week from election day backward approximately how many points we would like to get in the market. That will determine how much of our message gets to the voters. Then we try to figure out, after we do that, approximately how much the stations are going to charge us for each one of those commercials we put on television.

In the last few years, because of the huge increases, obviously, we have had to adjust our budgets. From that point we go forward and determine how much money we need to raise in our campaigns. That is why the cost of campaigns has continued to go up and up and up and up. From 1995 to 1998, we spent about $3.5 million in our first Senate race. In our second Senate race, just 2 years later, we spent almost $5 million. That is the reality. Mail costs about the same, and radio has gone up a little bit but not too badly, and almost all of the increase has been because of the cost of television.

Mr. TORRICELLI. If I could share one of my own experiences: In 1996, in my own Senate race, we tried to buy the advertising in advance. We knew, as did the Senator, how many points we wanted to buy. We offered to send the money to television. They would not take it because they wanted to increase the rates. They told us in advance: These rates will not hold. We will not take your money. The more they see the demand from political candidates, the more they increase the cost.

Now, to the point, if we are to have a $1,000 limit on all expenditures under McCain-Feingold—no soft money—only $1,000 contributions, in the city of New York an ad covering much of the State of New Jersey can be $60,000 or $70,000. So it will take 70 people writing $1,000 contributions to pay for one ad—one.

The point becomes, how many people do you need? How much do you have to raise to run a television campaign? Effectively, for a candidate in New York today, we will never see another Senate campaign that costs less than $25 million. At that rate, how many thousands and thousands and thousands of people have to write $1,000 contributions? There is no escaping this addiction of money until we lower these costs.

I am very grateful the Senator from Nevada has joined this cause. I am very grateful on a bipartisan basis it seems overwhelmingly the Senate is prepared now to have the second leg on the chair of campaign finance reform—control the money, control the costs, and then we have a balanced program for genuine reform.

I thank the Senator. I look forward to being with him in the debate tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I commend our colleagues from New Jersey and Nevada. This exchange between these two fine Senators represents the quality of the debate the Senate is now experiencing on this important issue of campaign finance reform.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to read into the RECORD the following article by Stanford law professor Kathleen Sullivan, entitled ''Paying Up Is Speaking Up.'' In it, she notes that politics and political campaigns are far cleaner today than they were in the days of Tammany Hall. She also notes that in Bucklay v. Valeo the Supreme Court made things worse by striking down expenditure limits while upholding contribution units, resulting in a situation where government may limit the supply of political money but not the demand.

Professor Sullivan says:

Those who claim that our political system is awash in money, corruption and influence peddling were predictably upset that the Senate again defeated the campaign finance restriction proposed by Senators Russell Feingold and John McCain. The Senate's failure to ban ''soft money''—large contributions to political parties that are made to avoid tight restrictions on donations to candidates—drew laments from editorial pages to corporate boardrooms, where some business executives now plead, ''Stop us before we spend again.''

The advocates of new, improved campaign finance reform are well-intentioned but misguided. Of course none of us wishes to live in a plutocracy, where wealth alone determines political clout. But as Senator Mitch McConnell noted in a heated exchange with Senator McCain, American politics today is far from ''corrupt'' in the traditional sense. And the most troubling features of political fundraising today are the unintended consequences of earlier efforts at campaign finance reform.

Begin with the allegations of ''corruption.'' Contributions to candidates and parties today do not line anybody's pockets, as they did in the heyday of machines like Tammany Hall. Vigilant media and law enforcement now nip improper personal enrichment in the bud, as politicians involved in the savings and loan scandals found out to their detriment.

Political money today instead goes directly into political advertising, a quintessential form of political speech. Our large electoral districts and weak political parties force candidates to communicate directly with large groups of voters. This depends on the use of the privately owned mass media. Thus getting the candidate's message out is expensive.

Reformers sometimes decry today's political advertising as repetitious and reductive. But it is not clear what golden age of high-minded debate they hark back to; the antecedents of the spot ad are, after all, the bumper sticker and slogans like ''Tippecanoe and Tyler, Too.''

Nor is there any doubt that restrictions on political money amount to restrictions on political speech. Reformers sometimes say they merely seek to limit money, not speech. But a law, say, barring newspapers from accepting paid political advertisements or limiting the prices of political books would also limit only the exchange of money. Yet no one would question that it would inhibit political speech—as do restrictions on campaign finance.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court only half recognized this point when, in 1976, it struck down limits on political expenditures while upholding limits on political gifts. Expenditures, the Court reasoned, may not be

limited in order to level the playing field, but political contributions may be limited to prevent the reality or appearance that big contributors will have disproportionate influence. So we still have in place the 1974 law limiting individual contributions to a Federal candidate to $1,000 per election—the equivalent of about $383 in 1999 dollars—and, perversely, candidates must spend ever more time chasing an ever larger number of donors.

The Court's noble but flawed attempt at compromise leaves us in the worst of all possible worlds: government may limit the supply of political money but not the demand. This is a situation that in a commercial setting would produce a black or gray market, and politics is no different. Instead of money flowing directly to candidates, it flows to parties as soft money, or to independent advocacy organizations for issue ads that often imply support for or opposition to specific candidates.

Political spending and speech thus have been shifted away from the candidates, who are accountable to the voters, to organizations that are much harder for the voters to monitor and discipline—a result that turns democracy on its head.

Reform proposals such as McCain-Feingold proceed on the assumption that the answer is to keep on shutting down ''loopholes'' in the system. But in a system of private ownership and free expression, we can never shut all the loopholes down. If the wealthy cannot bankroll campaigns, they can buy newspapers or set up lobbying organizations that will draft legislation rather than campaign ads. When the cure has been worse than the disease, the solution is not more doses of the same medicine.

Does this mean we should eliminate all campaign finance regulation? Certainly not. Even if we give up on contribution limits, we should retain and enhance mandatory disclosure and public subsidies—two kinds of government intervention that are consistent with both democracy and the Constitution.

Mandatory disclosure of the amounts and sources of political contributions enables the voters themselves, aided by the press, to follow the money and hold their representatives accountable if they smell the foul aroma of undue influence. Such disclosure is an extraordinarily powerful and accessible tool in the age of the Internet.

And more widespread public subsidies, like those now given in presidential and some state races, could, if given early in campaigns, help political challengers reach the critical threshold amounts they need to get their messages out.

In ongoing debates about campaign finance reform, it is worth remembering that free speech principles bar the creation of ceilings on political money, but they do not bar the raising of floors.

Mr. President, I would also like to read into the RECORD a recent article by Stuart Taylor Jr. of the National Journal entitled ''How McCain-Feingold Would Constrict Speech.'' It explains how McCain-Feingold would make our political system worse, not better. It notes that each new step down the road of restricting political speech and political spending actually creates new problems.

Mr. Taylor's article says:

It all sounds so clean, so wholesome, so righteous: close the loopholes in our campaign finance laws. End what Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., calls the ''corrupting chase for 'soft money.' '' Curb the influence of corporations and labor unions. Stop special interests from polluting our politics with ''sham issue ads.'' Mandate greater public disclosure of political spending.

But in reality, the McCain-Feingold-Cochran campaign finance bill would make our politics worse, not better, by further entrenching incumbents against challengers, by weakening our political parties, by increasing the influence of wealthy individuals and huge media corporations, by stifling political debate, and by attacking the First Amendment's premise that political speech should be free and uninhibited, not hobbled by a maze of prohibitions and regulations.

We might be able to make our politics cleaner and fairer by supplementing private campaign funding with some form of public financing to help give voice to candidates and causes with scant financial resources. (More on that next week.) We will not achieve this by piling onerous new restrictions on privately funded speech.

Our experience with the current curbs on campaign contributions, which were enacted in the early 1970s, should be sobering. Spread through hundreds of pages of almost indecipherable legalese understood only by specialists, these curbs are filled with traps, technicalities, and opportunities for selective enforcement by politically appointed bureaucrats and judges. Their main impact has been to force federally elected officials and their challengers to spend a huge percentage of their waking hours soliciting ever-smaller (after inflation) contributions from ever-larger numbers of people. Meanwhile, incumbents have become harder to defeat, the influence of special interests has grown, voter turnout has declined, and public confidence in our political system has plunged.

The solution, say McCain and other ''reformers,'' is to plug loopholes in the current laws—first and foremost, by ending the ability of wealthy individuals, corporations, and unions to circumvent the limits on ''hard-money'' contributions to candidates by giving their political parties unlimited sums of soft money to be spent promoting the candidates. This would make it harder for politicians to extort money from those who would prefer not to give. That is good. But it would also weaken the parties' ability to finance indisputably healthy grass-roots activities such as voter education, registration, and turnout drives, while spurring the many companies, unions, and individuals who want to be active in politics to take their money elsewhere. That is very bad.

The most obvious outlet for private money would be to fund so-called issue advertisements praising their preferred candidates and attacking their adversaries, either directly or by giving to one or more of the interest groups that buy such ads. These groups range from the Chamber of Commerce, the National Right to Life Committee, and the National Rifle Association on the right to labor unions, Planned Parenthood, and the Sierra Club on the left. Such a governmentally engineered shift of money and power from the parties—our most broad-based vehicles for citizen participation in politics—to single-issue groups and other ideologically driven organizations would warp our political discourse.

Not to worry, McCain and his allies say, we also have a plan to curb the financial clout of corporations, unions, and independent interest groups. This proposal (Title II of the bill) would severely restrict such organizations' spending on issue ads and other activities designed to disparage or promote federal candidates. Indeed, for some incumbents facing re-election battles, these provisions are the main attraction of the McCain-Feingold-Cochran bill. ''We're totally defenseless against the juggernaut of huge, unregulated, undisclosed expenditures'' by independent groups, Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., who faces an election next year, told the Wall Street Journal.

This part of the bill would, in the words of Brooklyn Law School professor Joel M. Gora, who has long worked with the American Civil Liberties Union on campaign finance issues, ''effectively silence a great deal of issue speech and advocacy by nonpartisan citizen groups, organizations, labor unions, corporations, and individuals.'' It would altogether bar for-profit corporations and unions from buying television or radio ads, or giving independent groups money to buy ads, that so much as mention—let alone criticize or praise—a federal candidate during the critical 60 days before an election and the 30 days before any primary. These are precisely the periods during which the public is most attentive to debate about political issues and candidates. The bill would also prohibit independent groups from buying such pre-election issue ads unless they set up unwieldy separate, segregated funds that shun corporate and union money and publicly disclose all individual contributions above $1,000.

An even more radical provision would expose such groups to possible legal sanctions if they do anything, at any time, that might help any candidate with whom they have ''coordinated''—a term defined so broadly and vaguely as to encompass almost any contacts with candidates or their aides—in working on issues of mutual interest. So restrictive are these ''coordination'' rules that some of McCain-Feingold-Cochran's biggest champions might have run afoul of them had they been in effect during the 1999–2000 election cycle. Common Cause, for example, worked closely (''coordinated'') with McCain in late 1999 on strategies for promoting his bill, while spending lots of its own soft money touting the bill (and McCain) to the public, at a time when McCain himself was putting campaign finance reform at the center of his presidential candidacy. Under his own bill, such routine political activities involving Common Cause and McCain might be deemed illegal corporate campaign contributions.

Nor is McCain-Feingold-Cochran's requirement that independent groups disclose the names of all donors of more than $1,000 for pre-election issue ads as innocuous as it may seem. It is, some independent groups argue, mainly for the benefit not of the public, but of powerful incumbents and other politicians who might use pressure and intimidation to deter people from funding issue ads the politicians don't like. Thus could a bill that purports to curb the influence of Big Money in politics have the effect of increasing the power of politicians to silence critics both big and small.

Fortunately, McCain-Feingold-Cochran's proposed restrictions on issue ads and independent groups will have trouble getting through Congress now that the AFL–CIO is opposing them—a major break with its usual Democratic allies. And even if enacted, these restrictions have little chance of surviving judicial review. They fly in the face of rules laid down by the Supreme Court in a long line of First Amendment decisions that guarantee that issue advocacy by independent groups, corporations, and unions will enjoy

broad protection from all forms of official regulation, including public disclosure requirements.

In any event, any portion of McCain-Feingold-Cochran that manages to get through Congress and past the courts would not take Big Money out of politics. The bill would, rather, increase the relative power of those moneyed interests that remain unregulated. These would include individuals rich enough to finance their own campaigns, such as Ross Perot, Steve Forbes, and the four Senate candidates (all Democrats) who each spent more than $5 million of their own money to win their races. This group was topped by Jon Corzine's $60 million purchase of a seat to represent New Jersey. Power would also flow to the national news media, which are owned by huge corporations such as AOL-Time Warner and General Electric, are staffed by journalists with their own biases, and are busily clamoring for restrictions on the campaign-related spending and First Amendment rights of everybody else.

Those reformers who are most serious about driving Big Money out of politics see McCain-Feingold-Cochran as only a first, tiny step. They would also cap campaign spending by wealthy candidates—a step that would require overruling the Supreme Court's landmark 1976 decision in Buckley vs. Valeo. And a few reformers have asserted that, in the words of associate professor Richard L. Hazen of Loyola University Law School in Los Angeles: ''The principle of political equality means that the press, too, should be regulated when it editorializes for or against candidates.''

Each new step down this road of restricting political spending and speech creates new problems and new inequities, fueling new demands to close ''loopholes'' by adding ever-more-sweeping restrictions. How far might campaign finance reformers go if they could have their way? Was McCain serious when he said on Dec. 21, 1999. ''If I could think of a way constitutionally, I would ban negative ads''? Shades of the Alien and Sedition Acts.

Politics will always be a messy business. Money will always talk. And the cure of legislating political purity and purging private money will always be worse than the disease.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to read into the RECORD an article by Judge James Buckley entitled ''Campaign Finance: Why I Sued in 1974.'' Judge Buckley was the lead plaintiff in the landmark campaign finance case of *Buckley* v. *Valeo*. This article provides an important historical context to the current debate over restricting Campaign finances further.

It says:

Twenty-five years ago, I was a member of the Senate majority that voted against the legislation that gave us the present limitations on campaign contributions. Having lost the debate on the floor, I did what any red-blooded American does these days: I took the fight to the courts as lead plaintiff in Buckley v. Valeo. This is the case in which the Supreme Court held that the 1974 act's restrictions on campaign spending were unconstitutional but that its limits on contributions were permissible in light of Congress's concern over the appearance of impropriety.

The issue of campaign finance is again before the Senate. Unfortunately, today's reformers are apt to make a badly flawed system even worse.

To understand why, it is instructive to take a look at the Buckley plaintiffs. I had squeaked into office as the candidate of New York's Conservative Party. My co-plaintiffs included Sen. Eugene McCarthy, whose primary challenge caused President Lyndon Johnson to withdraw his bid for re-election; the very conservative American Conservative Union; the equally liberal New York Civil Liberties Union; the Libertarian Party; and Stewart Mott, a wealthy backer of liberal causes who had contributed $200,000 to the McCarthy presidential campaign. We were a group of political underdogs and independents; and although we spanned the ideological spectrum, we shared a deep concern that the 1974 act would dramatically increase the difficulties already faced by those challenging incumbents and the political status quo.

Incumbents enjoy formidable advantages, including name recognition, access to the media, and the goodwill gained from handling constituent problems. A challenger, on the other hand, must persuade both the media and potential contributors that his candidacy is credible. This can require a substantial amount of seed money. As we testified, Sen. McCarthy could not have launched a serious challenge to a sitting president and I could not have won election as a third-party candidate under the present law. Large contributions from a few early supporters established us as viable candidates. Once the media took us seriously, we were able to reach out to our natural constituencies for financial support and to attract the cadres of volunteers that characterized our campaigns.

Although we won a number of the arguments we presented in Buckley, we lost the critical one when the court held that the limits on contributions were constitutional. Experience, however, has vindicated our worries over the practical consequences of these and other provisions of the 1974 act.

The legislation was supposed to de-emphasize the role of money in federal elections and encourage broader participation in the political process. Instead, by limiting the size of individual contributions, it has made fund raising the central preoccupation of incumbents and challengers alike; and it created a bureaucracy, the Federal Election Commission, that has issued regulations governing independent spending that are so complex and have made the costs of a misstep so great that grassroots action has virtually disappeared from the political scene. Today, anyone intrepid enough to engage in such activities is well advised to hire a lawyer; and even then, he must be prepared to engage in protracted litigation to prove his independence.

Legislation that was supposed to democratize the political process has served instead to reinforce the influence of the political establishment. By compounding the difficulties faced by challengers, it has consolidated the advantages of incumbency and increased the power of the two major parties. By limiting individual contributions to $1,000, it has enhanced the political clout of both business and union political action committees—the notorious PACs.

Moreover, if today's reformers succeed in their efforts to restrict ''issue advocacy,'' the net effect will be to increase the already formidable power of the media. The New York Times or The Wall Street Journal will be free to throw their enormous influence behind a particular candidate or cause through Election Day. But public interest groups would be denied the right to advertise their disagreement with the Times or the Journal during the final weeks of a campaign.

What is needed is not more restrictions on speech but a re-examination of the premises underlying the existing ones. Recent races have exploded the myth that money can ''buy'' an election. Ask Michael Huffington, who lost his Senate bid in California after spending $28 million. The voters always have the final say. What money can buy is the exposure challengers need to have a chance. And while large contributions can corrupt, studies of voting patterns confirm that that concern in vastly overstated. The overwhelming majority of wealthy donors back candidates with whom they already agree, and they are far more tolerant of differences on this point or that than are the PACs to which a candidate will otherwise turn.

An alternative safeguard against corruption is readily available—the daily posting of contributions on the Internet. This would enable voters to judge whether a particular contribution might corrupt its recipient. What makes no sense is to retain a set of rules that make it impossible for a Stewart Mott to provide a Eugene McCarthy with the seed money for a challenge to a sitting president, or that make elective politics the playground of the super rich.

The problem today is not that too much money is spent on elections. Proctor & Gamble spends more in advertising than do all political campaigns and parties in an election cycle. The problem is that the electoral process is saddled by a tangle of laws and regulations that restrict the ability of citizens to make themselves heard and that rig the political game in favor of the most privileged players. And because congressional incumbents are the beneficiaries of the tilted playing field, it is fanciful to believe that Congress will re-write the rule book to give outsiders an even break.

We have nothing to fear from unfettered political debate and everything to gain. American democracy can ill afford government control of the political marketplace; but that is where today's reformers would lead us.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

DIRECTED ENERGY AND NON-LETHAL USE OF FORCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a serious and effective use of new technologies in our military operations. While I will focus on a specific directed energy technology, the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program Office is involved in many other research areas that provide innovative solutions to our military men and women in their daily missions.

Recently, the Marines unveiled a device known as Active Denial Technology, ADT. This is a non-lethal weapons system based on a microwave source. This device, mounted on a humvee or other mobile platform, could serve as a riot control method in our peacekeeping operations or in

other situations involving civilians. This project and technology was kept classified until very recently.

The Pentagon noted that further testing, both on humans and, evidently, goats will be done to ensure that it truly is a non-lethal method of crowd control or a means to disperse potentially hostile mobs. The notion that the Pentagon is using ''microwaves'' on humans, and especially on animals, has inflamed some human and animal rights groups. Among others it has simply sparked fear that a new weapon exists that will fry people.

This is not the case. And, unfortunately, few of the media reports offer sufficient detail or comparisons to clarify the value of such a system or put its use in perspective. While ADT is ''tunable,'' the energy cannot be ''tuned up'' to a level that would immediately cause permanent damage to human subjects.

The technology does not cause injury due to the low energy levels used. ADT does cause heat-induced pain that is nearly identical to briefly touching a lightbulb that has been on for a while. However, unlike a hot lightbulb, the energy propagated at this level does not cause rapid burning. Within a few seconds the pain induced by this energy beam is intended to cause the subject to run away rather than to continue to experience pain.

Such technologies have never before been used in a military or peacekeeping endeavor. Therefore, there is naturally suspicion or fear of the unknown and usually the worst is imagined. I believe this is unwarranted, especially when one considers the currently available options in these types of military situations.

Think of 1993 in Somalia. The U.S. lost 18 soldiers and somewhere between 500 and 1,000 Somalis were killed on the streets of Mogadishu. The Somalis used children as human shields, and our military was forced to fire on angry crowds of civilians, some civilians having automatic rifles and grenades.

Peacekeeping operations are not void of lethal threats. Oftentimes our military is confronted with armed civilians or situations where unarmed, defenseless civilians are intermixed and indistinguishable from persons possessing lethal means.

Regardless of the new Administration's approach to involvement of the U.S. military in non-traditional operations, I believe these types of missions will continue to be a staple of our military's daily operations for a long time to come. Further, these missions often involve situations that render U.S. soldiers vulnerable or threaten the lives of innocent civilians.

I believe that the applications of directed energy technologies in these and other operations can provide a more humane and militarily effective approach. Active denial technology is merely one device on a list of research and development endeavors currently underway by the Pentagon's Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program.

I would encourage my colleagues to get briefed on the mission and projects in the Non-Lethal Weapons Program. Further, I believe that the tunability of microwave and laser technologies will offer a palette of readily available options to address operational needs in both traditional and non-traditional military operations, and I fully support further funding of research in this area.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY SERGEANT PHILLIP FRELIGH

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to extend my sympathies to the families and loved ones of those killed during the recent Naval training exercise in Kuwait. Of the five U.S. military personnel killed in the accident, Sergeant Phillip Freligh, whom I intend to pay tribute to today, was from my home state of Arkansas.

Army Sgt. Phillip Freligh, of Paragould, AR, graduated in 1993 from Greene County Tech and enlisted in the Army later that same year. He attended jump training and was assigned to the 82nd Airborne Division. He then was trained as a bomb specialist and was assigned to the 734th Explosive Ordinance Division in White Sands, NM and was on a six month deployment in Kuwait when the accident occurred.

I want to express my deepest regret and sympathies to the family and friends of Sgt. Freligh as well as the families of all the servicemen who lost their lives in this tragic accident. We owe it to all of our brave servicemen and those who serve with them to do our best to uncover the cause of this tragedy, and to do our utmost to prevent it from happening again. Theirs is a dangerous profession, and this tragic accident reminds us of the debt we owe to those who serve. I join the President, Secretary Rumsfeld, and my colleagues in saluting the courage, commitment and sacrifice of these servicemen.

STEPHANIE BERNSTEIN'S ADDRESS ON PAN AM FLIGHT 103

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Friday, March 16, Stephanie Bernstein, who lost her husband on Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, addressed a conference on the future of Libyan-American relations hosted by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the Atlantic Council, and the Middle East Institute.

Ms. Bernstein's remarks are insightful and show, in very real human terms, the pain suffered by the Lockerbie families. They also demonstrate the need for the U.S. and the international community to keep the pressure on Qadhafi until he accepts responsibility for the actions of Libya's intelligence officer, tells what the Government of Libya knows about the bombing and compensates the families of the victims for this horrible tragedy.

I urge my colleagues to read Ms. Bernstein's remarks as we consider the reauthorization of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act.

I ask unanimous consent that her statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF STEPHANIE L. BERNSTEIN—CONFERENCE ON U.S.-LIBYAN RELATIONS AFTER THE LOCKERBIE TRIAL: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

MARCH 16, 2001.

I would like to thank the Atlantic Council, the Middle East Institute, and the Woodrow Wilson Center for inviting me to participate in this conference.

I have been asked to talk from my perspective as someone whose life has been profoundly and permanently altered by the actions of the government of Libya. I am not a diplomat or a politician, but an average citizen of a country, 189 of whose citizens were brutally murdered on December 21, 1988. The impact of this savage act of mass murder was described in eloquent terms by the Lord Advocate of Scotland during his remarks to the Scottish Court just prior to its sentencing of the defendant, Megrahi, who was found guilty of murder on January 31, 2001:

''More than 400 parents lost a son or daughter; 46 parents lost their only child; 65 women were widowed; 11 men lost their wives. More than 140 children lost a parent and 7 children lost both parents.''

I would like to tell you briefly about one of the 270 people who was murdered in the Lockerbie bombing. My husband, Mike Bernstein, was an ordinary person who died an extraordinary death. His dreams were simple: he wanted to guide his children into adulthood. He wanted to grow old with his wife. He wanted to do work which brought him satisfaction and which made the world a better place than he found it. He graduated with distinction and high honors from the University of Michigan, and received his law degree from the University of Chicago, where he was an associate editor of the Law Review. Mike was the Assistant Deputy Director of the Office of Special Investigations at the U.S. Department of Justice. This office finds, denaturalizes, and deports persons from the United States who participated in Nazi atrocities during World War II. Mike left two children, ages 7 and 4, a wife, a mother, and countless friends. He was 36 years old.

Over the last 12 years, the family members of those who were murdered in the Lockerbie have worked hard for some measure of justice. As a result of our efforts, and with the support of our many friends on Capitol Hill, legislation has been passed which sought to make aviation safer from terrorist acts and to put pressure on countries such as Libya which have been state sponsors of terrorism. The Aviation Security Act of 1992, the Lautenberg Amendment, and the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act would not be law without the efforts of the Lockerbie families.

On January 31 of this year, we achieved another victory when Abdel Basset al-Megrahi, a Libyan security agent (JSO), was convicted of the murders of my husband and 269 others. The Scottish Court was strong in its opinion

that Megrahi was acting at the behest of the Libyan government:

''The clear inference which we draw from this evidence is that the conception, planning and execution of the plot which led to the planting of the explosive device was of Libyan origin.'' (p.75)

''We accept the evidence that he was a member of the JSO, occupying posts of fairly high rank.'' (p. 80)

Since the verdict, the Bush administration has been firm in its insistence that Libya abide by the terms of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions, which call for Libya to accept responsibility for the bombing, and for payment of appropriate compensation to the families. The sanctions are rooted in the concept in international law that a government is responsible for the wrongful acts of its officials.

In a meeting with family members on February 8 of this year, Secretary of State Colin Powell was clear in detailing the Bush administration's policy:

''President Bush intends to keep the pressure on the Libyan leadership, pressure to fulfill the remaining requirements of the U.N. Security Council, including Libya's accepting responsibility for the actions of its officials and paying appropriate compensation.''

The Bush administration has stated that the investigation into the Lockerbie bombing is still open. A $5 million dollar award is still in place for information leading to the arrest and conviction of others involved in the bombing. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said last month that the United States will follow the evidence ''wherever it leads.'' Secretary Powell, in his meeting with the families, elaborated on this as well:

''However we resolve this and however we move forward from this point on, we reserve the right to continue to gather more evidence and to bring more charges and new indictments . . . So accepting responsibility as a leader of a nation, and as a nation, doesn't excuse other criminals who might come to the fore and be subject to indictment.''

Unfortunately, there are others who have not supported the reasonable aims of the Security Council, the United States, and Great Britain. In an interview with The Indepdent on February 9 of this year, Nelson Mandela, who helped broker the agreement which persuaded Gaddafi to turn the suspects over for trial, accused the U.S. and Great Britain of having ''moved the goalposts'' on the issue of lifting sanctions.

''The condition that Gaddafi must accept responsiblity for Lockerbie is totally unacceptable. As President for five years I know that my intelligence services many times didn't inform me before they took action. Sometimes I approved, sometime I reprimanded them. Unless it's clear that Gaddafi was involved in giving orders it's unfair to act on that basis.

I ask: is it really possible to believe that a Libyan intelligence agent would carry out a massive operation such as the downing of a passenger aircraft without approval from those higher up the chain of command?

Similarly, oil companies, some of whom I know are represented here today, have seen the verdict as the first step in resuming normal relations with Libya. Archie Dunham, the Chairman and Chief Executive of Conoco, stated last month that he was ''very optimistic'' that President Bush will lift the unilateral U.S. sanctions against Libya, in part because of the President and Vice President Cheney's ties to the Texas oil industry.

I find these efforts to promote business at the expense of justice to be deeply disturbing. I am afraid that comments such as those by Mr. Dunham and Mr. Mandela send a message that terrorists and the countries which sponsor or harbor them will not have to pay a significant price for their actions. When we allow ourselves to believe, as is a popular view now, that encouraging business relationships with countries such as Libya which carry out terrorist acts will somehow inoculate us against further terrorist attacks, I believe that we are dangerously naive. Is it really good business to do business with terrorists? Every corporation represented in this room today must ask if it is worth it to resume business in a country whose leader refuses to acknowledge his responsibility for the mass murder of 270 human beings. Anyone in this room could have easily had a loved one on Pan Am 103.

Where do we go from here? The government of Libya and Col. Gaddafi must accept responsibility for the bombing of Pan Am 103 and the murders of 270 people. The government of Libya must pay appropriate compensation to the families. The government of the United States must continue to pursue and develop information leading to the indictments, arrest, and conviction of the others responsible for the bombing. The world community must realize that lifting the sanctions against Libya before Libya has fully complied with them sends a signal that the civilized countries of the world are not serious about going after perpetrators of mass murder. The business community must know that sweeping Pan Am 103 under the rug will, ultimately, not be good for business. We must press for renewal of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act which is due to expire in August. We must re-impose the U.N. sanctions if the Libyan government does not comply with the terms of the original sanctions. Support for these positions is embodied in a current Sense of Congress resolution which has bipartisan support.

Finally, I think it is vital for everyone to know that the Pan Am families will not go away. In a Reuters article dated February 13 of this year, Saad Djebbar, a London based lawyer who has advised the Libyan government was quoted as follows:

''The more the United States sticks to the original agreement that the aim of the process was the surrender and trial of the two accused, the more the Libyans will cooperate and compensate the families.''

I interpret this to mean that if the families back off, the government of Libya will pay compensation to the families. This cynical approach dishonors the memories of our loved ones and we will never agree to it. Continuing to pursue what and who was behind the Lockerbie bombing and the acceptance of responsibility by the Libyan government are goals which will not be abandoned by the families.

Another British expert on Libya, George Joffe, was quoted in the same article as follows:

''Gaddafi knows he's going to have to pay compensation. The question is whether he can control the domestic agenda and curb his own tongue over the next few months, and whether extremists on the other side of the Atlantic among the families and their supporters in Congress can be kept under control.''

The ultimate resolution of the rift between the United States and Libya does not hinge on whether Gaddafi can ''keep his tongue.'' The ultimate resolution will come when the Libyan government meets its responsibilities to the families and to the international community. As for the families and our supporters in Congress being ''kept under control''—we have been invigorated by the verdict of the Scottish court, and we will not go away.

SWORD TO PLOUGHSHARES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss some efforts in defense conversion that are reaping great gains. In the book, ''The Idea of National Interest'', Charles Beard wrote:

> Government might legitimately take the initiative and pursue some interests aggressively. Furthermore, it might make use of its own citizens and their interests to advance the national interest.

Early on U.S. foreign policy for the Former Soviet Union, FSU, was designed to do just that: make use of U.S. citizens' interest to advance our national security objectives.

Today, I would like to briefly underscore some successes, specifically in the realm of defense conversion. Before doing so, however, I wanted to offer some insights regarding the scope of the problem.

First, the legacies of a command economy were prevalent in all nations behind the Iron Curtain. Such legacies included: a structure of production dominated by heavy industry, distorted factor and product prices, antiquated or obsolescent capital stock, inadequate skills to compete in a modern economy; a neglected infrastructure, severe environmental degradation, trade oriented towards other uncompetitive markets, and large volumes of non-performing loans and heavy foreign debt.

The FSU was no exception with respect to inheritance of these burdens and impediments. And despite all these similarities with other eastern European states, the FSU, especially Russia, was unique in one very important way.

For Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan ''heavy industry'' was that of defense. Fifty-two percent of Russia's industry was involved in military-related research, design and manufacturing. In Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, the defense industry comprised about fifteen percent of their heavy industry.

This distinction made the Soviet industry not merely an economic concern, but rather a central threat to international security. As Soviet central authority deteriorated, control over its massive military complex also crumbled. As such international security concerns are not limited to issues of control over nuclear weapons and material, but include attaining a degree of economic stability to offer stable employment to a vast number of persons in military and military-related occupations, especially scientists and engineers in that sector.

The threat was apparent; the risk of inadequate action has been readily apparent. The national interest, indeed,

the global interest, is in securing stability in the region. Stability in the region equates with global stability, especially in light of the potential leakage of knowhow from weapons complex.

Our approach has come in fits and starts. We have not offered a integrated, comprehensive plan for U.S. economic assistance or nonproliferation programs. Increasingly, however, we are coming to recognize the interrelationship between these two elements of our Russia policy, even if we still haven't achieved a semblance of a strategy.

I did, however, want to discuss some efforts that have succeeded. They are not sufficient in breadth, depth or financial means. Nonetheless, there are an exception to the rule in our efforts to provide meaningful, stable employment to former Soviet scientists and engineers.

I begin with the efforts of the Cooperative Research and Development Foundation, CRDF. CRDF was created pursuant to Section 511 of the Freedom Support Act of 1992 in 1995. Its mission is to conduct innovative activities of mutual benefit with the countries of the FSU. Further, CRDF was to offer opportunities to former weapons scientists to achieve transition to productive civilian research. They have been remarkably successful.

Since its inception, CRDF has expended $16 million of U.S. Government funds and $1 million from private foundations. The FSU, in turn, has committed $4.8 million to these activities. These funds have backed 597 projects that supported a total of 4300 scientists and engineers.

In addition, with major contracts from the DOE, DoD, NIH, and EPA as well as industry, CRDF is helping U.S. participants address issues of financial integrity in their dealings with the FSU. Over $30 million for over 500 projects has been managed by CRDF through these contracts.

The Foundation has committed an additional $11.8 million to projects in five program areas.

CRDF's industry programs reduce the risk for U.S. companies to engage FSU scientists. These grants have leveraged 300 percent of U.S. Government funds through in cash and in-kind contributions from U.S. industry.

I would also note that more than 95 percent of the collaborations formed in CRDF awards will continue, whether with CRDF support or not. Over 100 U.S.-FSU teams are seeking commercial applications for the products of their collaborative research. Twenty-two teams have filed for patents, fourteen of which are joint.

For over a year now CRDF has ensured financial integrity for Department of Energy projects under the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention, IPP, program. The United States Industry Coalition, USIC, the industry-arm of the IPP program, now boasts 96 members throughout the U.S. and several substantial commercial successes with FSU partners. Through its cooperation with CRDF, USIC and the IPP program now can ensure that funding for FSU scientists involved in these research efforts avoids taxation by Russian or other officials. This aspect is critical for maximizing the impact of U.S. Government or industry investments to provide stable employment and a steady income to FSU scientists.

Since 1994, the IPP program has engaged over 6,200 former weapons of mass destruction scientists. Importantly, USIC members usually surpass cost-sharing arrangements with DOE expenditures totaling $39.3 million versus the $63.4 million invested by U.S. industry. Currently, 75 of USIC's members are engaged in 120 cost-shared projects.

I would like to briefly highlight a recent success story in my home state of New Mexico. On January 15, I participated in a technology demonstration and press conference to announce a $20 million international investment in technologies jointly developed by a small U.S. engineering company, a Russian nuclear weapons plant, and two of the Department of Energy's facilities.

An entrepreneurial American company, Stolar Horizon of Raton, NM, a long-standing member of USIC, identified a Russian technology with market potential, then staked over $5 Million of its own money to develop it. Stolar Horizon worked in tandem with Sandia National Laboratories and the Kansas City Plant through the IPP program to test and refine the technology for commercial, peaceful applications.

The result: Credit Suisse First Boston has committed $20 million in financing to take the product to the global market. An estimated 350 new jobs will be created in New Mexico, and over 600 jobs await Russian nuclear scientists and technicians in Nizhny Novgorod at the Institute for Measuring Systems Research, NIIIS, are planned.

I would remind everyone that U.S. appropriations in FY2001 for the IPP program is only $24.5 million. In this one example, Credit Suisse will provide an investment equal to 80 percent of our own in this fiscal year.

The Stolar Horizon/NIIIS success is a concrete example of the original IPP vision: making the world a safer place through cooperative commercial efforts leading to long-term, well-paying jobs in both nations.

The cooperative efforts of USIC members, DOE–IPP, other U.S. government agencies, and the scientific institutes of the NIS are revolutionizing the post-Cold War world, creating new opportunities for weapons scientists and engineers, and making our world more safe and secure.

I return to the thoughts of Charles Beard. In pursuit of its interests, Government might make use of citizens' interests to advance the national interest. This is the foremost objective of nonproliferation programs that seek to create commercial opportunities in the FSU.

The statistics and examples I've offered above underscore the successes we've achieved. Obviously, our attempts have frequently stumbled sometimes as a result of our own false starts and other times due to circumstances beyond our control. However, at the same time, we have never faced a situation similar to the collapse of the Soviet Union. We had never before legislated or formulated programs with the express intent of preventing proliferation through promotion of commercial opportunities. We had never confronted providing economic development aid to countries burdened by legacies of a command economy. From this perspective, we've made remarkable progress.

Mr. President, I would conclude on the following note: each concrete successful commercial venture will have exponential benefits. I am convinced that these ventures will pay off—by mitigating immediate potential proliferation threats, contributing to a stable economy in the region, and advancing U.S. citizens' own monetary interests.

CONGRATULATING FIRST BOOK

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last Friday, Congressman MIKE CAPUANO and I had the honor of congratulating First Book for distributing over a quarter of a million books to children across Massachusetts. My distinguished colleague from Massachusetts is a tireless advocate for ensuring that children of all ages obtain the reading materials and skills they need to become active members of our State and of our Nation, and I am happy to have been able to share this important afternoon with him.

Thanks to the coordination of First Book, the generous donations by Random House Children's Books and Little, Brown & Company, and the dedicated volunteers from the Campus Outreach Opportunity League, the Coast Guard and First Book, thousands of children throughout our state who do not always get the opportunity to receive brand new books, are now enjoying their gifts.

First Book is making it possible for young children to have access to books and take the first steps toward learning to read and it is making a real difference in their lives. It is impressive that last year, First Book was responsible for distributing more than 4 million books to children in more than 290 communities across the country.

A 1999 evaluation of First Book conducted by Lou Harris and funded by the

U.S. Department of Education, showed that after a child's involvement in First Book, 55 percent of them reported an increased interest in reading. Ninety-eight percent of the local advisory boards reported that their community was better off because of the support of First Book.

Children need to have reading materials outside of school, and even before they start school. It is the best way to develop a love of reading early in life.

When President Kennedy was young, two of his favorite books were ''Billy Whiskers'' and ''King Arthur and the Round Table.'' My mother read for endless hours to all nine of us, and she was conscientious about choosing books that were educational and inspirational as well as entertaining. She instilled a love of reading in all of us.

Reading is the foundation of learning and the golden door to opportunity. First Book knows that to open a book is to open a child's mind to a world of new possibilities.

But too many children fail to read at an acceptable level. Reading is a pleasure, but today it is also a necessity. Students who don't learn to read well in their early years cannot keep up in their later years. That is why literacy programs are so important. They give young children practical opportunities to learn to read and practice reading.

As a volunteer for a reading program in Washington, I know that literacy and mentoring programs make a difference not only for the children who participate in them, but the children in the program make a difference in my life, too.

This is the fourth year that Jasmine and I have been reading partners at Brent Elementary School, and it is very impressive to see her make progress as a reader. There is nothing more exciting for Jasmine and me than when we get to choose a brand new book to read together.

If we all work together, families, schools and communities, children will have the support they need to become good readers in their early years, and gain an appreciation for reading that will last a lifetime.

TAXES, THE ECONOMY AND THE FUTURE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, after nearly a decade of economic growth, historic gains in productivity and reining in the Federal budget deficits, Congress is now considering enacting a tax cut. I support a tax cut. And I think it should be retroactive to January 1 of this year to provide a needed boost to our economy.

Cutting taxes now will be helpful both to individual taxpayers and to our economy. But we also need to use some of the expected available surplus to pay down our Federal debt. If a country runs up a debt during tough times, it should pay it down during good times. And some of the surplus should be used to do other important things like improve our schools, provide emergency help to family farmers, and help the elderly afford prescription drug costs.

There is an effort by some to frame this tax cut debate in terms of whether one supports the President. But it is not about who we support. Rather, it's about what we support. What kind of a tax cut should we enact and how large should it be?

Here's what I think we should do:

One, enact the income tax cut in phases. The projected 10 year budget surpluses are just that, projections, and are not at all certain. Therefore we should be conservative. Enact the first phase of the tax cut now, and make it retroactive to January 1. In 2 years, if our economy is still producing the expected surpluses, add to the tax cut.

Two, cut income tax rates and do it in a way that provides fair tax cuts for all tax brackets.

Three, eliminate the marriage tax penalty in the income tax code.

Four, simplify filing requirements by allowing ''return free filing'' for up to 70 million Americans.

Five, totally exempt all family farms and family businesses from the estate tax and increase the estate tax exemption to two million dollars for all estates—$4 million for married couples.

Six, add a tax credit for investments that are made in rural States, where there is out-migration of people. We should use this opportunity to use tax cuts to stimulate new jobs and economic growth in rural states that have been left behind.

Here are some of the major issues that we must consider as we enact this tax cut.

The President's plan assumes we will have budget surpluses for the next 10 years. I hope that is the case, but with the current slowdown in our economy, we ought to be cautious. Economic forecasts are no more reliable than weather forecasts. If we lock in a large tax cut and then do not get the expected surpluses, we will once again put our country in financial trouble.

One of the major priorities for using the surplus should be to pay down the Federal debt. It grew by trillions in the 80s and early 90s. Now we have the opportunity and an obligation to use part of these surpluses to pay down that debt.

Our Government collects about $1 trillion in personal income taxes and about $650 billion in payroll taxes from individuals each year. The top 1 percent of all income earners in the U.S. pay 21 percent of all taxes, but under the President's plan they would receive 43 percent of the tax cut. That's not fair. We should make changes to the President's plan to provide a larger share of the tax cuts to working families.

A tax cut is a priority, but so too is fixing our schools, helping family farmers through tough times, dealing with the high prices of prescription drugs, and strengthening Medicare and Social Security. Yes, surpluses need to be used to cut taxes and reduce the debt, but some should be used to address other urgent needs that improve our country.

This debate is larger and more important than partisan politics. And these decisions are bigger than whether the Congress is supporting a new President.

Our country works best when we think ahead and think together. That is what we need to do on this issue.

VETERANS' HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 2001

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am privileged to be a cosponsor of the Veterans' Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001, S. 131, and I will explain why this legislation is so important.

No one from either side of the aisle questions the importance of education as the steppingstone to success in the 21st century. We all know that the economy of the future is going to require people with specialized training and skills, while the unskilled labor that typified the 18th and 19th centuries is becoming less and less useful. In this regard, it is hardly surprising that Congress is flooded with proposals to enhance access to high-quality elementary education, secondary education, and higher education. I myself have strongly supported expansion of Pell Grants, broadening of student loans, and tax incentives to help families pay for a college education.

As we rightly promote the importance of government help for higher education, it might be useful to recall that one of the first, and most successful, of these higher education initiatives was the GI bill that was enacted back in 1944. Following World War II, millions of veterans were able to obtain college educations through the GI bill, with the result that many were able to attain a standard of living they could not have imagined. Furthermore, all this college-trained talent contributed to the burst of economic advances that improved life for all of us over the ensuing decades.

Fast forward 57 years. We still have a GI bill, and in our highly successful all-volunteer military, it turns out that the single most important factor that attracts many young people to join the military is the availability of educational benefits after discharge. Yet the current GI bill suffers from one big flaw: the educational stipend is no longer sufficient to pay for the cost of a college education.

The current monthly payment in the GI bill has not come close to matching the rate of inflation in educational

costs over the past 50 years. Just consider these statistics. At present, the standard GI bill benefit is $650 per month for 36 months. That is it. Moreover, we now ask servicemembers who want educational benefits after discharge to contribute $1200 while they are in the military. By contrast, when it began in 1944, the GI bill benefit included full tuition and fees at any educational institution to which the veteran could gain admittance, PLUS a monthly stipend equivalent to $500 in 2001 dollars, $750 for married veterans.

We thus find ourselves in an anomalous situation: at the same time that the Government is ramping up its support and subsidy for non-veterans seeking college educations, the program that started this whole thing, and which provides key benefits for those who put their lives at risk for the country, is lagging way behind.

The Veterans' Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001 goes a long way toward redressing this situation. The key provision of this bill is quite simple: the total VA educational stipend under the Montgomery GI Bill will be increased to a level equal to the average cost of tuition at 4-year public colleges. In other words, the standard 36 months of GI bill benefits will be sufficient to allow a veteran to attend college and complete a degree.

The Veterans Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001 provides the minimal benefit that we should be offering to those who are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to keep our country free and prosperous, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

FARMERS AND RANCHERS ON NATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today marks National Agriculture Day. Unfortunately, what should be a celebration is instead overshadowed by the grim reality that many of the hard-working families producing food for this Nation and world are having a difficult time making ends meet.

I salute our farmers and ranchers for many reasons. First, Americans spend less than anyone in the world on their grocery bill. Roughly 11 percent of our household income is spent on food, and it takes a mere 38 days to earn enough income to pay a food bill for the entire year. We truly enjoy the most nutritious, affordable, and stable food supply in the world.

Furthermore, the American economic engine depends upon a strong agricultural sector to run on all cylinders. Indeed the agricultural economy is central to my State's prosperity or adversity. According to South Dakota State University, the multiplied value of agriculture's impact on South Dakota's economy was $16 billion in 1999, one-fourth of our total economic output and more than double that of any other industry in my State. I believe the public institutions and private businesses that lay the foundation for rural communities thrive only when we have a strong base of independent family farmers and ranchers in South Dakota.

Finally, agricultural producers are the day-to-day stewards of our land. Environmental and conservation benefits like clean water and air, rich soil, and diverse wildlife habitat are enjoyed by the public largely due to the care and management of family farmers and ranchers.

So, why aren't we truly celebrating National Agriculture Day?

Because current economic conditions are poised to squeeze many of South Dakota's 32,500 farmers and ranchers right out of business—conditions set to reverberate across the entire country. Absent farm aid and long-term farm policy fixes that provide true economic security to family farmers and ranchers, the environmental benefits and food security enjoyed by so many in this country may not survive on a sustained basis.

I believe Congress must take two fundamental steps to remedy this situation: modify the farm bill now and strengthen our laws so the marketplace is truly competitive and fair for all.

Since 1997, U.S. farmers have experienced a price crisis of enormous proportions, exacerbated by a series of weather-related disasters in many regions of the Nation. Surplus crop production, both here and abroad, weak global demand, marketplace concentration, and an inadequate farm income safety net are prime reasons for this price crisis.

Moreover, given the input-intensive nature of production agriculture, many farmers and ranchers are paying more each year for critical inputs like fuel and fertilizer. Corn and wheat farmers in South Dakota may be forced to pay up to twice per acre for fertilizer this year, and still not cover enough acres to boost yields to profit-producing levels. This situates farmers in a price-cost squeeze making it nearly impossible to earn income that covers total expenses.

As a result of an inadequate farm bill, Congress has enacted multi-billion dollar disaster programs in the last 3 years—a record $28 billion in fiscal year 2000. USDA economists predict 2001 may be the worst year ever. Without supplemental income or emergency aid, USDA estimates that net farm income in 2001 could approach its lowest level since 1984. Clearly, the 1996 farm bill fails to provide a meaningful, fiscally-responsible, safety-net for farmers when prices are poor on an annual and sustained basis.

I am concerned that the administration's budget blueprint apparently does not grasp the economic obstacles facing the Nation's farmers, ranchers, and rural communities, as illustrated by the fact that the budget includes zero funding for emergency aid or a farm bill rewrite. This seems ironic, since every major farm group has sent myself and others on the Senate Budget Committee a letter agreeing that roughly $10 billion per year will be needed to modify the farm bill for future years, and that around $9 billion is needed in fiscal year 2001 to offset income losses due to low prices and failed farm safety-net policies.

Already, these farm groups and some Members of Congress are suggesting that we will simply assemble a fourth consecutive aid package for farmers in 2001. I will support this imperative aid when the time comes, but suggest American farmers and taxpayers deserve better. These ad hoc emergency bills, totaling billions of dollars each year, are a poor excuse for a long term policy fix. I believe Congress can and should amend current farm policy immediately to provide a more predictable, secure safety-net for farmers now.

One farm bill alternative I have introduced is S. 130, the Flexible Fallow farm bill amendment. Rep. DOUG BEREUTER (R–NE) has introduced an identical bill in the House. Under my Flex Fallow bill—an idea developed by two South Dakota agricultural producers—farmers voluntarily devoting part of their total cropland acreage to a conservation use receive greater price support on their remaining crop production. My proposal embodies the planting flexibility so popular under ''Freedom to Farm,'' yet strengthens the underlying farm income safety net. In fact, my Flex Fallow bill has been endorsed by Iowa State agricultural economist Neil Harl, who believes the proposal works in a market-oriented fashion and said Flex Fallow ''is the missing link to the 1996 Farm Bill.''

Furthermore, I believe agricultural producers want to derive income from the marketplace, and in order to assure that can happen, Congress must restore fair competition to crop and livestock markets. The forces of marketplace concentration are squeezing independent farmers and ranchers out of profit opportunities.

The livestock market is one case in point. Meatpacker ownership and captive supply arrangements tend to transpire outside the cash market. As a result, the process of bidding in an open fashion for the purpose of buying slaughter livestock—which is central to competition—is fading away. As such, livestock producers—who depend upon competitive bidding to gain a fair price—are forced to either enter into contractual, ownership, or marketing arrangements with a packer or find themselves left out of market opportunities.

I have authored a bipartisan bill, S. 142, with Senators GRASSLEY, THOMAS,

and DASCHLE to forbid meatpackers from engaging in these anticompetitive buying practices. While my legislation is just one of many steps that should be taken to bolster our laws to protect true market competition, I believe Congress should move to address this issue in earnest.

Former President Eisenhower once said, ''farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles away from a farm.'' Because we live in a country where the food is safe and affordable, and the environment is not taken for granted, perhaps some have forgotten President Eisenhower's simple yet honest-to-goodness words.

So today, let us not overlook the critical role farmers and ranchers play in weaving the economic, social, and environmental fabric of this country. Instead, I join all Americans to salute farmers and ranchers on National Agriculture Day. And I invite all Americans to support efforts to ensure a brighter future for the families who put food on our tables every day.

CONDEMNATION OF THE TALIBAN'S WAR ON GLOBAL CULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to condemn an act of mindless destruction by a regime known for its intolerance. I am referring to the reported destruction of the two ancient statues of Buddha carried out by the Taliban government in Afghanistan and the Taliban's call for complete elimination of all artifacts in the region.

The Bamiyan Buddha statues were priceless artifacts. They stood for centuries as guardians of the silk route that connected the ancient Greek and Roman Empires to Asia. Once one of the most cosmopolitan regions in the world, Afghanistan is now one of the most intolerant and repressive nations due to the actions of the ruling Taliban faction. The destruction of these 1,500-year-old statues was ordered and carried out for fear that they would be used for idol worship. Destroying those creations because of an irrational fear motivated by intolerance of other cultures and religions should be condemned by thoughtful people everywhere.

The country of Afghanistan and the global community has lost two of its greatest treasures, and the world is poorer for it. We cannot tolerate the willful destruction of international treasures that are a part of the world's heritage.

People of all faiths and nationalities, including Muslim communities around the world, have condemned this action. It is imperative that the United States Senate join the people and governments around the world in condemning these senseless acts of destruction, and call on the Taliban regime to immediately cease the destruction of other Pre-Islamic relics.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG SOLUTION MUST BE A PRIORITY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, few issues have caught the public's attention more than prescription drugs, and few are more deserving of Congress' attention.

We live at a time when we can clearly discern remarkable benefits from all manner of drugs. It is nothing short of miraculous when we consider the relative ease and success of today's treatment of common disorders, as compared with that of only two or three generations ago.

When World War II began, for example, penicillin and other similar antibiotics were known only to a small number of scientists. At the conclusion of the War in 1945, penicillin was widely available, used not only for battle wounds but for infectious diseases in the general public as well. Patients with high blood pressure or high cholesterol levels were, at best, only partially and inadequately treated in the 1940s and 1950s. Now success is the rule, rather than the exception. Calvin Coolidge's son died in 1924 as a result of a blister and a skin infection after playing tennis at the White House. An infection such as that today would be treated as simple, outpatient therapy.

While these examples are noteworthy and provide us with a valuable perspective of times gone by, the hard, cold fact is that many of these modern miracles are still out of the reach of too many American citizens. They simply cannot afford the drugs that might so often prove lifesaving, because of either no insurance or lack of drug coverage within their insurance.

Recent studies indicate that if you go to virtually any other industrialized democracy, the cost of prescription drugs is about half what it is in the United States. We pay about double what anybody else in the industrialized world pays. That to me is so utterly unacceptable and unfair.

When Medicare was created 35 years ago, its benefits were based on private sector coverage, which rarely included prescription drugs. Now, however, virtually all private sector plans include coverage for prescription drugs, while Medicare does not. As a result, many millions of Americans, both Medicare age and younger have either inadequate or no prescription drug insurance at all. A byproduct of no coverage is that these patients wind up paying the highest rates of anyone—an average of 15 percent more than those with insurance. Many of these uninsureds, including the seniors often called ''The Greatest Generation'' are not filling prescriptions because of their cost, choosing between food and medicine. Or they split pills in half to make them go farther. This is shameful. These are very real every day problems that beg for help.

I strongly believe that all Medicare beneficiaries deserve affordable coverage and financial protection as prescription drugs costs grow at double-digit rates. Astronomical drug prices have come hand-in-hand with the great improvements in drug therapy. Spending for prescription drugs in the United States doubled between 1990 and 1998. In each of the 5 years between 1993 and 1998, prescription drug spending increased by an average of 12.4 percent. In 1999, the drug spending increase was 19 percent and just last year we saw another double digit increase. My office recently completed a three-year statewide survey of prescription drug prices in South Dakota, using a sample of the most heavily prescribed drugs for seniors. I was astonished to find that over 60 percent of the drugs' prices grew at a pace that exceeded the cost-of-living adjustment provided by Social Security, which many Medicare beneficiaries rely on to meet their daily financial needs. In fact, 30 percent of the drugs increased at a pace that was double that of the COLA.

In response to evidence such as this, along with having heard from thousands of concerned South Dakotans affected by skyrocketing drug prices, I have recommitted myself to finding a solution for the prescription drug needs of all Medicare beneficiaries. As such, I have reintroduced two bills that comprise the main pillars of my prescription drug plan: the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act of 2001, and the Generic Pharmaceutical Access and Choice for Consumers Act of 2001. I don't proclaim these proposals to be the magic bullet that solves all of our nation's prescription drug concerns but they are sensible, financially reasonable approaches that should be a part of an overall prescription drug plan for Medicare beneficiaries. The Fairness bill would provide Medicare beneficiaries access to prescription drugs at the same low prices that drug manufacturers offer their most favored customers. As well, I strongly believe we cannot develop a financially feasible prescription drug benefit without maximizing the utilization of generic drugs. My proposal would increase access and choice in Federal programs by encouraging greater usage of generic pharamaceuticals as a safe, less costly alternative to an often expensive brand-name pharmaceutical. Generic pharmaceutical drugs have been shown to save consumers between 25 percent and 60 percent on their average prescription drug and this plan would greatly benefit many of the most vulnerable members of society.

I do believe Congress needs to create a universal, voluntary drug benefit in the Medicare program, one that provides all Medicare beneficiaries with

affordable coverage for drug costs. Perhaps most importantly for South Dakota's Medicare beneficiaries, the plan must ensure access for beneficiaries in rural and hard-to-serve areas including incentives to rural pharmacies and the private entity serving those areas to ensure rapid delivery of prescription drugs.

I believe that these efforts are both comprehensive and achievable in the 107th Congress, and I will work closely with my colleagues to accomplish my personal goal of ensuring access to affordable prescription drugs for all Medicare beneficiaries both in South Dakota and around the Nation.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, March 19, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,729,611,586,294.55, five trillion, seven hundred twenty-nine billion, six hundred eleven million, five hundred eighty-six thousand, two hundred ninety-four dollars and fifty-five cents.

Five years ago, March 19, 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,058,839,000,000, Five trillion, fifty-eight billion, eight hundred thirty-nine million.

Ten years ago, March 19, 1991, the Federal debt stood at $3,447,165,000,000, three trillion, four hundred forty-seven billion, one hundred sixty-five million.

Fifteen years ago, March 19, 1986, the Federal debt stood at $1,982,540,000,000, one trillion, nine hundred eighty-two billion, five hundred forty million.

Twenty-five years ago, March 19, 1976, the Federal debt stood at $599,190,000,000, five hundred ninety-nine billion, one hundred ninety million, which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,130,421,586,294.55, five trillion, one hundred thirty billion, four hundred twenty-one million, five hundred eighty-six thousand, two hundred ninety-four dollars and fifty-five cents, during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A TRIBUTE TO GRACE COLE

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I'm sad to inform my colleagues that on Saturday, March 17th, Washington State lost a great advocate for families, and I lost both a good friend and mentor, with the passing of Grace Cole.

At this difficult time, my heart goes out to her family including her two brothers, four sons, four daughters in law, and six grandchildren. I want them to know what the rest of us have known for years: Grace Cole made a difference. We are proud of her and grateful for all she did. And even though she's no longer with us, her activism and her passion live on in the men and women she led into public service.

Well-known and well-loved in Shoreline, in Olympia, and among families and educators throughout our State, Grace Cole set a new standard for public service with strong words and a soft heart. She led the way for advocates like me to follow her from the local school board to the Washington State legislature. And most important, she made a difference for thousands of families throughout our state by standing up for education, the environment and social justice.

Mr. President, today moms and dads who serve their communities in Washington State know they can go on to serve at the State and Federal level. Years ago, however, that path wasn't so clear. Grace Cole blazed that trail and then helped others like me follow her into public service. When I look at the Washington state legislature, I see the impact Grace Cole has made.

I first met Grace in the early 1980s when I started attending Shoreline School Board meetings. During her many years of service on the school board, Grace was a strong and honest voice who always came down on the side of our children.

When I decided to run for the Shoreline School Board, Grace encouraged me and counseled me. During the time I served with Grace on the school board, she always made sure we were acting in the best interests of those we served. Grace knew just what to say, and on many occasions, her wise words helped ease tense moments.

In 1983, Grace was appointed to the House of Representatives. She was reelected seven times and retired in 1998. As long as Grace served in the House, I knew Washington's children had a strong advocate.

In 1987, I decided to run for the Washington State Senate. Once again, Grace was there for me as a counselor, a supporter, and a friend. Even though she was running for reelection at the same time, Grace took the time to make sure that I and others could follow in her footsteps. That is the way Grace was. She set a path and helped us follow it.

Grace Cole also set a new standard for what it means to be an outstanding school board member. In fact, new members of the Shoreline School Board are often measured by the ''Grace Cole Standard.'' I've heard people say of new members, ''She'll be great—just like Grace Cole.'' In 1998, the Shoreline School Board honored Grace with its first Distinguished Service Award.

What made Grace Cole such an icon? First, she knew how to lead. She listened to all sides, helped bring people together, and knew how to put people at ease. She was also a community builder. She worked side-by-side with other parents to pass school levies. She put labels on letters and walked through neighborhoods knocking on doors to ensure voters would go to the polls.

Most of all, Grace was compassionate and caring. Her passion for children drove everything she did. I remember her bill in the state legislature to outlaw spanking in schools. It seemed like such an uphill battle, but Grace would always say, ''Kids need to learn by example.'' She said that over and over again for years until her bill finally passed. The bill's opponents eventually went along because they realized that Grace Cole would never give up on something she believed in.

In the State legislature, Grace won the respect of all lawmakers on both sides of the aisle. I knew that her time in the House was a personal sacrifice for her. She had to leave her family in Shoreline to work long hours in Olympia, then return home to attend community meetings and to help others. During all her public service though, Grace made sure to always put her kids first.

For me, Grace was a perfect example of selfless community service. Today's leaders are too often judged on how much press they get or how ''visible'' they are. Grace was the person who worked behind the scenes to make people's lives better.

I will miss Grace. She always knew the right thing to say, and she was never afraid of tough votes. She didn't have to be. She knew to do the right thing. Grace showed me and countless others the path to public service. Over the years, so many have followed her—starting in PTA, serving on the school board, and then going to Olympia to fight for their communities.

I know that at this difficult time her four sons and their families feel tremendous sorrow. We all do, but through her work Grace left us so much to be proud of: a strong community of good schools, good neighborhoods, and good friends.

Grace had such a strong and positive spirit that I have a feeling wherever she is, she's organizing a coffee get-together to make sure everyone is doing the right thing. If there are envelopes to lick, phone calls to make, or laws to write, I am sure Grace is making sure it gets done.

I feel fortunate to have known Grace. I am proud to call her a mentor and guide, and I will miss her greatly.•

RECOGNITION OF NORMA LEA MIHALEVICH

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks regarding the tremendous contributions Norma Lea Mihalevich has made to her community, her state, and to public education.

It isn't often that we can recognize someone who has devoted her life to public service, but Norma Lea Mihalevich has done just that. As a lifelong resident of Pulaski County in Missouri, Norma Lea has spent the

past 24 years in Crocker, MO as Mayor. Her continued re-election has been a stamp of approval on the outstanding job she has done.

Norma Lea Mihalevich has also demonstrated her commitment to public education by her service on the Crocker R–II Board of Education for the past forty-nine years. In addition, she has served as a member of the Missouri School Boards' Association's Board of Directors for eleven years. Ms. Mihalevich knows that the key to improving public education is public involvement on the local level. She has definitely led by example and in 1985 she was named as Missouri Pioneer in Education by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

It is an honor for me to tell my colleagues about Norma Lea. She is an outstanding individual and example for others. Her service, and commitment to service, is something of which we should all be proud.●

SIMPLOT GAMES

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to use this occasion to recognize and commend the premier indoor high school track and field event in the Nation. Found in my very own backyard, the Simplot Games are held annually at Holt Arena on the campus of Idaho State University in Pocatello, ID. For the past twenty-three consecutive years, the Simplot Games have provided an opportunity for thousands of youths to compete with top-ranked athletes from every corner of the United States and Canada in a nurturing and supportive environment. Run almost solely by volunteers, the Games are a source of inspiration and pride for all participants. The J.R. Simplot Company, a sponsor of the Games, should be applauded for its dedication to the athletes, not only financially, but for providing such a stage to showcase so many talented young people from around the nation.

The Simplot Games are held annually during the third weekend of February on the fastest indoor track in the country. It is certain a few national records will be broken every year before a cheering crowd of thousands, not to mention the national television audience. I had the opportunity to attend the games this year and witness firsthand the camaraderie and team spirit these exceptional young adults displayed. It was impossible not to be caught up in the excitement of this unique event.

The Simplot Games are sanctioned by USA Track and Field, and awards are presented to contenders finishing in the top six places of their respective events. The Games are not just about athletics, but also about providing guidance and advice to the young competitors. Many notable athletes of Olympic and professional fame make a personal commitment to be a positive influence on the participants through their work with the Simplot Games. This year, Olympians included: Al Joyner, Honorary Chairman of the Simplot Games and 1984 Gold Medalist in the triple jump; Dick Fosbury, 1968 Gold Medalist in the high jump and U.S. Olympic Hall of Famer; Paralympian Marlon Shirley, 2000 Gold Medalist in the 100-meter dash; Andre Phillip, 1988 gold medalist in the 400-meter hurdles; and Dan O'Brien, 1996 Gold Medalist in the decathlon and University of Idaho graduate.

In conjunction with the Games, the Adidas Golden Spike Invitational meet was held during the Simplot events. This professional event brought a hefty number of world class athletes to Pocatello to challenge each other for qualifying marks for the 2004 Summer Olympic Games. Through the competition, one hometown favorite was a particular bright spot: Stacy Dragila, 2000 Olympic Gold Medalist in women's pole vaulting, eclipsed her own world record of fifteen feet, five inches, by a full inch and three quarters.

Next year the Simplot Games will be held February 14–16. I encourage all who compete or have sons and daughters that compete in track and field to participate in this world-class event. If you cannot make the competition, or cheer from a seat in the arena, I invite you to watch this exciting and uplifting event unfold from your own living room on television. I am proud that my state of Idaho is the home of this wonderful event and its sponsor, the J.R. Simplot. I am also proud of all the athletes who compete, not only with the other participants but with themselves, to be the best. It is encouraging for all Americans to see how our children are capable of rising above our expectations and accomplish great things.

While I have the focus on Pocatello and Idaho State University, I would like to congratulate the ISU women's basketball team for earning its first berth ever to the NCAA Women's Tournament. The Bengals went undefeated in the Big Sky Conference this year and tied the nation's longest winning streak this season with 21 straight victories. Despite ISU's first round loss to Vanderbilt, the Bengals showed a lot of heart and determination, and I am proud of all they accomplished this year.●

SHRM VISIT TO CAPITAL

● Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to welcome the members of the Society for Human Resource Management, SHRM, to Washington for their 18th Annual Employment Law and Legislative Conference. Today, close to 300 SHRM members will visit Capitol Hill to share their views on and experience with issues such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, health care, the Fair Labor Standards Act, pension reform, and Section 127 educational assistance.

The Society for Human Resource Management, SHRM, is a strong voice for the human resource profession. SHRM represents its members on issues affecting the workplace, employment, employers, and employees. It also provides them with invaluable services such as government and media representation, education and information services, conferences and seminars, online services, and publications.

SHRM was founded 52 years ago by a small group of ''personnel'' officers to help the nation work through its post WW II labor-management challenges and improve the professionalism of the industry. Today, SHRM's membership includes over 155,000 human resource professionals in all fifty states and ranges from small one-person consulting firms to Fortune 500 companies. SHRM's members also represent a wide variety of industries, from the 25 percent who work in manufacturing to the 15 percent who work in the service sector. Other members work in the transportation, utilities, retail, finance, insurance, health, real estate, construction, and technology industries.

I want to commend the members of SHRM for taking time out of their demanding daily lives to come to Washington, D.C. to speak with their Senators and Representatives regarding the issues that affect their profession. As a legislator, I cannot stress enough the importance of legislative conferences through which members of associations like the Society for Human Resource Management come to our nation's capital to participate in the legislative process. Citizen participation is a crucial component of the legislative process because it allows legislators and their staff to hear their constituents explain their experiences as they live and work under our nation's laws. The knowledge that legislators gain through these conversations results in sounder legislation and, ultimately, a stronger democracy. Accordingly, I sincerely thank the members of SHRM for their commitment not only to their profession but to the political process.●

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–1005. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Clothes Washer Energy Conservation Standards'' (RIN1904–AA67) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1006. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Commercial and Industrial Equipment; Efficiency Standards for Commercial Heating, Air Conditioning and Water Heating Equipment'' (RIN1904–AB06) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1007. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternate Fuel Transportation Program; Biodiesel Fuel Use Credit'' (RIN1904–AB00) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1008. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contractor Legal Management Requirements; Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation'' (RIN1990–AA27) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1009. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps Energy Conservation Standards'' (RIN1904–AA77) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1010. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Determination and Findings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1011. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report concerning the prison impact assessment for 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1012. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated March 16, 2001; transmitted jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; Appropriations; the Judiciary; and Foreign Relations.

EC–1013. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information'' received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1014. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required to be Segregated'' received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1015. A communication from the Acting Executive Director of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required to be Segregated'' (RIN3038–AB52) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1016. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of New Markets Venture Capital, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Markets Venture Capital Program'' (RIN3254–AE40) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC–1017. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of New Markets Venture Capital, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''HUBZone Program—Amendments'' (RIN3254–AE28) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC–1018. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Office of New Markets Venture Capital, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''New Markets Venture Capital Program; Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN3254–AE62) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC–1019. A communication from the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to Remove the Aleutian Canada Goose from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife'' (RIN1018–AF42) received on March 15, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1020. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; Tennessee and Memphis-Shelby County'' (FRL6956–6) received on March 15, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1021. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Lead-Based Paint Activities in Target Housing and Child-Occupied Facilities; Approval of State of Indian Lead Activities Program''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1022. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report concerning the New York and New Jersey Harbor Navigation Study; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1023. A communication from the Chief of the Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula'' (Rev. Rul. 2001–13) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1024. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs: Physicians Referrals to Health Care Entities with which They Have Financial Relationships: Delay of Effective Date'' received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1025. A communication from the Chairman of the International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Lamb Meat: Monitoring Developments in the Domestic Industry''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1026. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Social Health Maintenance Organizations: Transition into Medicare+Choice''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1027. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the promulgation of an interim rule which amends 22 CFR 41.2(i); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1028. A communication from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the Strategic Plan under the Government Performance and Results Act for Fiscal Year 2000 through 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1029. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1030. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1031. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1032. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual performance report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1033. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor , transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Initial Approval Determination; New Jersey Public Employee Only State Plan'' (RIN1218–AB98) received on March 15, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1034. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Dimethyl Dicarbonate'' (Docket No. 00F–0812) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1035. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Natamycin (Pimaricin)'' (Docket No. 00F–0175) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1036. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department

of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products ; Establishment Registration and Listing'' (Docket No. 98N–1042) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1037. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food'' (Docket No. 00F–0789) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1038. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings and Paper and Paperboard Components'' (Docket No. 99F–2081) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1039. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on management reform for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1040. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Capital Requirements for Federal Home Loan Banks'' (RIN3069–AB01) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking , Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1041. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines for Safeguarding Member Information'' (12 CFR Part 748) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1042. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Development Revolving Loan Program For Credit Unions'' (12 CFR Part 705) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1043. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibilitys'' (66 FR 10586) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1044. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' (66 FR 10596) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1045. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' (66 FR 10592) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1046. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determination'' (66 FR 10590) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1047. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' (66 FR 10588) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1048. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report concerning inventory of commercial activities for 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1049. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary on Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the inventory of commercial activities for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1050. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Information Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the inventory of commercial activities for year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1051. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1052. A communication from the Executive Director of the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of additions to the procurement list received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1053. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar years 1999 and 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1054. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the list of General Accounting Office reports for December 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1055. A communication from the Acting Director of Employment Service/Staffing Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Repayment of Student Loans'' (RIN3206–AJ12) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1056. A communication from the Acting Director of Employment Service/Staffing Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suitability'' (RIN3206–AC19) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1057. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Correction of Administrative Errors'' received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1058. A communication from the Acting Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the use of the aids to navigation system by commercial, recreational, and public users; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1059. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the status of fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce , Science, and Transportation.

EC–1060. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Domestic Fisheries Division, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2001 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surf Clams, Ocean Quahogs, and Marine Mahogany Ocean Quahogs'' (RIN0648–AM50) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1061. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish by Vessels Using Non-Pelagic Trawl Gear in the Red King Crab Savings Subarea'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1062. A communication from the Acting Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule; Notice of Boundary Expansion; Supplemental Management Plan'' (RIN0648–AO18) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1063. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Closes A Season Directed Atka Mackerel Fishing in the Western Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area and Opens Trawl Gear Fishing in Some Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat Areas in the Western Aleutian District'' received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1064. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1065. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Emergency for the Summer Flounder Fishery; Extension of and Expiration Date'' (RIN0548–AO32) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1066. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries,

National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Commercial Run-Around Gillnet Fishery for Gulf Group King Mackerel in the EEZ of the Southern Florida West Coast Subzone'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1067. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Final Rule to Implement Amendment 66 to the Fishery Management Plan of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area (Removes Squid Allocation to the Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program)'' (RIN0648–AM72) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1068. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; 2001 Specifications and Foreign Fishing Restrictions'' (RIN0648–AN69) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1069. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Extension of Closed Areas'' (RIN0648–AO71) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1070. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Funds for Financial Assistance for Research and Development Projects in the Gulf of Mexico and Off the United States South Atlantic Coastal States; Marine Fisheries Initiative'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1071. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2001 Specifications; Commercial Quota Harvested'' (RIN0648–AN71) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1072. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish by Vessels Using Non-Pelagic Trawl Gear in the Red King Crab Savings Area'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1073. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''NMFS Reduces the Trip Limit in the Commercial Hook-and-Line Fishery for King Mackerel in the Southern Florida West Coast Subzone to 500 lb (227 kg) of King Mackerel Per Day in or from the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1074. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Change in Pacific Mackerel Incidental Catch'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1075. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Closure for the Inshore Component Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1076. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1077. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in the Seller Sea Lion Protection Areas in the Western Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1078. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Regulatory Adjustments; Technical Amendment'' (RIN0648–A095) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1079. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1080. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in Steller Sea Lion Protection Areas in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1081. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Closure for the A Season Allowance of Pollock in Statistical Area 610, Gulf of Alaska'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1082. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fisheries; Vessel Monitoring Systems; Delay of Effectiveness; Request for Comments'' (RIN0648–AJ67) received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1083. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Eastern Aleutian District and Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' received on March 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1084. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief of Wireless Telecommunications, Policy and Rules Branch, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Reviewing Request for Relief from State and Local Regulations Pursuant to Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v) of the Communications Act of 1934'' (Docket No. 97–192) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1085. A communication from the Attorney Advisor of the Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carriage of Digital Television Broadcast Signals: Amendments to Part 76 of the Commission's Rules, Implementation of the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act of 1999: Local Broadcast Signal Carriage Issues, Application of Network Non-Duplication-Syndicated Exclusivity Sports Blackout Rules to the Satellite Retransmission of Broadcast Signals, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' (Docket Nos. 99–120, 00–96, 00–2) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1086. A communication from the Legal Advisor of the Cable Service Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act of 1999: Broadcast Signal Carriage Issues, Retransmission Consent Issues'' (Docket Nos. 99–363, 00–96) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1087. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model EC120B Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0163)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1088. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes''

((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0162)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1089. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–600, –700, –800, and –700C Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0161)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1090. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model AS350B, B1, B3, Ba, C, D, D1; ASE55E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0160)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1091. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Pratt and Whitney JT9D Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0159)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1092. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Model 1900D Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0164)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1093. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas, DC–8–31, –32, –33, –41, –42, –43, –51, –52, –53, –55, –61, 61F, –62, –62F, –63, –63F, DC–8F–54, and CD–8F–55 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0158)) received on March 19, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 568. A bill to amend the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to respond to the severe economic losses being incurred by crop producers, livestock and poultry producers, and greenhouse operators as a result of the sharp increase in energy costs or input costs from energy sources; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 569. A bill entitled the ''Health Care Access Improvement Act''; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. MILLER, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 570. A bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 571. A bill to provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELMS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 572. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend modifications to DSH allotments provided under the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 573. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow children enrolled in the State children's health insurance program to be eligible for benefits under the pediatric vaccine distribution program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 574. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide health benefits coverage for parents of children eligible for child health assistance under the State children's health insurance program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 575. A bill entitled the ''Hospital Length of Stay Act of 2001''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 576. A bill to require health insurance coverage for certain reconstructive surgery; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 577. A bill to limit the administrative expenses and profits of managed care entities to not more than 15 percent of premium revenues; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 578. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from amending or otherwise modifying the operating certificates of major air carriers in connection with a merger or acquisition for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 579. A bill to amend the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of nonprofit entities for the Department of State's international educational, cultural, and arts programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 580. A bill to expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 581. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize Army arsenals to undertake to fulfill orders or contracts for articles or services in advance of the receipt of payment under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution designating 2002 as the ''Year of the Rose''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. REID, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. CHAFEE):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the United States Agency for International Development relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide meaningful campaign finance reform through requiring better reporting, decreasing the role of soft money, and increasing individual contribution limits, and for other purposes.

S. 96

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 96, a bill to ensure that employees of traveling sales crews are protected under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and under other provisions of law.

S. 125

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to provide substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for medicare beneficiaries.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes.

S. 193

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 193, a bill to authorize funding for Advanced Scientific Research Computing Programs at the Department of Energy for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance through States to eligible weed management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative weeds on public and private land.

S. 202

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to rename Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts as ''Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts''.

S. 255

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for

mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.

S. 256

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers.

S. 258

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of annual screening pap smear and screening pelvic exams.

S. 264

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand coverage of bone mass measurements under part B of the medicare program to all individuals at clinical risk for osteoporosis.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 281, a bill to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for partnerships in character education.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 350, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 392, a bill to grant a Federal Charter to Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 409

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the standards for compensation for Persian Gulf veterans suffering from certain undiagnosed illnesses, and for other purposes.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 410, a bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 by expanding legal assistance for victims of violence grant program to include assistance for victims of dating violence.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend part F of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and refocus civic education, and for other purposes.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable education opportunity tax credit.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of S. 501, a bill to amend titles IV and XX of the Social Security Act to restore funding for the Social Services Block Grant, to restore the ability of States to transfer up to 10 percent of TANF funds to carry out activities under such block grant, and to require an annual report on such activities by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 512, a bill to foster innovation and technological advancement in the development of the Internet and electronic commerce, and to assist the States in simplifying their sales and use taxes.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 543, a bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits.

S. 548

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 548, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced reimbursement for, and expanded capacity to, mammography services under the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

S. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 16, a resolution designating August 16, 2001, as ''National Airborne Day.''

AMENDMENT NO. 112

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 112 proposed to S. 27, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 568. A bill to amend the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to respond to the severe economic losses being incurred by crop producers, livestock and poultry producers, and greenhouse operators as a result of the sharp increase in energy costs or input

costs from energy sources; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 568

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

SECTION 1. EMERGENCY RELIEF FROM HIGH ENERGY COSTS FOR CROP PRODUCERS, LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PRODUCERS, AND GREENHOUSE OPERATORS.

Section 815 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 1549, 1549A–55), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2) and subsection (c)(2)'';

(2) in subsections (b)(2) and (d), by striking ''subsection (c)(2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(B)'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking ''Assistance'' and inserting the following:

''(1) LOSSES DUE TO DAMAGING WEATHER AND RELATED CONDITIONS.—Assistance''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ECONOMIC LOSSES DUE TO HIGHER ENERGY COSTS.—The Secretary shall also provide assistance under this section to crop producers, livestock and poultry producers, and greenhouse operators for any severe increased operating costs that the producers and operators have experienced, or are likely to experience, during calendar year 2000 or 2001 as the result of an increase in energy costs or input costs from energy sources.''; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''Assistance'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (c)(2), assistance''.

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 569. A bill entitled the ''Health Care Access Improvement Act''; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the ''Health Care Access Improvement Act of 2001.'' This bill is designed to dramatically expand rural America's access to modern health care.

The Health Care Access Improvement Act creates a significant tax incentive, which encourages doctors, dentists, physician assistants, licensed mental health providers, and nurse practitioners to establish practices in underserved areas. Until now, rural areas have not been able to compete with the financial draw of urban settings and therefore have had trouble attracting medical professionals to their communities. The $1,000 per month tax credit will allow health care workers to enjoy the advantages of rural life without drastic financial sacrifices. But the real winners in this bill are the thousands of Americans whose access to health care is almost impossible due to a lack of doctors and dentists in small town America.

There are nine counties in the great state of Montana which do not have even one doctor. In these rural settings, agriculture is often the only employer. Farming and ranching is hard, dangerous work. Serious injuries can happen in an instant. And while Montanans have always been known as a heartier breed of people, we get sick too. It is unreasonable to expect the farmer who has had a run-in with an auger or the elderly rancher's widow to drive two hours or more to get stitched up or to have a crown on a tooth replaced. As doctors, dentists, physicians assistants, mental health providers, and nurse practitioners are attracted to the more urban areas, Montanans and others in isolated communities will suffer. We must do what we can to ensure that these health care providers come to rural America, we must give them some incentive to practice in these smaller communities so that citizens living in these areas can finally enjoy the medical treatment they deserve.

This problem is not unique to my State of Montana, alone. In fact, throughout the United States, we continue to experience scarcity in all or parts of 2,692 counties. In rural areas, serious shortages exist in the supply of primary care practitioners and specialty care practitioners. This is precisely the reason why this bill is so important.

Twenty-nine health care organizations believe strongly in this legislation, as well. They actively support the introduction of this legislation to provide a tax credit to health care providers establishing practices in underserved areas because they realize it will help thousands of health care providers make decisions to establish their practices in America's underserved communities. So many communities whose access to qualified health care professionals has been a constant ''revolving door'' will be greatly helped by this tax credit. Mr. President, I hold here in my hand a letter on behalf of these various groups which I ask to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BURNS. It is important to note that less than 11 percent of the nation's physicians are practicing in non-metropolitan areas, less than 11 percent. This is a significant number, folks. We owe it to the men, women, children, elderly and families living in these non-urban communities to take steps necessary to increase this percentage and get more health care providers to their communities.

The Department of Health and Human Services uses a ratio of one primary care physician per 3,500 population as the standard for a primary care Health Professional Shortage Area, HPSA. More than 20 million Americans live in rural and frontier HPSAs. Most of the State of Montana is beyond rural, it's frontier. As of 1997, more than 2,200 physicians were needed nationwide to satisfy these non-metropolitan primary care HPSAs shortages. I think this bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to work with me and join in support of this legislation. Rural Montana, rural America, and health service providers all benefit from increased access, service and a better quality of life. In short, everyone wins with this legislation. I look forward to making this legislation work for so many of the men, women and children in need of quality health care.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 569

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 ''Health Care Access Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. NONREFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDERS SERVING HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following new section:

''SEC. 25B. PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDERS SERVING HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual who is a qualified primary health services provider for any month during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year an amount equal to $1,000 for each month during such taxable year—

''(1) which is part of the eligible service period of such individual, and

''(2) for which such individual is a qualified primary health services provider.

''(b) QUALIFIED PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified primary health services provider' means, with respect to any month, any physician, physician assistant, or nurse practitioner, who is certified for such month by the Bureau to be a primary health services provider or a mental health provider licensed under applicable state law who—

''(1) is providing primary health services full time and substantially all of whose primary health services are provided in a health professional shortage area,

''(2) is not receiving during the calendar year which includes such month a scholarship under the National Health Service Corps Scholarship Program or the Indian health professions scholarship program or a loan repayment under the National Health Service

Corps Loan Repayment Program or the Indian Health Service Loan Repayment Program,

''(3) is not fulfilling service obligations under such Programs, and

''(4) has not defaulted on such obligations. Such term shall not include any individual who is described in paragraph (1) with respect to any of the 3 most recent months ending before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(c) ELIGIBLE SERVICE PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible service period' means the period of 60 consecutive calendar months beginning with the first month the taxpayer is a qualified primary health services provider.

''(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) BUREAU.—The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance, Health Resources and Services Administration of the United States Public Health Service.

''(2) PHYSICIAN.—The term 'physician' has the meaning given to such term by section 1861(r) of the Social Security Act.

''(3) PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT.—The term 'physician assistant' has the meaning given to such term by section 1861(aa)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act.

''(4) NURSE PRACTITIONER.—The term 'nurse practitioner' has the meaning given to such term by section 1861(aa)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act.

''(5) PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—The term 'primary health services provider' means a provider of basic health services (as described in section 330(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Public Health Service Act).

''(6) HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREA.—The term 'health professional shortage area' means any area which, as of the beginning of the eligible service period, is a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act) taking into account only the category of health services provided by the qualified primary health services provider.

''(7) ONLY 60 MONTHS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—In no event shall more than 60 months be taken into account under subsection (a) by any individual for all taxable years.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

''Sec. 25B. Primary health services providers serving health professional shortage areas.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

EXHIBIT 1

ADEA,
AMERICAN DENTAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2001.

Hon. CONRAD BURNS,
United States Senate,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURNS: The 29 undersigned organizations actively support your introduction of legislation to provide a tax credit to health care providers establishing practices in underserved areas. This tax credit will not only help thousands of health care providers make decisions to establish their practices in America's underserved communities, but also will provide sufficient time for them to establish roots in these communities.

Many communities whose access to qualified health care professionals has been a constant ''revolving door'' will be greatly helped by this tax credit. It is estimated that more than 20,000 clinicians are needed to eliminate all of the Primary Care Dental, Medical and Mental Health, Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) now designated across our nation.

Please accept our endorsement for this critical proposal that will improve America's public health and access to health care in underserved areas. Thank you for offering such an important proposal at the outset of the legislative session and for your continued leadership. Please let us know how we may be helpful to you as we work together to improve access to care. We are committed to provide sustained assistance as you move this proposal forward.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. VALACHOVIC, D.M.D., M.P.H.
Executive Director.

On behalf of the: American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry; American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine; American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy; American Association of Community Dental Programs; American Association for Dental Research; American Association of Public Health Dentistry; American College of Nurse-Midwives; American College of Nurse Practitioners; American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians; American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians; American Dental Association; American Dental Education Association; American Dental Hygienists' Association; American Medical Student Association; American Optometric Association; American Osteopathic Association; American Psychological Association; American Student Dental Association; Association of Academic Health Centers; Association of American Medical Colleges; Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges; Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions; Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry; Association of Schools of Public Health; Clinical Social Work Federation; Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations; National Association of Graduate-Professional Students; National League for Nursing and National Organization of Nurse Practitioners Faculties.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. MILLER, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 570. A bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today, I address once more the subject of violence against women. It is still a problem.

According to the Justice Department statistics, violence against women by intimate partners is actually down, falling 21 percent from 1993 to 1998. Luckily, we can thank the programs created by the Violence Against Women Act, which I introduced almost a decade ago, and the efforts of advocates all across this country, from Dover to Denver, in educating us to confront domestic violence head-on.

Yet, unfortunately, we are far from eradicating this crime. It is a crime which harms women, leaving them battered and blue, sending them to the hospital, and causing them to miss work. We have also a crime that affects their children—children who cower while watching their mother get battered, children who too often then act out their own aggression.

I would love to say that, in my lifetime, we will break this cycle of family violence. But, we are not there yet.

One way of working towards this goal, however, is to preserve the Violence Against Women Office at the Justice Department. Today I, along with Senators DEWINE, LEVIN, SPECTER, CARNAHAN, HUTCHISON, MILLER, COLLINS, and CARPER, have introduced a bill making the Office permanent.

This office is vital because it has been instrumental in our efforts to help women harmed by domestic violence. Since its inception, the Violence Against Women Office has distributed over one billion dollars in its first five years to states, localities, tribal governments, and private organizations. These governments and groups, in turn, have used these precious funds to improve the investigation and prosecution of crimes of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault; to train prosecutors, police officers, and judges on the special aspects of cases involving violence against women; and to offer the needed services to victims and their families.

In particular, this funding includes the incredibly successful STOP grants—grants which fund the Services for the Training of Officers and Prosecutors. These STOP grants—the largest grant program created by the Violence Against Women Act, are especially effective because each grant must be used to upgrade three vital areas: prosecution, law enforcement, and victim services.

Likewise, the Violence Against Women Office has awarded grants to encourage arrest policies, which seek to educate our police officers that, when they answer a call for help by a woman being battered, they should not turn away. This battery is not a private matter, to be left behind closed doors—where a man as king of his castle can do as he pleases. No, not anymore. That woman's abuser is committing a crime and he is subject to arrest and prosecution.

The Office has also distributed monies to our rural areas as part of the program for Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement. I am sorry to say but this problem is in every part of this nation, and the Violence Against Women Office has sent funds to every corner of America, all the way from Orem, UT to Waterbury, VT. Yet, despite its pervasiveness, domestic violence itself is under attack.

And the Violence Against Women Office is leading the fight. Given the success of the many programs of the Violence Against Women Act as administered by the Office, I believe that the time has come to make the Violence Against Women Office permanent by statute. This Office is long overdue a strong foundation.

Moreover, the Office is due the prestige it deserves. My bill realizes this aim in a couple of ways. First, my bill provides that the Office be separate from any division or component of the Justice Department. In this regard, with the Office's Director reporting directly to the Associate Attorney General, as my bill requires, the Office will be shielded from any attempts to undo the great work it has historically accomplished. Why mess with success?

Second, my bill provides that the Director of the Office shall now be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This, too, raises the prestige of the work that the Violence Against Women Office seeks to accomplish day-in and day-out. It also subjects the selection of the Director, who performs the essential job of implementing the Violence Against Women Act, to the democratic process—thereby insuring that we attract the best candidates.

Yes, indeed, we are far from solving the crime of domestic violence. But let us take a step in the right direction. Join me in making the Violence Against Women Office permanent. The safety of women and their families depends on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 570

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 ''Violence Against Women Office Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department of Justice a Violence Against Women Office (in this Act referred to as the ''Office'') under the general authority of the Attorney General.

(b) SEPARATE OFFICE.—The Office—

(1) shall not be part of any division or component of the Department of Justice; and

(2) shall be a separate office headed by a Director who shall report to the Attorney General through the Associate Attorney General of the United States, and who shall also serve as Counsel to the Attorney General.

SEC. 3. JURISDICTION.

The Office—

(1) shall have jurisdiction over all matters related to administration, enforcement, coordination, and implementation of all responsibilities of the Attorney General or the Department of Justice related to violence against women, including formula and discretionary grant programs authorized under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322) and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106–386); and

(2) shall be solely responsible for coordination with other offices or agencies of administration, enforcement, and implementation of the programs, grants, and activities authorized or undertaken under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322) and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106–386).

SEC. 4. DIRECTOR OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director for the Violence Against Women Office (in this Act referred to as the ''Director'') to be responsible for the administration, coordination, and implementation of the programs and activities of the office.

(b) OTHER EMPLOYMENT.—The Director shall not—

(1) engage in any employment other than that of serving as Director; or

(2) hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or other agreement under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322) or the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106–386).

(c) VACANCY.—In the case of a vacancy, the President may designate an officer or employee who shall act as Director during the vacancy.

(d) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at a rate of pay not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. REGULATORY AUTHORIZATION.

The Director may, after appropriate consultation with representatives of States and units of local government, establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as are necessary to the exercise of the functions of the Office, and are consistent with the stated purposes of this Act and those of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322) and the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106–386).

SEC. 6. OFFICE STAFF.

The Attorney General shall ensure that there is adequate staff to support the Director in carrying out the responsibilities of the Director under this Act.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 571. A bill to provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to create a National Museum for the United States Army. This endeavor is important to every American, every veteran, and all Members of Congress.

I would be greatly pleased to have my colleagues join me in sponsoring this worthy legislation.

Our great Capital City and its surrounding countryside host every kind of museum imaginable, but not one for one of this Nation's greatest institutions, the United States Army. Area museums serving the American public today are all worthy museums, but this great city and this great Nation are sadly without a museum for its citizen-soldiers who have sacrificed so much for their country.

The purpose of the legislation which I introduce today is to designate a place for the Army Museum to be built to preserve, interpret, and display the important role the Army has played in the history of our Nation.

What I propose is not new. Over the past two decades many sites have been suggested and most are unsatisfactory because they have unrealistic development requirements, because their locations are unsuitable for such an esteemed building, or they lacked an appropriate Army setting. Since 1983, the process of choosing a site for the Army Museum has been a long cumbersome undertaking. A site selection committee was organized and it developed a list of 17 criteria which any candidate site is required to possess before it was to be selected as home to the Army Museum. Among other requirements, these criteria required such things as: an area permitting movement of large military vehicles for exhibits and tractor trailer trucks for shipments, commanding and aesthetically pleasing vistas, positive impact on environment, closeness to public transportation, closeness to a Washington Tourmobile route, convenience to Fort Myer for support by the 3rd Infantry, The Old Guard, accessibility by private automobile, adequate parking for 150 staff and official visitors, adequate parking for a portion of the 1,000,000 visitors per year that do not use public transportation, food service for staff and visitors, area low in crime and safe for staff and visitors, suitable space, 300,000 square feet, for construction, a low water table, good drainage and no history of flooding and suitability for subterranean construction.

Since 1984, more than 60 sites have been studied, yet only a handful has been worthy of any serious consideration.

The most prominent recent site suggestions have included Carlisle, Pennsylvania; Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; the Washington Navy Yard; and Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Of these sites, most clearly have characteristics which are directly contrary to the established criteria for site selection. The extraordinary distance of Carlisle from Washington speaks for itself. The suggestion that the Army locate its museum in Washington's Navy Yard is also directly contrary to prerequisites for site selection. The Washington Navy Yard is situated in a dangerous and difficult-to-get-to part of Washington, on the

Anacostia River and on a precarious 50-year flood plain. Because this area floods so often, a ''Washington Navy Yard Army Museum'', let me pause to repeat this awkward location a ''Washington Navy Yard Army Museum'', might well suffer the embarrassment of being closed ''due to flooding.'' This would not be the way America should honor Army history. The Navy Yard over the years has become less military in character and a patchwork home to various government offices. To locate the Army Museum in an old Navy yard, which is sometimes under water, would send a clear signal to visitors that choosing a home to their history was nothing more than an afterthought.

In 1991, the Deputy Secretary of Defense directed that the site searches include the Mount Vernon Corridor as a possible location for the Army Museum. Fort Belvoir quickly became a very attractive location. Fort Belvoir offers a 48-acre site, only 5 minutes from Interstate 95, which is traveled by over 300 million vehicles annually, it is 3 minutes from the Fairfax County parkway, and is served by Metro Bus, the Fort Belvoir site fronts on US Route 1, Richmond Highway and is next to the main gate of Fort Belvoir.

The Fort Belvoir site is also a winner historically. It is on a portion of General George Washington's properties when he was Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. It is located on the historical heritage trail of the Mount Vernon Estate, The Grist Mill, Woodlawn Plantation, Pohick Church, and Gunston Hall. Situating the Army Museum at Fort Belvoir is a natural tie to a long established military and historic installation that has already been approved by the National Capitol Planning Commission to be used for community activities, which includes museums, as a part of the Fort Belvoir Master Plan. The Fort Belvoir site meets all 17 criterions originally established by the Army.

The bill I am introducing today names Fort Belvoir as the site for the Army Museum. Fort Belvoir is the best location in the Washington area to host an Army museum. Army veterans want to remember and show their contribution to history in an Army setting and culture in which they themselves once served. Fort Belvoir is the perfect place to do this and it qualifies on every criterion established in 1983 by the Army's Site Selection Committee. For Belvoir is Army and should host Army history. Therefore, I ask that my colleagues support this bill and bring the 18-year search for a home for the Army Museum to a close by selecting a worthy home for one of this Nation's greatest institutions.

Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1817, ''A morsel of genuine history is a thing so rare as to be always valuable.'' I am pleased to see that the National U.S. Army Museum is a task for this Congress at the beginning of a new century, at a time when all Americans are proud of their Nation's accomplishments and those who made it all possible. I am absolutely concerned that all our veterans are honored, and honored honorably. Every year Army veterans bring their families to Washington and are disappointed that no museum exists as a tribute to their service and sacrifice. Time is running out for many Army veterans, especially those of World War II. I urge my colleagues to review this important piece of legislation and support its passage. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill and the site selection criteria be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 571

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 ''National Museum of the United States Army Site Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Nation does not have adequate knowledge of the role of the Army in the development and protection of the United States.

(2) The Army, the oldest United States military service, lacks a primary museum with public exhibition space and is in dire need of a permanent facility to house and display its historical artifacts.

(3) Such a museum would serve to enhance the preservation, study, and interpretation of Army historical artifacts.

(4) Many Army artifacts of historical significance and national interest which are currently unavailable for public display would be exhibited in such a museum.

(5) While the Smithsonian Institution would be able to assist the Army in developing programs of presentations relating to the mission, values, and heritage of the Army, such a museum would be a more appropriate institution for such programs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide for a permanent site for a museum to serve as the National Museum of the United States Army;

(2) to ensure the preservation, maintenance, and interpretation of the artifacts and history collected by such museum;

(3) to enhance the knowledge of the American people of the role of the Army in United States history; and

(4) to provide a facility for the public display of the artifacts and history of the Army.

SEC. 3. LOCATION OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

The Secretary of the Army shall provide for the location of the National Museum of the United States Army at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

ARMY'S NMUSA SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

1. Site large enough for building of 300,000 square feet.
2. Suitable soil and other physical properties.
3. Low water table, good drainage, no history of flooding and suitable for subterranean construction, if necessary.
4. Topography of site permits building design to include north light for labs and graphics branch.
5. Area will permit movement of large military vehicles for exhibits and tractor trailer trucks for shipments.
6. Commanding and aesthetically pleasing vistas.
7. Positive impact on environment.
8. Close to public transportation.
9. Close to Tourmobile route.
10. Convenient to National Archives and Library of Congress for staff use.
11. Convenience to the Pentagon for staff coordination.
12. Close enough to Fort Myer for support by the 3d Infantry, The Old Guard.
13. Accessible by private automobile.
14. Adequate parking for 150 staff and official visitors or space for same.
15. Adequate parking for a portion of the 1,000,000 visitors per year that do not use public transportation or space for same.
16. Food service for staff and visitors, if not provided in new building.
17. Area low in crime and safe for staff and visitors.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 573. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow children enrolled in the State children's health insurance program to be eligible for benefits under the pediatric vaccine distribution program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues Senators CHAFEE, DURBIN, REED, MURRAY, and BOXER to introduce a bill to clarify that children receiving health insurance under the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, in States like California are eligible for free vaccines under the federal Vaccines for Children, VFC, program.

Providing low-income children with access to immunizations is a high priority of mine. I believe that we must work to ensure that our nation's youngsters begin life protected against the diseases for which there are vaccinations available.

The Centers for Disease Control, CDC, estimates that in many areas of the U.S. immunization rates continue to fall below 75 percent among children under 2 years old. This is unacceptable.

In 1993, the U.S. experienced the largest outbreak of whooping cough in over 20 years. Additionally, from 1989 to 1991, a measles outbreak resulted in 123 deaths and 55,000 cases. These are diseases for which vaccinations are available.

While we are doing a better job of educating families about the importance of receiving timely immunizations, we must now focus our efforts on ensuring access to immunizations for those most in need.

The federal Vaccines for Children program, created by Congress in 1993,

P.L. 105–33, is an excellent example of a program that provides vaccines at no cost to low-income children.

To be eligible for the VFC program under current federal law, a child must be a Medicaid recipient, uninsured, or of American Indian or Alaskan Native heritage.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, argues that a child participating in SCHIP, called Healthy Families in California, is not eligible for the free immunizations provided by the VFC program because that child is ''insured.''

I believe the interpretation of ''insured'' is not consistent with Congress's intent in establishing SCHIP. I believe that in defining the term ''insured'' at that time Congress clearly meant private health insurance plans.

Children enrolled in SCHIP, or in my State the Healthy Families program, are participating in a federal-state, subsidized insurance plan. Healthy Families is a state-operated program. Families apply to the State for participation. They are not insured by a private, commercial plan, as traditionally defined or as defined in the Vaccine for Children's law (42 U.S.C. sec. 1396s(b)(2)(B).

Several California based provider groups agree. For example, in February 1999 the California Medical Association wrote to then-HHS Secretary Donna Shalala: ''As they are participants in a federal and state-subsidized health program, these individuals are not ''insured'' for the purposes of 42 U.S.C. sec. 1396s(b)(B).''

HHS has interpreted the law so narrowly that as many as 630,000 children in California under California's Healthy Families program have lost or will lose their eligibility to receive free vaccines. Approximately 428,641 kids have lost eligibility to date.

The VFC program is particularly important to California in ensuring access to life-saving immunizations for two reasons.

First, California ranks 40th overall among states having children fully immunized by the age of 19 to 35 months. In 1996, however, California ranked 32nd. Clearly the situation in California is getting worse rather than better. Allowing SCHIP children to access immunizations through the VFC program could increase the number of children receiving vaccinations in the State.

Second, in creating SCHIP in California, the State chose to set up a program under which the State contracts with private insurers, rather than providing eligible children care through Medicaid, Medi-Cal in California.

The California Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board, which is administering the new program with the Department of Health Services, wrote to HHS in February 1999: ''It is imperative that states like California, who have implemented SCHIP using private health insurance, be given the same support and eligibility for the Vaccines for Children, VFC, program at no cost as States which have chosen to expand their Medicaid program.''

A study conducted by the California Medical Association found that pediatric capitation rates for children ages 0–21 averages $24.24 per child per month. However, a 1998 Towers Perrin Study of physician costs for children ages 0–21 years found averages to be $47.00 per child per month. These numbers demonstrate the discrepancy between payment and costs for children enrolled in a capitation plan, which includes all children enrolled in California's Healthy Families program.

Add to this discrepancy in payments the fact that children need 18 to 22 immunizations before the age of 6. This process becomes quite costly!

The discrepancy in payment and costs means that many California physicians cannot afford to provide patients with the necessary life-saving immunizations, so children in my State are often going without vaccinations.

This reality has caused serious problems for children in California.

For example: From 1993 to 1997, Orange County California had 85 hospitalizations and four deaths related to chicken pox. Across the State in 1996 there were 15 deaths and 1,172 hospitalizations related to chicken pox. The Immunization Branch in California reported over 1,000 whooping cough cases, including 5 deaths, in 1998—the largest number of cases and deaths since the 1960s.

Whooping cough and chicken pox are two examples of diseases for which there are vaccinations available.

We must do more to increase access to vaccinations for our nation's children.

In 1998, as many 743,000 poor children in California, who were uninsured or on Medicaid, received these vaccines. This number is down by approximately 32,000 children in comparison to the 1997 immunization figures for California's poor children.

What can be so basic to public health than immunization against disease? Do we really want our children to get polio, measles, mumps, chicken pox, rubella, and whooping cough, diseases for which we have effective vaccines, diseases which we have practically eradicated by widespread immunization?

Congress recognized the importance of immunizations in creating the VFC program, with many Congressional leaders at the time arguing that childhood immunization is one of the most cost-effective steps we can take to keep our children healthy.

It makes no sense to me to withhold immunizations from children who 1. have been getting them when they were uninsured and 2. have no other way to get them once they become insured.

According to an Annie E. Casey Foundation report, 22 percent of California's two-year olds are not immunized. Add to that the fact that we have one of the highest uninsured rates in the country.

Over 28 percent of California's children are without health insurance, compared to 25 percent nationally, according to the Annie E. Case Foundation. Clearly, there is a need.

The San Francisco Chronicle editorialized on March 10, 1998: ''More than half a million California children should not be deprived of vaccinations or health insurance because of a technicality . . .,'' calling the denial of vaccines ''a game of semantics.''

Children's health should not be a ''game of semantics.'' Proper childhood immunizations are fundamental to a lifetime of good health. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, to help me keep our children healthy.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 574. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide health benefits coverage for parents of children eligible for child health assistance under the State children's health insurance program, to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President. Today, I am introducing legislation to allow States, at their option, to enroll parents in the State Children's Health Insurance Program, known as S- CHIP.

This bill could provide insurance to 2.7 million uninsured parents nationwide and 356,000 parents in California at a time when the uninsured rate in the country and in California continues to rise.

Congress has appropriated a total of $17.2 billion for SCHIP for Fiscal Years 1998, 1999, and 2000, or about $4.3 billion for each Fiscal Year.

SCHIP is a low-cost health insurance program for low-income children up to age 19 that Congress created in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. After three years, SCHIP covers approximately two million children across the country, out of the three to four million children estimated to be eligible.

Congress created SCHIP as a way to provide affordable health insurance to uninsured children in families that cannot afford to buy private insurance. States can choose from three options when designing their SCHIP program: 1. expansion of their current Medicaid program; 2. creation of a separate State insurance program; or 3. a combination of both approaches.

California's SCHIP is known as the Healthy Families program and is set up as a public-private program rather than a Medicaid expansion. Healthy

Families allows California families to use federal and State SCHIP funds to purchase private managed care insurance for their children.

Under the federal law, States generally cover children in families with incomes up to 200 percent of poverty, although States can go higher if their Medicaid eligibility was higher than that when SCHIP was enacted in 1997 or through waivers by the Department of Health and Human Services. In California, eligibility was raised to 250 percent of poverty in November 1999, which increased the number of eligible children by 129,000.

Basic benefits in the California SCHIP program include inpatient and outpatient hospital services, surgical and medical services, lab and x-ray services, and well-baby and well-child care, including immunizations. Additional services which States are encouraged to provide, and which California has elected to include, are prescription drugs and mental health, vision, hearing, dental, and preventive care services such as prenatal care and routine physical examinations.

In California, enrollees pay a $5.00 copayment per visit which generally applies to inpatient services, selected outpatient services, and various other health care services.

The United States faces a serious health care crisis that continues to grow as more and more people go without insurance. The U.S. has seen an increase in the uninsured by nearly five million since 1994.

Currently, 42 million people, or 17 percent, of the non- elderly population in the country are uninsured. In California, 22 percent, or 6.8 million, of the nonelderly are uninsured.

A study cited in the May 2000 California Journal found that as many as 2,333 Californians lose health insurance every day. A May 29, 2000 San Jose Mercury article cited California's emergency room doctors who ''estimate that anywhere from 20 percent to 40 percent of their walk-in patients have no health coverage.''

Among the 1.85 million uninsured children in California, nearly two-thirds or 1.3 million are eligible for Medicaid or SCHIP, called Healthy Families in the state, according to the University of California at Los Angeles.

Last year, we passed legislation enabling California to keep approximately $350 million of the $600 million unspent SCHIP funds. My state and others were at risk of losing funds because the law required states to use all their funds in three years and time was running out on the 1998 funds. Since my state and others still have these funds, as well as funds allotted in fiscal years 1999, 2000 and 2001, enrolling parents and more children could be a good way to increase enrollment.

The bill we are introducing today would gives States the option to expand SCHIP coverage to parents whose children are eligible for the program at whatever income eligibility level the state sets. In my State, that would mean a family of four earning up to $42,625 would be eligible for coverage.

This bill would retain current funding formulas, State allotments, benefits, eligibility rules, and cost-sharing requirements. The only change is to allow States the option to enroll parents.

An SCHIP expansion should be accomplished without substituting SCHIP coverage for private insurance or other public health insurance that parents might already have. The current SCHIP law requires that State plans include adequate provisions preventing substitution and my bill retains that. For example, many States require that an enrollee be uninsured before he or she is eligible for the program. This bill does not change that requirement.

This bill is important for several reasons. More than 75 percent of uninsured children live with parents who are uninsured. Many experts say that by covering parents of uninsured children we can actually cover more children.

If an entire family is enrolled in a plan and seeing the same doctors, in other words, if the care is convenient for the whole family, all the members of the family are more likely to be insured and to stay healthy. This is a key reason for this legislation, bringing in more children by targeting the whole family.

Private health insurance in the commercial market can be very expensive. The average annual cost of family coverage in private health plans is around $6,000. California has some of the lowest-priced health insurance, yet the State ranks fourth in uninsured.

In California, high housing costs, high gas and electricity prices, expensive commutes, and a high cost-of-living make it difficult for many California families to buy health insurance. Over eight in ten of uninsured Californians are working, but they do not earn enough to buy private insurance. SCHIP is a practical and attractive alternative.

Many low-income people work for employers who do not offer health insurance. In fact, forty percent of California small businesses, those employing between three and 50 employees, do not offer health insurance, according to a Kaiser Family Foundation study in June 2000. Californians in 1999 were 6.6 percentage points less likely to receive health insurance through employers than the average American, 62.8 percent versus 69.4 percent, according to UCLA experts.

We need to give hard-working, lower income American families affordable, comprehensive health insurance, and this bill does that.

The California Medical Association and Alliance of Catholic Health Care agree with us and support this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and passing this bill. By giving States the option to cover parents—whole families—we can reduce the number of uninsured, encourage the enrollment of more children, and help keep people healthy by maximizing this valuable, but currently under-utilized program.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. SNOWE).

S. 575. A bill entitled the ''Hospital Length of Stay Act of 2001'', to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE and I are introducing a bill to guarantee that the decision of how long a patient stays in the hospital is left to the attending physician. Our legislation would require health insurance plans to cover the length of hospital stay for any procedure or illness as determined by the physician to be medically appropriate, in consultation with the patient.

The bill is endorsed by the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the American Psychological Association.

We are introducing this bill because many people, patients and physicians, have told us that HMOs set limits on hospital stays that are shorter than what the attending physicians believe are medically necessary. In my view, only the physician who is taking care of the patient understands the patient's full medical history and the patient's medical condition and needs. Every patient's condition and course of illness varies. Patients respond differently to treatments. Complications arise. The doctor should decide when patients are medically ready to be discharged, not an insurance plan.

The American Medical Association has developed patient-based discharge criteria which say: ''Patients should not be discharged from the hospital when their disease or symptoms cannot be adequately treated or monitored in the discharge setting.''

A number of physicians have shared with me their great frustration with the health care climate, in which they feel they spend too much of time trying to get permission and justify their decisions on medical necessity to insurance companies.

A California pediatrician told me of a child with very bad asthma. The insurance plan authorized 3 days in the hospital; the doctor wanted 4–5 days. He told me about a baby with infant botulism (poisoning), a baby with a toxin that had spread from the intestine to the nervous system so that the child could not breathe. The doctor thought a 10–14 day hospital stay was medically necessary for the baby; the insurance plan insisted on one week.

A California neurologist told my staff about a seven-year-old girl with an ear infection and a fever who went to the doctor. When her illness developed into pneumonia, she was admitted to the hospital. After two days she was sent home, but she then returned to the hospital three times because her insurance plan only covered a certain number of days. The third time she returned she had meningitis, which can be life threatening. The doctor said that if this girl had stayed in the hospital the first time for five to seven days, the antibiotics would have killed the infection and the meningitis would never have developed.

Another California physician told my office about a patient who needed total hip replacement because her hip had failed. The doctor believed a seven-day stay was warranted; the plan would only authorize five.

A Chico, California, maternity ward nurse put it this way: ''People's treatment depends on the type of insurance they have rather than what's best for them.'' A Laguna Niguel, California woman, Gwen Placko, wrote this to me: ''. . . doctors have become mere employees of for-profit insurance companies. They are no longer captains of their own 'ships' so to speak. . . Only doctors should be the ones to make decisions for the direct treatment and benefit of their patients.''

Physicians say they have to wage a battle with insurance companies to give patients the hospital care they need and to justify their decisions about patient care.

A study by the American Academy of Neurology found that the Milliman and Robertson guidelines used by many insurance companies on length of stay are ''extraordinarily short in comparison to a large National Library of Medicine database . .. And that [the guidelines] do not relate to anything resembling the average hospital patient or attending physician. . . .'' The neurologists found that these guidelines were ''statistically developed'' and not scientifically sound or clinically relevant.

The arbitrary limits HMOs and insurance plans have set are resulting in unintended consequences. Some 7 in 10 physicians said that in dealing with managed care plans, they have exaggerated the severity of a patient's condition to ''prevent him or her from being sent home from a hospital prematurely.''

The American College of Surgeons said it all when this prestigious organization wrote: ''We believe very strongly that any health care system or plan that removes the surgeon and the patient from the medical decision-making process only undermines the quality of that patient's care and his or her health and well being. . . . specifically, single numbers [of days] cannot and should not be used to represent a length of stay for a given procedure'', April 24, 1997. ACS wrote, ''We believe very strongly that any health care system or plan that removes the surgeon and the patient from the medical decision making process only undermines the quality of that patient's care and his or her health and well being.''

The American Medical Association wrote, ''We are gratified that this bill would promote the fundamental concept, which the AMA has always endorsed, that medical decisions should be made by patients and their physicians, rather than by insurers or legislators. . . We appreciate your initiative and ongoing efforts to protect patients by ensuring that physicians may identify medically appropriate lengths of stay, unfettered by third party payers.''

The American Psychological Association wrote me, ''We are pleased to support this legislation, which will require all health plans to follow the best judgment of the patient and attending provider when determining length of stay for inpatient treatment.''

Americans are disenchanted with the health insurance system in this country, as HMO hassles never seem to end and physicians are effectively overruled by insurance companies. Doctors and patients feel that patient care is compromised in a climate in which anonymous insurance clerks interfere with medical decision-making.

This bill is one step toward returning medical decision-making to those medical professionals trained to make medical decisions.

To summarize, the Hospital Length of Stay Act of 2001:

Requires plans to cover hospital lengths of stay for all illnesses and conditions as determined by the physician, in consultation with the patient, to be medically appropriate;

Prohibits plans from requiring providers (physicians) to obtain a plan's prior authorization for a hospital length of stay;

Prohibits plans from denying eligibility or renewal for the purpose of avoiding these requirements;

Prohibits plans from penalizing or otherwise reducing or limiting reimbursement of the attending physician because the physician provided care in accordance with the requirements of the bill; and

Prohibits plans from providing monetary or other incentives to induce a physician to provide care inconsistent with these requirements.

It includes language clarifying that: nothing in the bill requires individuals to stay in the hospital for a fixed period of time for any procedure; plans may require copayments but copayments for a hospital stay determined by the physician cannot exceed copayments for any preceding portion of the stay.

It does not pre-empt state laws that provide greater protection.

It applies to private insurance plans, Medicare, Medicaid, Medigap, federal employees' plans, Children's Health Insurance Plan, the Indian Health Service.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 576. A bill to require health insurance coverage for certain reconstructive surgery; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing a bill to require health insurance plans to cover medically necessary reconstructive surgery for congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infection, tumors, or disease.

This bill is modeled on a California law and responds to reports that insurance plans are denying coverage for reconstructive surgery that doctors say is medically necessary. Too many plans are too quick to label it ''cosmetic surgery.'' The American Medical News has called the HMOs stance, ''a classic health plan word game. . . .''

Dr. Henry Kawamoto, testifying before the California Assembly Committee on Insurance stated:

> It used to be that if you were born with something deforming, or were in an accident and had bad scars, the surgery performed to fix the problem was considered reconstructive surgery. Now, insurers of many kinds are calling it cosmetic surgery and refusing to pay for it.

Many doctors have told me that before the heavy penetration of managed care, repairing a person's abnormalities was considered reconstructive surgery and insurance companies reimbursed for the medical, hospital, and surgical costs. But today, many insurance companies and managed care organizations will not pay for reconstruction of many deformities because they deem them to be ''cosmetic'' and not a ''functional'' repair.

This bill is endorsed by the March of Dimes, Easter Seals, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Organization for Rare Disorders, the American College of Surgeons, the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons, the American Association of Pediatric Plastic Surgeons and the American Society of Maxillofacial Surgeons.

The children who face refusals to pay for surgery are the true evidence that this bill is needed. Here are some of the examples that were brought to the California legislature:

Hanna Gremp, a 6-year old from California, was born with a congenital birth defect, called bilateral microtia, the absence of an inner ear. Once the first stage of the surgery was complete, the Gremp's HMO denied the next surgery for Hanna. They called the other surgeries ''cosmetic'' and not medically necessary.

Michael Hatfield, a 19-year old from Texas, has gone through similar struggles. He was born with a congenital

birth defect that is known as a midline facial cleft. The self-insured plan his parents had only paid for a small portion of the surgery which reconstructed his nose. The HMO also refused to pay any part of the surgery that reconstructed his cheekbones and eye sockets. The HMO considered some of these surgeries to be ''cosmetic.''

Cigna Health Care denied coverage for surgery to construct an ear for a little California girl born without one and only after adverse press coverage reversed its position saying that, ''It was determined that studies have shown some functional improvement following surgery.''

Qual-Med, another California HMO, initially denied coverage for reconstructive surgery for a little boy who also had microtia, authorizing it only after many appeals and two years delay.

The bill uses medically-recognized terms to distinguish between medically necessary surgery and cosmetic surgery. It defines medically necessary reconstructive surgery as surgery ''performed to correct or repair abnormal structures of the body caused by congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infection, tumors, or disease to (1) improve functions; or (2) give the patient a normal appearance, to the extent possible, in the judgment of the physician performing the surgery.'' The bill specifically excludes cosmetic surgery, defined as ''surgery that is performed to alter or reshape normal structures of the body in order to improve appearance.''

Examples of conditions for which surgery might be medically necessary are the following: cleft lips and palates, burns, skull deformities, benign tumors, vascular lesions, missing pectoral muscles that cause chest deformities, Crouson's syndrome (failure of the mid-face to develop normally), and injuries from accidents.

This bill is an effort to address the arbitrariness of insurance plans that create hassles and question physicians' judgments when people try to get coverage under the plan they pay premiums for every month.

We need our body parts to function and, fortunately, modern medicine today can often make that happen. We can restore, repair, and make whole parts which by fate, accident, genes, or whatever, do not perform as they should. I hope this bill can make that happen.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 577. A bill to limit the administrative expenses and profits of managed care entities to not more than 15 percent of premium revenues; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Health Benefits Integrity Act to make sure that most health care dollars that people and employers pay into a managed care health insurance plan get spent on health care and not on overhead.

Under my bill, managed care plans would be limited to spending 15 percent of their premium revenues on administration. This means that if they spend 15 percent on administration, they could spend 85 percent of premiums revenues on health care benefits or services.

This bill was prompted by a study by the Inspector General (IG) for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reported under a USA Today headline in February, ''Medicare HMOs Hit for Lavish Spending.'' The IG reviewed 232 managed care plans that contract with Medicare and found that in 1999 the average amount allocated for administration ranged from a high of 32 percent to a low of three percent. The IG recommended that the Department establish a ceiling on the amount of administrative expenditures of plans, noting that if a 15 percent ceiling had been in place in 1998, an additional $1 billion could have been passed on to Medicare beneficiaries in the form of additional benefits or reduce deductibles and copayments.

The report said, ''This review, similar OIG reviews, and other studies have shown that MCOs' [managed care organizations'] exorbitant administrative costs have been problematic and can be the source for abusive behavior.'' Here are some examples cited by the Inspector General on page 7 of the January 18, 2000 report: $249,283 for food, gifts and alcoholic beverages for meetings by one plan; $190,417 for a sales award meeting in Puerto Rico for one plan; $157,688 for a party by one plan; $25,057 for a luxury box at a sports arena by one plan; $106,490 for sporting events and/or theater tickets at four plans; $69,700 for holiday parties at three plans; $37,303 for wine gift baskets, flowers, gifts and gift certificates at one plan.

It is no wonder that people today are angry at HMOs. When our hard-earned premium dollars are frittered away on purchases like these, we have to ask whether HMOs are really providing the best care possible. Furthermore, in the case of Medicare, we are also talking about wasted taxpayer dollars since Part B of Medicare is funded in part by the general treasury. One dollar wasted in Medicare is one dollar too much. Medicare needs all the funds it can muster to stay solvent and to be there for beneficiaries when they need it.

I was also encouraged to introduce the bill because of annual studies prepared by the California Medical Association, CMA, called the ''Knox-Keene Health Plan Expenditures Summary.'' The March 2001 CMA report covering Fiscal Years 1999 to 2000 found a range of administrative expenditures from plans in my state from a low of 2.7 percent, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Southern California, to a high of 22.1 percent, OMNI Healthcare, Inc.

If HMOs are to be credible, they must be more prudent in how they spend enrollees' dollars. Administrative expenses must be limited to reasonable expenses.

An October 1999 report by Interstudy found that for private HMO plans, administrative expenses range from 11 percent to 21 percent and that for-profit HMOs spend proportionately more on administrative cost than not-for-profit HMOs. This study found the lowest rate to be 3.6 percent and the highest 38 percent in California! In some states the maximums were even higher.

The shift from fee-for-service to managed care as a form of health insurance has been rapid in recent years. Nationally, 86 percent of people who have employment-based health insurance (81.3 million Americans) are in some form of managed care. Around 16 percent of Medicare beneficiaries are in managed care nationally (40 percent in California), a figure that doubled between 1994 and 1997. By 2010, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that 31 percent of Medicare beneficiaries will be in managed care. Between 1987 and 1999, the number of health plans contracting with Medicare went from 161 to 299. As for Medicaid, in 1993, 4.8 million people (14 percent of Medicaid beneficiaries) were in managed care. Today, 17.8 million (55.6 percent) are in managed care, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. In California, 52 percent or 2.6 million out of 5 million Medicaid beneficiaries are in managed care.

In California, the state which pioneered managed care for the nation, an estimated 88 percent of the insured are in some form of managed care. Of the 3.7 million Californians who are in Medicare, 40 percent, 1.4 million, are in managed care, the highest rate in the U.S. As for Medicaid in California, 2.5 million people, 50 percent, of beneficiaries are in managed care.

And so managed care is growing and most people think it is here to stay.

I am pleased to say that in California we already have a regulation along the lines of the bill I am proposing. We have in place a regulatory limit of 15 percent on commercial HMO plans' administrative expenses. This was established in my state for commercial plans because of questionable expenses like those the HHS IG found in Medicare HMO plans and because prior to the regulation, some plans had administrative expense as high as 30 percent of premium revenues.

This bill will never begin to address all the problems patients experience with managed care in this country. That is why we also need a strong Patients Bill of Rights Bill. I hope, however, this bill will discourage abuses like those the HHS Inspector General

found and will help assure people that their health care dollars are spent on health care and are not wasted on outings, parties, and other activities totally unrelated to providing health care services.

I call on my colleagues to join me in enacting this bill.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 578. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from amending or otherwise modifying the operating certificates of major air carriers in connection with a merger or acquisition for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am very concerned about the current state of affairs in our nation's airline industry. The way airlines have remade themselves since deregulation is very troubling to me and should be very troubling to most of the traveling public in this country.

Since deregulation we have seen an unprecedented number of mergers in the airline industry. What used to be 11 airlines is now 7, and now with United wanting to buy US Airways, and American wanting to buy TWA out of bankruptcy, there is a very high risk that we will quickly be reduced to three mega-carriers in this country. I am afraid of what this will mean to competition which is already almost nonexistent in so many parts of the country.

That is because the major carriers have spent the last 20 years retreating into regional hubs, such as Minneapolis, Denver, and Atlanta, where one airline will control 50 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent of the hub traffic. The result has been that a dominant airline controlling the hub traffic sets its own prices, and it is the people in sparsely populated areas in the country that end up paying for it with outrageously high prices.

These proposed mergers fly directly in the face of public interest and ought not to be allowed. We need more than three airlines. Increased consolidation would be moving in the wrong direction. We need more competition, not more concentration.

That is why I am introducing legislation today to place a moratorium on airline mergers above a certain size for a couple years so we can take a breath and evaluate what kind of air transportation system we want in this country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in expressing loudly that we must avoid having this country go to three major airline carriers. It would be a step backward, not forward.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 579. A bill to amend the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of nonprofit entities for the Department of State's international educational, cultural, and arts programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation to authorize the establishment of nonprofit entities to provide grants and other assistance for international educational, cultural and arts programs through the Department of State. This is an initiative that was developed last year in discussions with officials of the Department of State. I am pleased to be joined by Representative JIM LEACH of the other body, who is introducing the same bill today.

We are in an era in which cultural issues are increasingly central to international issues and diplomacy. Trade disputes, ethnic and regional conflicts, and issues such as biotechnology all have cultural and intellectual underpinnings.

Cultural programs are increasingly necessary to promoting international understanding and achieving U.S. national objectives. American multinational companies and other Americans doing business overseas welcome opportunities to support the unique cultures of nations in which they do business, as well as telling the story of America's diversity in other countries.

One way they could do this is by helping to sponsor cultural exchange programs arranged through the Department of State. Department officials tells us, however, that there is apparently no easy way to do that. Moreover, many people in our own government are uncertain whether they should engage in presenting the creative, intellectual and cultural side of our nation.

Under this legislation Congress would authorize the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of private nonprofit organizations to assist in supporting international cultural programs, making it both easy and attractive for private organizations to support cultural programs in cooperation with the Department of State. In so doing, we would affirm support for the promotion and presentation of the nation's intellectual and creative best as part of American diplomacy.

This initiative would support a broad range of cultural exchange programs. Its priority would be to support the organization and promotion of major, high-profile presentations of art exhibitions, musical and theatrical performances which represent the finest quality of creativity our nation produces. These should be presentations that reach large numbers of people, which contribute to achieving our national interests and which represent the diversity of American culture.

The bill would provide authority to solicit support for specific cultural endeavors, offering individuals, foundations, corporations and other American businesses engaged overseas the opportunity to publicly support cross-cultural understanding in countries where they do business.

The non-profit entity would work with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs as well as the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy at the Department of State.

I understand that the House International Relations Committee is planning to consider a version of this bill later this week. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate on this legislation in the coming weeks.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 579

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It is in the national interest of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other nations.

(2) Among the means to be used in achieving this objective are a wide range of international educational and cultural exchange programs, including the J. William Fulbright Educational Exchange Program and the International Visitors Program.

(3) Cultural diplomacy, especially the presentation abroad of the finest of the creative, visual, and performing arts of the United States, is an especially effective means of advancing the United States national interest.

(4) The financial support available for international cultural and scholarly exchanges has declined by approximately 10 percent in recent years.

(5) There has been a dramatic decline in the amount of funds available for the purpose of ensuring that the excellence, diversity, and vitality of the arts in the United States are presented to foreign audiences by and in cooperation with United States diplomatic and consular representatives.

(6) One of the ways to deepen and expand cultural and educational exchange programs is through the establishment of nonprofit entities to encourage the participation and financial support of multinational companies and other private sector contributors.

(7) The United States private sector should be encouraged to cooperate closely with the Secretary of State and the Secretary's representatives to expand and spread appreciation of United States cultural and artistic accomplishments.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH NONPROFIT ENTITIES.

Section 105(f) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f)) is further amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(f)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) The Secretary of State is authorized to provide for the establishment of private, nonprofit entities to assist in carrying out the purposes of the Act. Any such entity shall not be considered an agency or instrumentality of the United States Government,

nor shall its employees be considered employees of the United States Government for any purposes.

''(3) The entities may, among other functions—

''(A) encourage United States multinational companies and other elements of the private sector to participate in, and support, cultural, arts, and educational exchange programs, including those programs that will enhance international appreciation of the cultural and artistic accomplishments of the United States;

''(B) solicit and receive contributions from the private sector to support these cultural arts and educational exchange programs; and

''(C) provide grants and other assistance for these programs.

''(4) The Secretary of State is authorized to make such arrangements as are necessary to carry out the purposes of these entities, including—

''(A) the solicitation and receipt of funds for the entity;

''(B) designation of a program in recognition of such contributions; and

''(C) designation of members, including employees of the United States Government, on any board or other body established to administer the entity.

''(5) Any funds available to the Department of State may be made available to such entities to cover administrative and other costs for their establishment. Any such entity is authorized to invest any amount provided to it by the Department of State, and such amount, as well as any interest or earnings on such amount, may be used by the entity to carry out its purposes.''.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 580. A bill to expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would expedite construction of the World War II Memorial. Some of our colleagues may not be aware that even after having had the opportunity to argue their case before the twenty-two public hearings over the last five years regarding the site and design of the memorial, opponents have now turned to the courts to overturn the Memorial's approval.

Regrettably, it is now clear that legislation will be needed if the World War II Memorial is to be constructed before all the patriots who fought in defense of liberty have passed on. The ugly truth is that every day we lose more than a thousand members of our greatest generation. How many more will be deprived of the joy of seeing this richly deserved tribute to their heroic service completed?

According to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the World War II Memorial will be the first national memorial dedicated to all who served in the armed forces and Merchant Marine of the United States during World War II and acknowledging the commitment and achievement of the entire nation. All military veterans of the war, the citizens of the home front, the nation at large, and the high moral purpose and idealism that motivated the nation's call to arms will be honored.

Symbolic of the defining event of the 20th century in American history, the memorial will be a monument to the spirit, sacrifice, and commitment of the American people, to the common defense of the nation and to the broader causes of peace and freedom from tyranny throughout the world. It will inspire future generations of Americans, deepening their appreciation of what the World War II generation accomplished in securing freedom and democracy. Above all, the memorial will stand for all time as an important symbol of American national unity, a timeless reminder of the moral strength and awesome power that can flow when a free people are at once united and bonded together in a common and just cause.

Construction of this memorial is long overdue. Opponents have had ample opportunity to make their case, and while I respect their opinions, the simple truth is that the site has been selected and the time to begin to move dirt has arrived. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this resolution. Let us, as a nation, prevent the cheapening of this tribute by putting a stop to frivolous legal challenges. Let us say thanks to those who fought to save the babes of humanity from the wolves of tyranny. Let's build the World War II memorial, let's build it upon the National Mall, and let's build it now.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 580

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

SECTION 1. EXPEDITED COMMENCEMENT BY AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION OF CONSTRUCTION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL.

Section 2113 of title 36, United States Code, as added by section 601(a) of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106–117; 113 Stat. 1576), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Commission shall expeditiously proceed with the construction of the World War II memorial at the dedicated Rainbow Pool site in the District of Columbia without regard to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), or any other law pertaining to the siting or design for the World War II memorial.

''(2) The construction of the World War II memorial by the Commission shall be consistent with—

''(A) the final architectural submission made to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission on June 30, 2000, as supplemented on November 2, 2000; and

''(B) such reasonable construction permit requirements as may be required by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service.

''(3) The decision to construct the World War II memorial at the dedicated Rainbow Pool site, and the decisions regarding the design for the World War II memorial, are final and conclusive and shall not be subject to further administrative or judicial review.''.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 581. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize Army arsenals to undertake to fulfill orders or contracts for articles or services in advance of the receipt of payment under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce S. 581, a bill that will help United States Army arsenals remain competitive and productive in the 21st century. The Army arsenals have long been an important military resource. They have not only served as a cost-effective supplier of high-quality military equipment, they have also proven to be an invaluable supplier of last resort, providing mission-critical parts when private contractors have lacked the capacity to meet emergency needs or have breached their contracts with the government. This bill will help ensure that these important facilities do not fall into disuse during the periods between national emergencies and heightened military needs.

Rock Island Arsenal, in my home state of Illinois, was acquired by the United States in 1804. Located on an island in the Mississippi River, the area was converted to its current function, and named Rock Island Arsenal, in 1862. Since then, Rock Island Arsenal has built weapons and military equipment for all of our nation's wars, developing a specialty in the manufacture of howitzers.

Today, Rock Island Arsenal is the Department of Defense's only general-purpose metal-manufacturing facility, performing forging, sheet metal, and welding and heat-treating operations that cover the entire range of technologically feasible processes. Rock Island Arsenal also contains a machine shop that is capable of such specialized operations as gear cutting, die sinking, and tool making; a paint shop certified to apply Chemical Agent Resistant Coatings to items as large as tanks; and a plating shop that can apply chrome, nickel, cadmium, and copper, and can galvanize, parkerize, anodize, and apply oxide finishes.

These capabilities have proven essential to the functioning of the United States military. In recent years, Rock Island Arsenal has been called on to produce M16 gun bolts when a private contractor defaulted on a contract. It has also produced mission-critical pins and shims for Apache helicopters when

outside suppliers have proven unresponsive to the Army's needs.

S. 581 will help guarantee that United States arsenals will be there again when the military needs them in an emergency, by helping to ensure that arsenals have an adequate workload in normal times. During the 1990s, the Department of Defense shifted away from direct funding of arsenals to the Working Capital Fund, ''W.C.F.'', system, under which private companies compete with the arsenals for government service and production contracts. This system has improved the efficiency of the military by promoting cost transparency and discouraging the overconsumption of arsenal goods and services.

Unfortunately, implementation of the W.C.F. system has also produced some unintended consequences. As arsenals have been placed in competition with private firms, they have remained tied down by government rules that place the arsenals at a competitive disadvantage—and that hamper their efforts to secure a full workload. One of these rules is the requirement that arsenals be paid in advance for all services and products that they provide. Private firms are not required to operate under such conditions, they routinely receive payment only once they have delivered on their contract. As a result, a military department seeking goods or services, or a private contractor seeking help in supplying the government—is discouraged from contracting with an arsenal. Even when an arsenal can provide higher quality or at lower cost, the requirement of upfront payment may prove burdensome enough to convince purchasers to meet their needs elsewhere.

The legislation that I introduce today will place United States Army arsenals on a more equal footing with their private competitors. It will limit the advance-payment requirement to only those circumstances where payment is less than certain, and will otherwise allow arsenals to accept payment after performance. Specifically, arsenals will be allowed to accept later payment when the United States purchases directly from an arsenal, when an arsenal supplies a contractor serving the United States, or when payment for foreign military purchases is guaranteed by the United States. In these cases, an advance-payment requirement is unnecessary—it serves only to put the arsenals at a competitive disadvantage. Application of the requirement in these circumstances should be ended.

S. 581 will help ensure that Army arsenals will be able to secure an adequate workload in periods between supply emergencies. This bill will also serve taxpayers' money by encouraging efficient use of reserve resources, which must be maintained regardless of whether or not they are fully in use. Therefore, in the interest of encouraging optimal utilization of an invaluable national resource, and to help integrate the Army arsenals into the private-competition system of the Working Capital Fund, I today introduce s. 581.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 581

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

SECTION 1. PERFORMANCE OF ORDERS FOR ARTICLES OR SERVICES BY ARMY ARSENALS BEFORE RECEIPT OF PAYMENT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—(1) Chapter 433 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4541 the following new section:

''§ 4541a. Army arsenals: performance before receipt of payment

''(a) AUTHORITY.—Regulations under section 2208(h) of this title shall authorize the Army arsenals to undertake, with working-capital funds, to fulfill orders or contracts of customers referred to in subsection (b) for articles or services in advance of the receipt of payment for the articles or services.

''(b) TRANSACTIONS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—The authority provided in subsection (a) applies with respect to an order or contract for articles or services that is placed or entered into, respectively, with an arsenal by a customer that—

''(1) is—

''(A) a department or agency of the United States;

''(B) a person using the articles or services in fulfillment of a contract of a department or agency of the United States; or

''(C) a person supplying the articles or services to a foreign government under sections 22, 23, and 24 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2762, 2763, 2764); and

''(2) is eligible under any other provision of law to obtain the articles or services from the arsenal.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4541 the following new item:

''4541a. Army arsenals: performance before receipt of payment.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the regulations to carry out section 4541a of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution designating 2002 as the ''Year of the Rose''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Senate, the continuing beauty and appeal that flowers bring to our nation. Americans have always loved the flowers which God has chosen to decorate our land. In particular, we hold the rose dear as symbols of life, love, devotion, beauty, and eternity. For the love of man and woman, for the love of mankind and God as well as for the love of country, Americans who would speak the language of the heart do so with a rose.

We see evidence of this everywhere. The study of fossils reveals that the rose has existed in America for ages. We have always cultivated roses in our gardens. Our first President, George Washington bred roses and a variety he named after his mother is still grown today. The White House itself boasts of a beautiful Rose Garden. We find roses in our art, music, and literature. We decorate our celebrations and parades with roses. Most of all, we present roses to those we love, and we lavish them on our altars, our civil shrines, and the final resting places of our honored dead. In 1986, in recognition of the high esteem roses are held, President Ronald Reagan and the Congress of the United States proclaimed the rose as the National Floral Emblem of the United States of America.

This proclamation was as a result of the handiwork and dedication of the American Rose Society. The American Rose Society is the premier organization dedicated exclusively to the cultivation of roses. Since 1892, the American Rose Society has strived to enhance the enjoyment and promotion of roses to gardeners of all skill levels. In 2001, the American Rose Society, in conjunction with the 37 member countries that make up the World Federation of Rose Societies, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, and the American Nursery and Landscape Association began waging a campaign to honor our national floral emblem, the Rose.

In an effort to increase support for public rose gardens in the United States; recognize the beauty and inspiration roses add to the environment and landscapes of cities, and communities around the country; to introduce the therapeutic benefits of roses to people of all ages and background; to provide educational programs designed to stimulate and teach about the joys of gardening, especially rose gardening; and to teach the great history and diversity the genus offers, the American Rose Society, whose national headquarters is located in Shreveport, Louisiana, is requesting a joint congressional resolution proclaiming the year 2002 as the Year of the Rose.

The American people have long held a special place in their hearts for roses. Let us continue to cherish them, honor the love and devotion they represent and to bestow them upon all we love just as God has bestowed them on us.

I ask unanimous that the text of this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 8

Whereas the study of fossils has shown that the rose has been a native wild flower in the United States for over 35,000,000 years;

Whereas the rose is grown today in every State;

Whereas the rose has long represented love, friendship, beauty, peace, and the devotion of the American people to their country;

Whereas the rose has been cultivated and grown in gardens for over 5,000 years and is referred to in both the Old and New Testaments;

Whereas the rose has for many years been the favorite flower of the American people, has captivated the affection of humankind, and has been revered and renowned in art, music, and literature;

Whereas our first President was also our first rose breeder, 1 of his varieties being named after his mother and still being grown today; and

Whereas in 1986 the rose was designated and adopted as the national floral emblem of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) designates the year of 2002 as the ''Year of the Rose''; and

(2) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. REID, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. CHAFEE):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the United States Agency for International Development relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on February 15, the United States Agency for International Development issued Contract Information Bulletin 01–03 regarding the ''Restoration of the Mexico City Policy.''

This bulletin reinstates the international gag rule, which prohibits international family planning organizations that receive federal funding from using their own privately-raised funds to counsel women about abortion, provide abortion services, and lobby on reproductive rights.

Today, I am introducing, along with Senators REID, SNOWE, JEFFORDS, COLLINS, SPECTER, and CHAFEE, a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act.

As my colleagues know, the CRA establishes a procedure for the expedited consideration of a resolution disapproving an agency rule.

I can think of no other case where expedited procedures are more appropriate. Women's lives are at stake.

Approximately 78,000 women throughout the world die each year as a result of unsafe abortions. At least one-fourth of all unsafe abortions in the world are to girls aged 15–19. By 2015, contraceptive needs in developing countries will grow by more than 40 percent.

As a result of the gag rule, the organizations that are reducing unsafe abortions and providing contraceptives will be forced either to limit their services or to simply close their doors to women across the world. And this will cause women and families increased misery and death.

Make no mistake, the international gag rule will restrict family planning, not abortions. In fact, no United States funds can be used for abortion services. That is already law, and has been since 1973. This gag rule does, however, restrict foreign organizations in ways that would be unconstitutional here at home and that is why we seek to reverse it in an expedited fashion under the CRA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 9

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the United States Agency for International Development relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy (contained in Contract Information Bulletin 01–03, dated February 15, 2001), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BOXER in submitting a joint resolution of congressional disapproval relating to the restoration of the Mexico City Policy.

We are taking this step because the global gag rule—which denies funding to any organization that uses its own funds to provide or promote abortion services overseas—is an ill-conceived, anti-woman, and anti-American policy.

The President's rationale for reimposing the gag rule was that he wanted to make abortions more rare. Yet the last time the Mexico City Policy was in effect, there was no reduction in the number of abortions, only reduced access to quality health care services, more unintended pregnancies and more abortions. Research shows that the only way to reduce the need for abortion is to improve family planning efforts that will decrease the number of unintended pregnancies. Access to contraception reduces the probability of having an abortion by 85 percent.

It the only reason to repeal the Mexico City Policy was to decrease the need for abortions then that would be enough. But our support of international family planning programs literally means the difference between life or death for women in developing countries. At least one woman dies every minute of every day from causes related to pregnancy and child birth in developing nations. This means that almost 600,000 women die every year from causes related to pregnancy. Family planning efforts that prevent unintended pregnancies save the lives of thousands of women and infants each year.

In addition to reducing maternal and infant mortality rates, family planning helps prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. This effort is particularly critical considering that the World Health Organization has estimated that 5.9 million individuals, the majority of whom live in developing nations, become infected with HIV almost every year.

Let me be clear: We are not asking to use one single taxpayer dollar to perform or promote abortion overseas. The law has explicitly prohibited such activities since 1973. Instead, the Mexico City Policy would restrict foreign organizations in a way that would be unconstitutional in the United States. The Mexico City Policy violates a fundamental tenet of our democracy—freedom of speech. Exporting a policy that is unconstitutional at home is the ultimate act of hypocrisy. Surely this is not the message we want to send to struggling democracies who are looking to the United States for guidance.

When President Bush reinstated the Mexico City Policy, he turned the clock back on women around the world by almost two decades. Today, Senator BOXER and I are looking toward the future and taking the first step to repeal this antiquated, anti-woman policy.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 115. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

SA 116. Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 117. Mr. BENNETT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 118. Mr. SMITH, of Oregon proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 119. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 120. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 121. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 122. Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORZINE and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 115. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. MODIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) INCREASED LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''No person'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (i), no person''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) INCREASED LIMIT TO ALLOW RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(1) INCREASE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the opposition personal funds amount with respect to a candidate for election to the office of Senator exceeds the threshold amount, the limit under subsection (a)(1)(A) (in this subsection referred to as the 'applicable limit') with respect to that candidate shall be the increased limit.

''(B) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—

''(i) STATE-BY-STATE COMPETITIVE AND FAIR CAMPAIGN FORMULA.—In this subsection, the threshold amount with respect to an election cycle of a candidate described in subparagraph (A) is an amount equal to the sum of—

''(I) $150,000; and

''(II) $0.04 multiplied by the voting age population.

''(ii) VOTING AGE POPULATION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'voting age population' means in the case of a candidate for the office of Senator, the voting age population of the State of the candidate (as certified under section 315(e)).

''(C) INCREASED LIMIT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), for purposes of subparagraph (A), if the opposition personal funds amount is over—

''(i) 2 times the threshold amount, but not over 4 times that amount—

''(I) the increased limit shall be 3 times the applicable limit; and

''(II) the limit under subsection (a)(3) shall not apply with respect to any contribution made with respect to a candidate if such contribution is made under the increased limit of subparagraph (A) during a period in which the candidate may accept such a contribution; and

''(ii) 4 times the threshold amount, but not over 10 times that amount, the increased limit shall be 6 times the applicable limit; and

''(iii) 10 times the threshold amount—

''(I) the increased limit shall be 6 times the applicable limit;

''(II) the limit under subsection (a)(3) shall not apply with respect to any contribution made with respect to a candidate if such contribution is made under the increased limit of subparagraph (A) during a period in which the candidate may accept such a contribution; and

''(III) the limits under subsection (d) with respect to any expenditure by a State or national committee of a political party shall not apply.

''(D) OPPOSITION PERSONAL FUNDS AMOUNT.—The opposition personal funds amount is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(i) the greatest aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds (as defined in section 304(a)(6)(B)) that an opposing candidate in the same election makes; over

''(ii) the aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds made by the candidate with respect to the election.

''(2) TIME TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER INCREASED LIMIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a candidate and the candidate's authorized committee shall not accept any contribution under the increased limit under paragraph (1)—

''(i) until the candidate has received notification of the opposition personal funds amount under section 304(a)(6)(B); and

''(ii) to the extent that such contribution, when added to the aggregate amount of contributions previously accepted under the increased limits under this subsection for the election cycle, exceeds 110 percent of the opposition personal funds amount.

''(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL OF AN OPPOSING CANDIDATE.—A candidate shall not accept any contribution under the increased limit after the date on which an opposing candidate ceases to be a candidate to the extent that the amount of such increased limit is attributable to such an opposing candidate.

''(3) DISPOSAL OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount of contributions accepted by a candidate or a candidate's authorized committee under the increased limit under paragraph (1) and not otherwise expended in connection with the election with respect to which such contributions relate shall, not later than 50 days after the date of such election, be used in the manner described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) A candidate or a candidate's authorized committee shall return the excess contribution to the person who made the contribution.

''(C) LIMITATION ON REPAYMENT OF PERSONAL LOANS.—Any candidate who incurs personal loans after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001 in connection with the candidate's campaign for election shall not repay (directly or indirectly), to the extent such loans exceed $250,000, such loans from any contributions made to such candidate or any authorized committee of such candidate after the date of such election.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to loans made or incurred after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(i) DEFINITION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—In this subparagraph, the term 'expenditure from personal funds' means—

''(I) an expenditure made by a candidate using personal funds; and

''(II) a contribution or loan made by a candidate using personal funds (or a loan secured using such funds) to the candidate's authorized committee.

''(ii) DECLARATION OF INTENT.—Not later than the date that is 15 days after the date on which an individual becomes a candidate for the office of Senator, the candidate shall file a declaration stating the total amount of expenditures from personal funds that the candidate intends to make, or to obligate to make, with respect to the election will exceed the State-by-State competitive and fair campaign formula with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iii) INITIAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 24 hours after a candidate described in clause (ii) makes or obligates to make an aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds in excess of 2 times the threshold amount in connection with any election, the candidate shall file a notification with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iv) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.—After a candidate files an initial notification under clause (iii) the candidate shall file an additional notification each time expenditures from personal funds are made or obligated to be made in an aggregate amount that exceed $10,000 amount with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

Such notification shall be filed not later than 24 hours after the expenditure is made.

''(v) CONTENTS.—A notification under clause (iii) or (iv) shall include—

''(I) the name of the candidate and the office sought by the candidate;

''(II) the date and amount of each expenditure; and

''(III) the total amount of expenditures from personal funds that the candidate has made, or obligated to make, with respect to an election as of the date of the expenditure that is the subject of the notification.

''(C) NOTIFICATION OF DISPOSAL OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—In the next regularly scheduled report after the date of the election for which a candidate seeks nomination for election to, or election to, Federal office, the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee shall submit to the Commission a report indicating the source and amount of any excess contributions (as determined under paragraph (1) of section 315(i)) and the manner in which the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee used such funds.

''(D) ENFORCEMENT.—For provisions providing for the enforcement of the reporting requirements under this paragraph, see section 309.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) ELECTION CYCLE.—The term 'election cycle' means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent election for the specific office or seat that a candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the next election for that office or seat. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a primary election and a general election shall be considered to be separate elections.

''(21) PERSONAL FUNDS.—The term 'personal funds' means an amount that is derived from—

''(A) any asset that, under applicable State law, at the time the individual became a candidate, the candidate had legal right of access to or control over, and with respect to which the candidate had—

''(i) legal and rightful title; or

''(ii) an equitable interest;

''(B) income received during the current election cycle of the candidate, including—

''(i) a salary and other earned income from bona fide employment;

''(ii) dividends and proceeds from the sale of the candidate's stocks or other investments;

''(iii) bequests to the candidate;

''(iv) income from trusts established before the beginning of the election cycle;

''(v) income from trusts established by bequest after the beginning of the election cycle of which the candidate is the beneficiary;

''(vi) gifts of a personal nature that had been customarily received by the candidate

prior to the beginning of the election cycle; and

''(vii) proceeds from lotteries and similar legal games of chance; and

''(C) a portion of assets that are jointly owned by the candidate and the candidate's spouse equal to the candidate's share of the asset under the instrument of conveyance or ownership, but if no specific share is indicated by an instrument of conveyance or ownership, the value of ½ of the property.''.

SA 116. Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following

SEC. 305. MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

(a) INCREASE IN INDIVIDUAL LIMITS.—Section 315(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$3,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000''.

(b) INCREASE IN AGGREGATE INDIVIDUAL LIMIT.—Section 315(a)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)), as amended by section 102(b), is amended by striking ''$30,000'' and inserting ''$75,000''.

(c) INCREASE IN MULTICANDIDATE LIMITS.—Section 315(a)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$15,000'' and inserting ''$45,000''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000''.

(d) INDEXING OF INCREASED LIMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence of paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b) and subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsections (a), (b), and (d)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) the term 'base period' means—

''(i) in the case of subsections (b) and (d), calendar year 1974; and

''(ii) in the case of subsection (a), calendar year 2001.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to calendar years after 2002.

SA 117. Mr. BENNETT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. PROHIBITING SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS FROM USING SOFT MONEY TO RAISE HARD MONEY.

Section 316(b)(2)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(2)(C)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that the costs of such establishment, administration, and solicitation may only be paid from funds that are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act''.

SEC. 306. PROHIBITING CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES FROM USING SOFT MONEY TO RAISE HARD MONEY.

Section 323 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) OTHER POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—A political committee described in section 301(4)(A) to which this section does not otherwise apply (including an entity that is directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such a political committee) shall not solicit, receive, direct, transfer, or spend funds that are not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act.''.

SA 118. Mr. SMITH of Oregon proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS WHILE CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 324. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS WHILE CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—During the period described in subsection (b), a candidate seeking nomination for election, or election, to the Senate or House of Representatives, any authorized committee of such a candidate, an individual who holds such office, or any political committee directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such a candidate or individual shall not accept a contribution from—

''(1) any individual who, at any time during the period beginning on the first day of the calendar year preceding the contribution and ending on the date of the contribution, was required to be listed as a lobbyist on a registration or other report filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

''(2) an officer, owner, or senior executive of any person that, at any time during the period described in paragraph (1), employed or retained an individual described in paragraph (1), in their capacity as a lobbyist;

''(3) a political committee directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by an individual described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

''(4) a separate segregated fund (described in section 316(b)(2)(C)).

''(b) PERIOD CONGRESS IS IN SESSION.—The period described in this subsection is the period—

''(1) beginning on the first day of any session of the body of Congress in which the individual holds office or for which the candidate seeks nomination for election or election; and

''(2) ending on the date on which such session adjourns sine die.''.

SA 119. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Campaign Finance Integrity Act of 2001''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 101. Requirement for in-State and in-district contributions to congressional candidates.

Sec. 102. Use of contributions to pay campaign debt.

Sec. 103. Modification of political party contribution limits to candidates when candidates make expenditures from personal funds.

Sec. 104. Modification of contribution limits.

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 201. Disclosure of certain non-Federal financial activities of national political parties.

Sec. 202. Political activities of corporations and labor organizations.

TITLE III—REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 301. Time for candidates to file reports.

Sec. 302. Contributor information required for contributions in any amount.

Sec. 303. Prohibition of depositing contributions with incomplete contributor information.

Sec. 304. Public access to reports.

TITLE IV—USE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND SERVICES

Sec. 401. Ban on mass mailings.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 501. Effective date.

TITLE I—CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 101. REQUIREMENT FOR IN-STATE AND IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) REQUIREMENT FOR IN-STATE AND IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) IN-STATE CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'in-State contribution' means a contribution from an individual that is a legal resident of the candidate's State.

''(B) IN-DISTRICT CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'in-district contribution' means a contribution from an individual that is a legal resident of the candidate's district.

''(2) LIMIT.—A candidate for nomination to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives and the candidate's authorized committee shall not accept an aggregate amount of contributions of which the aggregate amount of in-State contributions or in-district contributions, as appropriate, is less than 50 percent of such total amount of contributions accepted.

''(3) TIME FOR MEETING REQUIREMENT.—A candidate shall meet the requirement of paragraph (2) at the end of each reporting period under section 304.

''(4) PERSONAL FUNDS.—For purposes of this subsection, a contribution that is attributable to the personal funds of the candidate

or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee shall not be considered to be an in-State contribution or in-district contribution.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)''; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3)(A)(i), by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(f)''.

SEC. 102. USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PAY CAMPAIGN DEBT.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a), as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) LIMIT ON USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PAY CAMPAIGN DEBT.—

''(1) TIME TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of a general or special election, a candidate for election to the Senate or House of Representatives and the candidate's authorized committee shall not accept a contribution that is to be used to pay a debt, loan, or other cost associated with the election cycle of such election.

''(2) PERSONAL OBLIGATION.—A debt, loan, or other cost associated with an election cycle that is not paid in full on the date that is 90 days after the date of the general or special election shall be assumed as a personal obligation by the candidate.

''(3) DEFINITION OF ELECTION CYCLE.—In this subsection, the term 'election cycle' means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent general election for the specific office or seat that a candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the next general election for that office or seat.''.

SEC. 103. MODIFICATION OF POLITICAL PARTY CONTRIBUTION LIMITS TO CANDIDATES WHEN CANDIDATES MAKE EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a), as amended by section 102, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES IN RESPONSE TO CANDIDATE EXPENDITURES OF PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a general election for the Senate or House of Representatives, a political party committee may make contributions to a candidate without regard to any limitation under subsections (a) and (d) until such time as the aggregate amount of contributions is equal to or greater than the applicable limit.

''(2) APPLICABLE LIMIT.—The applicable limit under paragraph (1), with respect to a candidate, shall be the greatest aggregate amount of expenditures that an opponent of the candidate in the same election and the opponent's authorized committee make using the personal funds of the opponent or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the opponent (including contributions by the opponent to the opponent's authorized committee) in excess of 2 times the limit under subsection (a)(1)(A) with respect to a general election.

''(3) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEE.—In this subsection, the term 'political party committee' means a political committee that is a national, State, district, or local committee of a political party (including any subordinate committee).''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B)(i) The principal campaign committee of a candidate for nomination to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives shall notify the Commission of the aggregate amount expenditures made using personal funds of the candidate or proceeds of indebtedness incurred by the candidate (including contributions by the candidate to the candidate's authorized committee) in excess of an amount equal to 2 times the limit under section 301(a)(1)(A).

''(ii) The notification under clause (i) shall—

''(I) be submitted to the Commission not later than 24 hours after the expenditure that is the subject of the notification is made;

''(II) include the name of the candidate, the office sought by the candidate, and the date and amount of the expenditure; and

''(III) include the aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds that have been made with respect to that election as of the date of the expenditure that is the subject of the notification.''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$2,500''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$2,500''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b) and subsection (d)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) and subsections (b) and (d)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''means the calendar year 1974.'' and inserting ''means—

''(i) for purposes of subsections (b) and (d), calendar year 1974; and

''(ii) for purposes of paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a), calendar year 2002.''.

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 201. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.

Section 304(b)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H)(v), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) for a national political committee of a political party, disbursements made by the committee in an aggregate amount greater than $1,000, during a calendar year, in connection with a political activity (as defined in section 316(c)(3));''.

SEC. 202. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) DISCLOSURE TO EMPLOYEES AND SHAREHOLDERS REGARDING POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except with the separate, written, voluntary authorization of each individual, a national bank, corporation or labor organization described in this section shall not—

''(A) in the case of a national bank or corporation, collect from or assess its stockholders or employees any dues, initiation fee, or other payment as a condition of employment or membership if any part of the dues, fee, or payment will be used for a political activity in which the national bank or corporation is engaged; and

''(B) in the case of a labor organization, collect from or assess its members or nonmembers any dues, initiation fee, or other payment if any part of the dues, fee, or payment will be used for a political activity.

''(2) EFFECT OF AUTHORIZATION.—An authorization described in paragraph (1) shall remain in effect until revoked and may be revoked at any time.

''(3) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—In this subsection, the term 'political activity' includes a communication or other activity that involves carrying on propaganda, attempting to influence legislation, or participating or intervening in a political party or political campaign for a Federal office.

''(d) DISCLOSURE OF DISBURSEMENTS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) CORPORATIONS AND NATIONAL BANKS.—A corporation or national bank described in this section shall submit an annual written report to shareholders stating the amount of each disbursement made for a political activity or that otherwise influences a Federal election.

''(2) LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—A labor organization described in this section shall submit an annual written report to dues paying members and nonmembers stating the amount of each disbursement made for a political activity or that otherwise influences a Federal election, including contributions and expenditures.''.

(b) DISCLOSURE TO THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND CORPORATIONS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REQUIRED STATEMENT OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Each corporation, national bank, or labor organization that makes an aggregate amount of disbursements during a year in an amount equal to or greater than $1,000 for any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 316(a)(2) shall submit a statement to the Commission (not later than 24 hours after making the payment) describing the amount spent and the activity involved.''.

TITLE III—REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 301. TIME FOR CANDIDATES TO FILE REPORTS.

(a) MONTHLY REPORTS; 24-HOUR REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) additional monthly reports, which shall be filed not later than the 20th day after the last day of the month and shall be complete as of the last day of the month, except that monthly reports shall not be required under this clause in November and December and a year end report shall be filed not later than January 31 of the following calendar year; and

''(iv) 24-hour reports, beginning on the day that is 15 days preceding an election, that shall be filed no later than the end of each 24-hour period; and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 304.—Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''quarterly reports'' and inserting ''monthly reports''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''quarterly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''monthly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)''.

(2) SECTION 309.—Section 309(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(b)) is amended by striking ''calendar quarter'' and inserting ''month''.

SEC. 302. CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN ANY AMOUNT.

(a) SECTION 302.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', and if the amount'' and all that follows through the period and inserting: ''and the following information with respect to the contribution:

''(A) The identification of the contributor.

''(B) The date of the receipt of the contribution.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subsection (A), by striking ''such contribution'' and inserting ''the contribution and the identification of the contributor''; and

(ii) in subsection (B), by striking ''such contribution'' and all that follows through the period and inserting '', no later than 10 days after receiving the contribution, the contribution and the following information with respect to the contribution:

''(i) The identification of the contributor.

''(ii) The date of the receipt of the contribution.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''or contributions aggregating more than $200 during any calendar year''; and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''(c)(5)'' and inserting ''(c)(4)''.

(b) SECTION 304.—Section 304(b)(3)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''whose contribution'' and all that follows through ''so elect,''.

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION OF DEPOSITING CONTRIBUTIONS WITH INCOMPLETE CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION.

Section 302 of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) DEPOSIT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The treasurer of a candidate's authorized committee shall not deposit or otherwise negotiate a contribution unless the information required by this section is complete.''.

SEC. 304. PUBLIC ACCESS TO REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(B)) is amended by inserting ''and publicly available at the offices of the Commission'' after ''Internet''.

TITLE IV—USE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND SERVICES

SEC. 401. BAN ON MASS MAILINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3210(a)(6) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) A Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress may not mail any mass mailing as franked mail.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (G), by striking '', including general mass mailings,'';

(II) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''or other general mass mailing''; and

(III) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''or other general mass mailing''; and

(ii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), and (F);

(II) by striking the second sentence of subparagraph (D); and

(III) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''subsection (a) (4) and (5)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a)'';

(C) by striking subsection (f); and

(D) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(2) Section 316 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (39 U.S.C. 3210 note) is amended by striking subsection (a).

(3) Section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1991 (2 U.S.C. 59e) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect at the beginning of the first Congress that begins after December 31, 2002.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 120. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.

Section 304(b)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H)(v), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(J) for a national political committee of a political party, disbursements made by the committee in an aggregate amount greater than $1,000, during a calendar year, in connection with a political activity (as defined in section 316(d));''.

SEC. 306. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) DISCLOSURE TO EMPLOYEES AND SHAREHOLDERS REGARDING POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b), as amended by section 203, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) DISCLOSURE OF DISBURSEMENTS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) CORPORATIONS AND NATIONAL BANKS.—A corporation or national bank described in this section shall submit an annual written report to shareholders stating the amount of each disbursement made for a political activity or that otherwise influences a Federal election.

''(2) LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—A labor organization described in this section shall submit an annual written report to dues paying members and nonmembers stating the amount of each disbursement made for a political activity or that otherwise influences a Federal election, including contributions and expenditures.

''(3) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—In this subsection, the term 'political activity' includes a communication or other activity that involves carrying on propaganda, attempting to influence legislation, or participating or intervening in a political party or political campaign for a Federal office.''.

(b) DISCLOSURE TO THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND CORPORATIONS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434), as amended by sections 103 and 201, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REQUIRED STATEMENT OF CORPORATIONS AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—Each corporation, national bank, or labor organization that makes an aggregate amount of disbursements during a year in an amount equal to or greater than $1,000 for any activity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 316(a)(2) shall submit a statement to the Commission (not later than 24 hours after making the payment) describing the amount spent and the activity involved.''.

SA 121. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. TIME FOR CANDIDATES TO FILE REPORTS.

(a) MONTHLY REPORTS; 24-HOUR REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) additional monthly reports, which shall be filed not later than the 20th day after the last day of the month and shall be complete as of the last day of the month, except that monthly reports shall not be required under this clause in November and December and a year end report shall be filed not later than January 31 of the following calendar year; and

''(iv) 24-hour reports, beginning on the day that is 15 days preceding an election, that shall be filed no later than the end of each 24-hour period; and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 304.—Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''quarterly reports'' and inserting ''monthly reports''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''quarterly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''monthly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)''.

(2) SECTION 309.—Section 309(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(b)) is amended by striking ''calendar quarter'' and inserting ''month''.

SEC. 306. CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN ANY AMOUNT.

(a) SECTION 302.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', and if the amount'' and all that follows through the period and inserting: ''and the following information with respect to the contribution:

''(A) The identification of the contributor.

''(B) The date of the receipt of the contribution.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subsection (A), by striking ''such contribution'' and inserting ''the contribution and the identification of the contributor''; and

(ii) in subsection (B), by striking ''such contribution'' and all that follows through the period and inserting '', no later than 10 days after receiving the contribution, the contribution and the following information with respect to the contribution:

''(i) The identification of the contributor.

''(ii) The date of the receipt of the contribution.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''or contributions aggregating more than $200 during any calendar year''; and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''(c)(5)'' and inserting ''(c)(4)''.

(b) SECTION 304.—Section 304(b)(3)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(b)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''whose contribution'' and all that follows through ''so elect,''.

SEC. 307. PROHIBITION OF DEPOSITING CONTRIBUTIONS WITH INCOMPLETE CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION.

Section 302 of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) DEPOSIT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The treasurer of a candidate's authorized committee shall not deposit or otherwise negotiate a contribution unless the information required by this section is complete.''.

SEC. 308. PUBLIC ACCESS TO REPORTS.

Section 304(a)(11)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(11)(B)) is amended by inserting ''and publicly available at the offices of the Commission'' after ''Internet''.

SA 122. Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORZINE, and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 305. TELEVISION MEDIA RATES.

(a) LOWEST UNIT CHARGE.—Subsection (b) of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) The charges'' and inserting the following:

''(b) CHARGES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the charges'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) TELEVISION.—The charges made for the use of any television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office in connection with the campaign of such candidate for nomination for election, or election, to such office shall not exceed the lowest charge of the station (at any time during the 365-day period preceding the date of the use) for the same amount of time for the same period.''.

(b) RATE AVAILABLE FOR NATIONAL PARTIES.—Section 315(b)(2) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(2)), as added by subsection (a), is amended by inserting '', or by a national committee of a political party on behalf of such candidate in connection with such campaign,'' after ''such office''.

(c) PREEMPTION.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) PREEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a licensee shall not preempt the use of a television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, by an eligible candidate or political committee of a political party who has purchased and paid for such use pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

''(2) CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND CONTROL OF LICENSEE.—If a program to be broadcast by a television broadcast station, or a provider of cable or satellite television service, is preempted because of circumstances beyond the control of the station, any candidate or party advertising spot scheduled to be broadcast during that program may also be preempted.''.

(d) RANDOM AUDITS.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315), as amended by subsection (d), is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) RANDOM AUDITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 45-day period preceding a primary election and the 60-day period preceding a general election, the Commission shall conduct random audits of designated market areas to ensure that each television broadcast station, and provider of cable or satellite television service, in those markets is allocating television broadcast advertising time in accordance with this section and section 312.

''(2) MARKETS.—The random audits conducted under paragraph (1) shall cover the following markets:

''(A) At least 6 of the top 50 largest designated market areas (as defined in section 122(j)(2)(C) of title 17, United States Code).

''(B) At least 3 of the 51-100 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(C) At least 3 of the 101-150 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(D) At least 3 of the 151-210 largest designated market areas (as so defined).

''(3) BROADCAST STATIONS.—Each random audit shall include each of the 3 largest television broadcast networks, 1 independent network, and 1 cable network.''.

(e) DEFINITION OF BROADCASTING STATION.—Subsection (f) of section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315(f)), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, is amended by inserting '', a television broadcast station, and a provider of cable or satellite television service'' before the semicolon.

(f) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Section 315 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''IN GENERAL.—'' before ''If any'';

(2) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (c)(1) of this section, by inserting ''DEFINITIONS.—'' before ''For purposes''; and

(3) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by inserting ''REGULATIONS.—'' before ''The Commission''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, March 27, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider national energy policy with respect to impediments to development of domestic oil and natural gas resources.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SRC–2 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger or Bryan Hannegan at (202) 224–7932.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2001 to hear testimony on the Jordan Free Trade Agreement.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2001 at 10:30 a.m. to hold a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on

Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 20, 2001 at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on the readiness impact of range encroachment issues, including: endangered species and critical habitats; sustainment of the maritime environment; airspace management; urban sprawl; air pollution; unexploded ordinance; and noise.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my law clerk, Susan Bruno, be granted floor privileges during the pendency of the campaign finance reform debate.

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

CALLING UPON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO END ITS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CHINA AND TIBET

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 22, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 22) urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce at the annual meeting of the Commission a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WARNER. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 22) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 22

Whereas the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, provides a forum for discussing human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance;

Whereas, according to the Department of State and international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China and Tibet;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has yet to demonstrate its willingness to abide by internationally accepted norms of freedom of belief, expression, and association by repealing or amending laws and decrees that restrict those freedoms;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to ban and criminalize groups it labels as cults or heretical organizations;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has repressed unregistered religious congregations and spiritual movements, including Falun Gong, and persists in persecuting persons on the basis of unauthorized religious activities using such measures as harassment, prolonged detention, physical abuse, incarceration, and closure or destruction of places of worship;

Whereas authorities in the People's Republic of China have continued their efforts to extinguish expressions of protest or criticism, have detained scores of citizens associated with attempts to organize a peaceful opposition, to expose corruption, to preserve their ethnic minority identity, or to use the Internet for the free exchange of ideas, and have sentenced many citizens so detained to harsh prison terms;

Whereas Chinese authorities continue to exert control over religious and cultural institutions in Tibet, abusing human rights through instances of torture, arbitrary arrest, and detention of Tibetans without public trial for peacefully expressing their political or religious views;

Whereas bilateral human rights dialogues between several nations and the People's Republic of China have yet to produce substantial adherence to international norms; and

Whereas the People's Republic of China has signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, but has yet to take the steps necessary to make the treaty legally binding: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) at the 57th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, the appropriate representative of the United States should solicit cosponsorship for a resolution calling upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its human rights abuses in China and Tibet, in compliance with its international obligations; and

(2) the United States Government should take the lead in organizing multilateral support to obtain passage by the Commission of such resolution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Nos. 19 and 20, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motion 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 then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Commander, Atlantic Area, United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 50:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Thad W. Allen, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 271:

To be rear admiral (Lower Half)

Capt. Harvey E. Johnson, Jr., 0000
Capt. Sally Brice-O'Hara, 0000

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE COAST GUARD

PN11 Coast Guard nominations (135) beginning Timothy Aguirre, and ending William J. Ziegler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 3, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2001

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 21. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of the Torricelli amendment to the campaign finance bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. WARNER. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the Torricelli broadcasting amendment beginning at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. Senators should expect a vote in relation to the amendment to occur at approximately 12:30 p.m. Amendments will continue to be offered and voted on every 3 hours throughout the day unless time is yielded back on the amendments

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WARNER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I

now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 21, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 2001:

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDER, ATLANTIC AREA, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. THAD W. ALLEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. HARVEY E. JOHNSON JR., 0000
CAPT. SALLY BRICE-O'HARA, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING TIMOTHY AGUIRRE, AND ENDING WILLIAM J. ZIEGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 3, 2001.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, March 20, 2001*

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP CRITICAL ASPECT FOR PROMOTING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress determined that the Federal Government be a better partner in promoting livable communities, to make our families safe, healthy and economically secure. Government needs to lead by example, to set the tone and follow through. A critical aspect is our environmental stewardship.

I just returned from 4 days in Oregon and was, frankly, surprised at the intensity of the public reaction to this administration's lack of commitment to the environment. The sudden about-face from an explicit campaign promise to have mandatory reductions in carbon dioxide emissions has struck a nerve. The administration may think it is time to study global warming, but most Americans agree with the overwhelming scientific evidence that global warming is real and that we must do something about it.

I was struck by the continued deep opposition to the administration's proposal to drill for oil in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. For me the issue is not a question of whether the environmental damage may result, it is the fundamental question whether we should do it at all.

I was pleased to see a recent newsletter by the Rocky Mountain Institute which contained an article by Amory and Hunter Lovins asking that fundamental question. They point out, for example, that the State of Alaska's own recent survey forecast on the long-term oil prices suggest that the prices are not going to be high enough to make the operation profitable. Using our time and resources to recover this more expensive oil would result not only in a waste of money, but it would in the long run result in more oil imports as we ignore more cost-efficient operations other than the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

This also continues to ignore the reality that we, as a country, cannot and should not continue to consume energy the way that we currently do: six times higher than the world per capita energy consumption, twice as much as developed countries like Japan and Germany.

The irony is that conservation does work and would work better than a mad rush to exploit our oil resources. It is estimated that a mere 3-mile-per-gallon improvement in the performance of SUVs would offset the entire proposed oil production from the Arctic. And if we feel that we cannot single out these large and inefficient vehicles, then just a ½-mile-per-gallon efficiency improvement in the fleet overall would meet the production of the Arctic wilderness. It is a lack of will regarding the average level over the last 20 years that we have not reduced these mileage requirements. Last year was 24 miles per gallon, tied for lowest in the last 20 years. We can and we should do better.

Simple things like in California having roofs that are white and reflective would reduce air conditioning costs by approximately 30 percent. It would be far more effective for us to make that investment in conservation.

I started in politics during the last energy crisis some 25 years ago, and despite Ronald Reagan's efforts to gut and reverse the efforts, conservation over a period of time has saved a quantity of energy that is four times the entire domestic oil energy production. Conservation is the only alternative that will provide immediate relief to those of us in the West this year. It has no threat from terrorists, no risk of environmental damage, and conservation continues producing every year. That is why past efforts at conservation have made each oil barrel that we have today support almost twice as much of the gross national product as in 1975.

But last and most significant, it does not make sense to strategically drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge if we are worried about oil security for the United States. What could be more foolish than placing our bets on an aging 800-mile facility that is increasingly unreliable, that is wearing out, and is impossible to defend? The potential for disruption makes it an ideal target for a terrorist, a rogue state or a deranged person.

It is in fact a potential disaster waiting to happen if you are concerned about security. Far better than this rancorous debate over the potential environmental damage in the wildlife refuge is to work to reduce the waste of energy in the United States.

HEALTH CARE TAX DEDUCTION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just dropped a bill this morning, and I intend to talk about it. It is called the Health Care Tax Deduction Act. What it does is allow deductions for amounts paid for health insurance premiums and unreimbursed prescription drugs. What I am proposing would also provide much-needed relief to individuals struggling with the high cost of health insurance and prescription drugs through a tax deduction.

As we all know, employers can write off the cost of health care coverage that is purchased for their employees. Why cannot individuals be afforded this same opportunity to write off their premiums and their unreimbursed prescription drug expenses? The current tax code sets a threshold at 7.5 percent of adjusted gross income before medical expenses can be taken as a write-off. I do not think this is fair.

Right now, under the current tax code, in order to claim health care expenses the individuals must file an itemized tax return. I believe that all taxpayers should be allowed to deduct these out-of-pocket expenses and costs and that we need to include a place where this deduction could be taken on the short form such as the 1040 EZ, and the 1040A. My bill also applies to the self-employed because individuals who are self-employed will not be eligible for a 100 percent write-off until the year 2003.

Employer-sponsored health insurance is declining. In 1987, 69.2 percent of the population under 65 had health insurance through their place of employment or a family member's place of employment. That number declined to 64.9 percent in 1998. Just who are we talking about? Well, four out of five uninsured Americans in 1998 lived in a family with a full-time worker. Only 72 percent of employees are eligible for coverage from their employer, and

about 40 percent of small businesses, 50 workers or less, do not offer any kind of health insurance. This is according to the National Coalition on Health Care.

So who is affected? Low and middle-income families; young adults 18 to 24 make up 30 percent of the uninsured; the near-elderly ages 55 to 64; minority and immigrant populations; people who work in small businesses; others include people with day-labor jobs, temporary or part-time jobs.

I believe we must address this issue because so many Americans are uninsured today, and many millions more are underinsured.

So you might ask why is this so important. Because we all end up paying for the uninsured through higher premiums, deductibles and copayments for covered services, higher taxes for uncompensated care, and reduced wages.

Did you know that Americans spends more than $1 trillion on health care? That represents about 13.5 percent of the gross domestic product. By 2008, spending will increase to 16.5 percent of the gross domestic product. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Americans spend more per capita for health care than any other nation in the world.

But why are so many people uninsured? Most studies cite cost as a major reason for not having insurance. Many workers decline coverage through their place of employment because they cannot afford to pay their share of the premium. Others, such as temporary workers, cannot afford to purchase their own insurance.

We all know that the cost of health care has risen dramatically over the last 20 years. The average premium costs about $4,500 for an individual and about $6,500 for a family. Of that amount, employees pay 10 to 30 percent of that premium. Unfortunately, things will probably get worse because many employers cover the cost of the high premiums to keep workers in a tight labor market. However, if the economy continues to slow down and unemployment begins to rise, then employers might pass the cost along to the employees or in fact discontinue providing health insurance altogether.

Seniors, in particular, have been impacted because so many HMOs have pulled out of Medicare due in large part to the high cost of prescription drugs. Allowing a simple write-off of certain costly health care expenses such as health insurance premiums and out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drugs would be a tremendous benefit that may not be available to them under the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I will be sending out a letter; and I hope all of my colleagues cosponsor my bill. It makes sense to have all taxpayers have this type of deduction available to them.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Cheryl J. Sanders, Third Street Church of God, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we lift hearts full of gratitude to You on this day that You have made, thanking You for the invitation to rejoice and be glad in it. We give thanks for the women and men of this House of Representatives.

Make Your presence and Your purpose come alive in their deliberations and debates today. By Your spirit, please empower their leadership and legislative process. Through them extend Your blessing to every family and community represented here today, Your grace to those without representation, Your equity to the poor, Your peace to the troubled, Your light to those in despair.

Grant us all full access to the healing resources and reconciling justice You have ordained for our Nation.

In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. NORTON 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 a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 420. An act to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes.

RECOGNIZING THE REVEREND DR. CHERYL J. SANDERS, SENIOR PASTOR, THIRD STREET CHURCH OF GOD

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, it is especially appropriate during this Women's History Month that we have welcomed for prayer a distinguished young woman, an ordained minister of the Church of God, the Reverend Dr. Cheryl Sanders. Not only is Reverend Sanders the senior minister of one of the District's oldest and most distinguished churches, the Third Street Church of God, she is professor of Christian Ethics at Howard University.

Not only does Dr. Sanders minister to the poor as a gifted preacher, she is a woman of extraordinary intellectual range. She has written and taught broadly on subjects ranging from biomedical ethics to the Holiness Pentecostal experience and African American religion and culture. I am proud to note that she has a special interest in feminist ethics.

Madam Speaker, I am particularly proud and pleased to celebrate Women's History Month by having the prayer offered this morning by a woman who, like me, is a native Washingtonian, who attended D.C. public schools, where she was well prepared to achieve her BA at Swarthmore and her masters and doctorate at Howard University Divinity School, where she now teaches.

Dr. Sanders' life as a Christian minister includes her husband and two children. The Church is blessed when such an able and dedicated woman is called to teach and preach in the Nation's Capital.

PRESERVING MARRIAGE

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, healthy families are fundamentally important to a healthy America. This should go without saying. According to our best data, out-of-wedlock births and weakened marriages are the principal causes of child poverty, welfare dependence, crime, drug use, and child abuse. But the Federal Government spends $150 billion, that is with a B, on welfare programs to subsidize and support single-parent families, and only $150 million trying to reduce out-of-wedlock births.

In other words, we spend 1,000 times as much money supporting single-parent families as we spend encouraging

parents to commit to raising their children together.

It is time we remembered the traditional two-parent family. Single parents often do a great job, even against the odds. There are millions of heroic single parents in this country doing their best to support and raise their children. But ask them what they think, and they will be the first to tell you that kids would be better off with both mother and dad caring for them.

TIME TO PASS A FLAT TAX

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. From the womb to the tomb, Madam Speaker, the Internal Rectal Service is one big enema. Think about it: they tax our income, they tax our savings, they tax our sex, they tax our property sales profits, they even tax our income when we die.

Is it any wonder America is taxed off? We happen to be suffering from a disease called Taxes Mortis Americanus.

Beam me up. It is time to pass a flat, simple 15 percent sales tax, and fire these nincompoops at the IRS.

Think about it.

I yield back the socialist, communist income tax scheme of these United States.

THE BUDGET, BY THE NUMBERS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, the facts are in, and the numbers do not lie. The budget proposed by this Republican-led Congress will meet not only all of the needs, but the priorities as well of the American people.

This budget continues our commitment to improving education by investing $80 billion next year, that is a 14 percent increase, in the education budget; and it supports our national defense with a $14 billion budget increase, and a $5.7 billion increase specifically for improving service members' pay, housing, and veterans health care.

In addition, this budget also includes $153 billion for Medicare reform, and $2.8 billion for the National Institutes of Health. We pay down a historic $2 trillion of the public debt, and ensure that the $2.6 trillion Social Security trust fund remains safe from the Washington spendthrifts.

Madam Speaker, we achieve all these goals while still giving the American families meaningful and fair tax relief, meaning $1,600 for the average family of four will be back in their pockets for them to spend.

Madam Speaker, the numbers simply do not lie. And there is one more, millions, and that is how many Americans want us to pass this reasonable budget and tax relief now.

180TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in honor of the 180th anniversary of Greek independence.

It was 180 years ago that the Greek patriots rose up against the Ottomans in a courageous act of defiance. Many of them fought and died for what they believed in, the right of self-determination, self-governance, that an independent Greek nation should rightfully exist alongside other sovereign nations, free of foreign domination, oppression and constraints.

A country with a rich history stretching back more than 4,000 years, Greece remains the cradle of democracy and one of the most important contributors to Western Civilization.

When the Founding Fathers of this country sought to create a government of, by, and for the people, they reached for inspiration in the words and theories of the great Greek philosophers.

On this day we reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. Like our day of independence on July 4th, in which we are always reminded of the cost of freedom and independence, it is only fitting that the Congress of the United States commemorate the struggle that led to Greek independence. We fought the same battles, and won, as did those Greek patriots.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE USING A LOCK BOX

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, more than 76 million baby boomers are marching toward retirement, creating the greatest demographic challenge this Nation has ever faced. Our government is not prepared to meet their needs. Medicare could be insolvent in the near future. In just a few years, Social Security could be in the red.

The implications are frightening. Seniors currently rely on Social Security for nearly half of their incomes. Medicare provides a staggering amount of the elderly with their basic insurance benefits.

That is why the Republican Congress has taken the first step. We stopped the 30-year raid on the Social Security trust fund, and also on Medicare. Republicans made retirement security a priority and followed through on our word. Now Congress has adopted a lock box on the Social Security program and the Medicare program.

Madam Speaker, Republicans stopped Congress from spending the surplus out of these trust funds for new spending programs.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK AND AG DAY

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women of America who help feed the world. This week is National Agriculture Week, and today is Ag Day. It is a time when we take a moment to pay tribute to those that work the land to feed our world.

For many of the constituents in my district, it is a very special day. Southwest Minnesota is a national leader in producing soybeans, corn, sugar, turkeys, pork, and dairy products.

The efficiency of U.S. farmers is a benefit to all Americans. American families spend approximately 9 percent of their income on food, compared to 11 percent in the United Kingdom, 17 percent in Japan and 53 percent in India.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to forget the farmer among all of the other pressing issues of the day. Agriculture is a vital link to the success of our Nation, and we must help our farmers by working to grow demand for their products.

ADMINISTRATION DOING NOTHING TO HELP POWER CRISIS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is locked in an unprecedented drought. We have lost hydropower generation and we are going to have to buy energy. But the energy markets have gone haywire because of the failed California deregulation. Prices are 10 times what they were a comparable month 2 years ago.

This is outrageous price gouging and profiteering on the part of some national energy companies. It is threatening residential ratepayers and businesses alike in the Northwest and California.

The Northwest delegation just met with Vice President CHENEY, and we have had the response of the Bush-Cheney administration. They will do one thing to help us, one thing to help the residential ratepayers and the businesses of the Pacific Northwest in the face of this catastrophe that is coming with huge rate increases for profiteering by a few national energy companies based, strangely enough, in Texas.

They will do one thing to help us, they told us, and that one thing is nothing.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PINA BROOKS SWIFT

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great lady of Virginia, my friend Pina Brooks Swift, who recently died unexpectedly at the age of 65.

Pina was the chairman of the Virginia Board of Elections and served as past chairman of Republican counties both in the city of Fredericksburg and in Stafford County, Virginia, two prominent localities in Virginia's first district.

Pina was a woman of great energy and integrity who always let you know where she stood, but at the same time respected the opinion of others. She had friends in all walks of life and in both parties. Even those who disagreed with her on some issues, admired her for her candor and genuine affection for her fellow human beings.

In my own case, Pina and I shared a common philosophy, though there were a few issues on which we diverged. But no matter, we spoke freely to one another and always parted as the best of friends.

The death of Pina Brooks Swift marks the end of a remarkably productive life. She will long be remembered as one of the founding ladies of the modern Republican Party of Virginia, as well as a person who was forceful, kind, caring and a great credit to humanity. She will be deeply missed.

OFFICER JAMES NAIM TRIBUTE

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

Ms. HART. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a fallen hero. James Naim of Hopewell Township in Pennsylvania was a police officer who was ambushed and fatally shot at point-blank range while he was on foot patrol this past Thursday night. It was a senseless act of violence and cowardice; but unfortunately, such violence has become all too common in our society today.

Officer Naim was at a turning point. He was 32 years old. He was only a police officer in the city of Aliquippa for 14 months, and he was only a few weeks away from earning his college degree. He had been working on it part-time. He was about to be reunited with his wife, Sofia, a native of Bulgaria, who had been having trouble getting her visa to return to the United States.

□ 1415

This young couple had a bright future ahead of them. In the midst of all of this opportunity and change, James Naim knowingly risked his life every day doing what he loved: protecting the lives of others.

All too often we find ourselves looking for heroes in movies and on television, when all we have to do is look next door and see someone like Officer Jim Naim, someone who never sought recognition for his honorable dedication to others, but courageously paid the ultimate price in achieving it.

Today over 1,000 police officers attended the burial of Officer Naim, which reflects the profound impact he had on the lives of those around him. I join them in their tribute to his service and ultimate sacrifice, and recognize that the world has tragically lost another hero.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF COMBATTING TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 67) recognizing the importance of combatting tuberculosis on a worldwide basis, and acknowledging the severe impact that TB has on minority populations in the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 67

Whereas tuberculosis is a horrible disease that is preventable and treatable;

Whereas one third of the world's population is infected with the TB bacteria, including between 10 and 15 million people in the United States;

Whereas someone in the world dies of TB every 15 seconds;

Whereas TB will kill more people this year than any other year in history;

Whereas TB rates are substantially higher for minorities in the United States;

Whereas African Americans suffer from TB at a rate that is eight times greater than that of Caucasians, Latinos at six times greater, Native Americans at five times greater and Asians at a rate of nearly fifteen times greater;

Whereas a substantial number of States have TB rates above the national average, the highest rates being found in Texas, Hawaii, California, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, and New York;

Whereas the increased threat of TB emerging in the United States is an unavoidable byproduct of increased international travel, commerce, and migration;

Whereas leading TB experts agree that in order to control TB in the United States, it is necessary to control TB in the developing countries that contribute the vast majority of the global TB burden and are the destination of tens of thousands of American visitors each year; and

Whereas it is possible to control tuberculosis worldwide, as the global community eradicated smallpox and may soon eradicate polio, if the worldwide political will to do so is found: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of increasing United States investment in international tuberculosis control within the foreign aid budget for fiscal year 2002;

(2) recognizes the importance of supporting and expanding domestic efforts to eliminate TB in the United States; and

(3) calls upon local, national and global leaders, including the President of the United States, to commit to putting an end to the worldwide TB epidemic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam 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 resolution presently being considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 67, introduced by our colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), seeks to draw more attention at home and abroad to the growing threat posed by tuberculosis. This deadly disease not only poses a threat throughout the developing world, but also disproportionately afflicts minority and poor populations in the United States.

Tragically, Madam Speaker, one-third of the world's population is infected with tuberculosis, a treatable and curable disease. Yet millions die from the disease because its victims lack education and an awareness about its deadly consequences on them or the meager resources needed for treatment. More alarming is the fact that between 10 million and 15 million Americans are infected with tuberculosis in the United States and thousands die of that disease each year.

Madam Speaker, every 15 seconds a person is infected with the deadly tuberculosis virus; and as a consequence, more people will die of the disease this year than in any other year in history. It is also important to underscore that

infectious diseases know no borders and that as a result of travel and commerce, more and more Americans, especially the poor and minorities, will become infected and die from this preventable disease.

The global community worked collectively to eradicate smallpox and is working to rid the world of the polio virus. We can do the same with regard to tuberculosis. It is also possible to save lives by providing the poor and minorities in our own country as well as overseas with inexpensive tuberculosis treatment. Madam Speaker, this is not only the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. By saving lives, we can increase the productivity and lessen the burden on our taxed health care systems, both in the United States and overseas.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is important for the Congress to pass H.R. 67 in order to recognize the challenge posed by the tuberculosis epidemic and to redouble our efforts to combat and eradicate this terrible and deadly disease. This is another example of how America can act globally to serve its own interests at home.

I commend my colleagues for drafting this timely and important resolution, and I urge them to vote for its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 67 expresses support for increased United States funding for international tuberculosis treatment and eradication efforts. I would first like to commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), for introducing this resolution.

This resolution before us today calls for increasing U.S. investment substantially in international tuberculosis control within the Foreign Aid budget for fiscal year 2002. The Reyes resolution also recognizes the importance of supporting and expanding domestic efforts to eliminate TB and calls on international leaders to commit to putting an end to the worldwide TB epidemic.

Madam Speaker, March 24 is World TB Day, the day dedicated to raising awareness of the terrible toll inflicted by tuberculosis and to increase support for fighting TB. It is, therefore, appropriate that we are taking up this resolution today, just a few days prior to World Tuberculosis Day.

Madam Speaker, tuberculosis kills 2 million people every single year. That is one person every 15 seconds. Globally, tuberculosis is the leading cause of death of young women and the leading cause of death of people with HIV/AIDS. The World Health Organization, Madam Speaker, estimates that one-third of the world's population is infected with bacteria that cause tuberculosis, including an estimated 10 million to 15 million people here in the United States. Tuberculosis is spreading as a result of inadequate treatment, and it is a disease that knows no national borders.

In order to control TB in the United States in a more effective manner, it is critical that we ensure the effectiveness of TB-controlled programs globally. There is a highly effective and inexpensive treatment for tuberculosis. It is recommended by the World Health Organization as the best method for treating TB. The strategy is known as Directly Observed Treatment Short Course, DOTS for short. It produces high cure rates, prevents the further spread of the infection, and prevents the development of strains of multidrug resistant TB. Yet fewer than one in five of those ill with tuberculosis are receiving this treatment.

Based on the estimates of the World Bank, Madam Speaker, this treatment is one of the most cost-effective health interventions available, costing less than $100 to save a life. It can produce cure rates of up to 95 percent, even in the poorest countries.

Madam Speaker, I think the United States should commit more of our resources to support this treatment globally. It is the only way that we will be able to stop TB here in the United States and across the globe. I believe that passage of the Reyes resolution will signal that this House of Representatives strongly supports increased funding for the global battle against tuberculosis.

I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for introducing this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 67.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), my friend and colleague, and the author of this most important resolution.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me this time this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support a very important resolution. This resolution recognizes the importance of combatting tuberculosis commonly referred to as TB, on a worldwide basis and acknowledges the severe impact that TB has on minority populations in the United States.

As I speak this afternoon, I want my colleagues to focus on these four statistics: someone in the world is infected with TB every second of every day; someone in the world dies of TB every 15 seconds; TB kills 2 million people every year; and TB rates are substantially higher for minorities in the United States.

I introduced this resolution with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), my friend and colleague, because the problem of tuberculosis, which many people think of as a disease of the past that has largely been eradicated, is again posing a serious threat to the health and security of our Nation. We must exert maximum effort to combat this disease on a global scale.

Madam Speaker, tuberculosis is a horrible disease that is preventable and treatable; yet one-third of the world's population is infected with the TB bacteria, including between 10 million and 15 million people in the United States. Every second of every day, a person somewhere in the world is infected with TB. Every second of every day, additionally, someone in the world dies of TB. This treatable disease will kill more people this year than any other time in our history.

Furthermore, TB rates are substantially higher for minorities in the United States, with African Americans suffering from this disease at a rate that is eight times greater than that of Caucasians; Latinos at a rate that is six times greater than Caucasians; Native Americans at a rate of five times greater; and Asians at a rate of nearly 15 times greater. Everything possible needs to be done to stop this disease in its tracks. I am greatly concerned with the TB infection rates along the U.S.-Mexico border as well. Texas and California have TB rates above the national average.

Madam Speaker, TB is emerging in the United States as an unavoidable by-product of increased international travel, commerce, and migration. It is necessary to control TB in developing countries if we are going to control it here within our own borders in the United States. We need to eradicate TB just as we have eradicated smallpox.

Madam Speaker, we need to substantially increase the investment in international tuberculosis control within the foreign aid budget for fiscal year 2002. We need to recognize the importance of supporting and expanding domestic efforts to eliminate TB in the United States, and we all need to work together to put an end to the worldwide TB epidemic.

I ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 67. The World Health Organization has designated this coming Saturday as World TB Day, and I cannot think of a more appropriate way to bring attention to this terrible disease this year than the passage of this resolution.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my good friend, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), also my good friend, and

their staffs for their work on the Committee on International Relations and for their help in managing this bill. I would also like to thank all of my colleagues who cosponsored this important legislation and who I am sure will keep up the fight to eradicate tuberculosis on a worldwide basis.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Tuberculosis is the greatest infectious killer of adults worldwide. Each year, 8 million people are diagnosed with tuberculosis and 2 million die from it, one person every 15 seconds. In India alone, 1,100 people die every day from tuberculosis. Not surprisingly, the statistics on access to TB treatment worldwide are pretty grim. Fewer than one in five of those with TB receive Directly Observed Treatment Short Course, or the so-called DOTS treatment.

Based on World Bank estimates, DOTS treatment is one of the most cost-effective health interventions available, costing as little as $20, and no more than $100, in the developing world to save a life and producing cure rates of up to 95 percent, even in the poorest countries with the least developed health care infrastructure.

□ 1430

But we have a small window of opportunity during which stopping tuberculosis can be cost effective. The failure to effectively treat TB, which comes from incorrect or interrupted treatment and inadequate drug supplies, creates stronger strains that can become resistant to today's drugs.

An epidemic of multi-drug resistant TB, so-called MDR–TB, multi-drug resistant TB, would cost billions to control, with no guarantee of success. MDR-TB has been identified on every continent. According to the World Health Organization, MDR–TB ultimately threatens to return TB control to the pre-antibiotic era, the pre-1950s era, where no cure for TB was available.

In the U.S., TB treatment, normally about $2,000 per patient, skyrockets to as much as a quarter million dollars per patient, what happened in New York City in the early 1990s, and an MDR–TB treatment may not even be successful.

MDR–TB kills more than half of those infected in the United States and other industrialized nations. In the developing world, multi-drug resistant TB is an effective death sentence.

As H. Res. 67 makes perfectly clear, more needs to be done.

To control TB in the U.S. more effectively, it is necessary to ensure the effectiveness of TB control programs worldwide.

It is not just the humanitarian and the right thing to do for us to work on TB in this country, it also makes a difference and work internationally on TB will make a difference in this country.

This week I will be joined by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) in introducing two pieces of legislation responding to the global TB threat.

Our global TB legislation calls for U.S. investment in international TB control of $200 million for next year, with a focus on expanding proven, low-cost TB treatment in countries with high levels of TB.

Our domestic bill calls for an annual investment of $528 million in Atlanta's Centers for Disease Controls in their efforts to eliminate TB and $240 million in the National Institutes of Health TB research activities.

The Director General of the World Health Organization, Gro Bruntland, said that TB is not a medical problem, it is a political problem. Getting Americans engaged in an international and a domestic issue like TB, even when addressing that issue serves our best interests, is an uphill battle. Still, it is one worth fighting.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for their efforts on this issue. We have an opportunity to save millions of lives now and prevent millions of needless deaths in the future.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters for the RECORD between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN):

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2001.

Hon. W.J. ''BILLY'' TAUZIN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your letter concerning H. Res. 67, a resolution recognizing the importance of combating tuberculosis on a worldwide basis. It is our intention that the House consider this resolution on the suspension calendar. The Committee on Energy and Commerce was granted an additional referral on this resolution based on its jurisdiction over public health issues.

We recognize your jurisdiction, and appreciate your willingness to waive your right to consider this resolution without waiving your jurisdiction over the general subject matter.

As you have requested, I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of the resolution.

I appreciate your assistance in getting this important legislation to the floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: it is my understanding that the House leadership has scheduled H. Res. 67, recognizing the importance of combating tuberculosis, for floor action tomorrow, March 20, 2001. As you know, the Committee on Energy and Commerce was given a named additional referral on this legislation.

Because of the desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, I will not exercise my Committee's right to a referral. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, however, the Energy and Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H. Res. 67.

I ask for your acknowledgment of the Energy and Commerce Committee's jurisdiction over this legislation. I further request that you include this letter as part of the RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

W.J. ''BILLY'' TAUZIN,
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I would like to, first of all, thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), my colleague who was elected with me in the 10th Congress, for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 67, legislation which highlights the importance of combatting TB on a worldwide basis.

I want to salute the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for introducing this resolution.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for taking the lead with me in introducing legislation to increase the amount of money that we are expending as seed money to combat tuberculosis on a worldwide basis.

My support is ongoing for programs which save, protect and enhance the lives of millions of people around the world, programs such as infectious disease control and tuberculosis control, in particular.

International tuberculosis control has become an important issue to me over the past few years. Although it is not a widely known fact, TB is the biggest infectious killer of young women in the world. In fact, TB kills more women worldwide than all other causes of maternal mortality combined.

Someone in the world is newly infected with TB every second, and 8 million people become sick with the disease annually. TB accounts for more than 1 quarter of all preventable adult deaths in developing countries.

Currently, an estimated one-third of the world's population, including 15

million people in the United States, are infected with the TB bacteria; and due to its infectious nature, TB cannot be stopped at national borders. It is impossible to control TB in the United States until we control it worldwide.

Effective TB treatment is one of the most cost-effective, tangible interventions that can extend the life of HIV-infected persons, protect families from financial ruin and enable women and girls to enjoy a brighter future. Unfortunately, less than one in four of these infected with TB have access to proven treatment, a proven treatment called DOTs, despite the fact that it is extremely cost effective and produces cures of up to 90 percent.

A full six-month course of drugs costs only $10 or $15, and this strategy has improved cure rates by up to 50 percent and has reduced drug resistance. However, I stress that only a quarter of the world's active TB patients now use DOTs. The World Health Organization, in collaboration with various governments, foundations and anti-TB groups, seeks to solve these problems by creating a global drug facility which will buy and supply good quality drugs to countries and nongovernmental organizations that agree to use them correctly.

The United States must take a leadership role in supporting this initiative by substantially increasing spending programs to eliminate the spread of TB worldwide from $60 million to $200 million next year, with at least half of the money going to the drug facility.

Until we control TB internationally, the minority sectors of our own society will continue to be severely impacted by this disease. Latinos suffer from TB at a rate that is six times that of Caucasians. Rates among African Americans are eight times higher, and Native Americans have an incidence five times greater. Moreover, TB affects Asians with an incidence nearly 15 times greater than Caucasians.

Today, when people and diseases can reach any destination on the globe within 36 hours, TB anywhere is a threat everywhere. The longer we wait to address the TB epidemic, the more difficult and expensive it will be to eradicate the disease.

H. Res. 67 summarizes exactly what we must do to achieve this end, and I urge the support of this body.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 67, which recognizes the importance of fighting tuberculosis worldwide and especially among minority populations in the United States. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), my good friend, for recognizing the increasing threat of tuberculosis worldwide and its reemergence in the United States.

Decades ago in this country many Americans were forced into sanitariums as a way to control the spread of TB. Since then, there have been diagnostic and treatment advances that have led to a decline in the number of tuberculosis cases. In the United States between 1977 and 1999, the cases of TB decreased by 42 percent. During this time, the cases of TB in Chicago also decreased by 57 percent.

However, despite the decline of TB among the general population, a disturbing trend of TB remains prevalent among African Americans and other minority groups within the United States. The cases of TB between 1995 and 1999 for African Americans in Chicago were more than four times higher as compared to nonHispanic whites.

Although African Americans were recorded as less than 40 percent of Chicago's population, African Americans accounted for 62 percent of all recorded TB cases in Chicago. In 1999, Chicago was ranked the third highest in the Nation of TB cases, with 463 cases reported.

The community of Chicago's Southside, where approximately 36 percent of the TB cases are reported, joined hands together with the help of the Metropolitan Chicago Tuberculosis Coalition and the American Lung Association of Metropolitan Chicago to develop priorities to move towards the decline in the number of TB cases. Education was listed as the first priority to help in reducing these cases; and I agree with the community leaders, health care professionals and individuals from organizations who are developing and implementing programs of education to educate citizens to become actively involved in fighting this dreaded disease.

Again, Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and all of those who are calling for additional funding for tuberculosis both Nationwide and here at home.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of H. Res. 67, recognizing the importance of combating tuberculosis on a worldwide basis, and acknowledge the severe impact that TB has on minority populations in the United States.

TB WORLDWIDE

While TB is an ancient disease, it is also one of the world's deadliest. Every day, 20,000 people develop TB and 5,000 die from it. TB accounts for more than one quarter of all preventable adult deaths in developing countries.

Each year, there are two million TB-related deaths worldwide and a disproportionate number of people who become sick with TB are the most vulnerable—women, the poor, the homeless, racial and ethnic minorities and people infected with HIV.

TB is the leading killer of people who are HIV-infected, accounting for one third of AIDS deaths worldwide. People co-infected with HIV and TB are up to 800 times more likely to develop active TB during their lifetime than people without HIV infection.

TB is the biggest killer of women, causing more deaths among women worldwide than all other causes of maternal mortality combined.

TB IN THE UNITED STATES

In the 1970s and '80s the United States let its guard down against TB. Many states and cities redirected TB prevention and control funds to other programs and TB came back with a vengeance. The trend toward elimination was reversed and the US experienced a resurgence of TB with a 20 percent increase in TB cases reported between 1985 and 1992. Many of these persons were suffering from difficult to treat drug-resistant TB.

Today, 15 million people in our country are infected with the TB bacteria.

TB rates are substantially higher for minorities in the United States.

African-Americans suffer from TB at a rate that is eight times that of Caucasians.

My state of North Carolina is just below the National average for TB cases. In 1999, North Carolina had a TB rate of 6.4 cases per 100,000 persons. The goal on the Tuberculosis Control program in North Carolina is to reduce TB by the year of 2010 to under one case per one million persons, virtually eliminating TB in the state. This bill encourages leaders in my state, the nation, and world-wide to continue efforts to eliminate Tuberculosis.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

The end of this week (March 24th) is World TB Day. This is the day we commemorate the discovery of the TB bacteria in 1882. Unfortunately, today we are further away from eliminating this killer than we were that day over 100 years ago.

The global community has been complacent about this disease for too long. That is why I am pleased to support Mr. REYES' Resolution commemorating this day and acknowledging the harsh toll that TB takes on minorities. In addition to acknowledging the continued impact of this disease, I also believe we here in the United States must greatly increase our investment in domestic and international TB control programs. Due to its infectious nature, the only way to control TB at home is to address it worldwide. We must invest in our future now, before it's too late—before the spread of drug-resistant TB becomes too difficult or too expensive to control at all.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 67, Recognizing the Importance of Tuberculosis On A Worldwide Basis. This resolution marks a significant realization by the global public health community that we need to do more to stop this illness.

One-third of the world's population, including between 10 million and 15 million people in the United States, is infected with the tuberculosis (TB) bacteria, and rates of TB are substantially higher for minorities in the United States than for other Americans.

This resolution recognizes the importance of "substantially increasing United States investment in international tuberculosis control" in the FY 2002 foreign aid budget. We can no longer delay in combating this illness with the priority it deserves. The resolution also recognizes the importance of supporting and expanding domestic efforts to eliminate tuberculosis (TB) in the United States and calls on

local, national and world leaders, including the president, to ''commit to putting an end to the worldwide TB epidemic.'' This is a global problem, which requires a rapid and effective response from all nations.

The measure notes that the increased threat of TB emerging in the U.S. is an ''unavoidable byproduct of increased international travel, commerce, and migration,'' and that in order to control TB in the United States, it is necessary to control TB in developing countries.

Madam Speaker, TB is an avoidable problem, and, in many ways, is much easier to control than other epidemics. We are not doing enough, however, to keep TB from touching our children's lives. We must redouble our efforts as to stem the tide of the TB epidemic and disseminate the appropriate preventative measures to lessen the illness where possible.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 67, recognizing the importance of tuberculosis funding.

On March 24th, 1882, Dr. Robert Kotch discovered the bacteria that causes TB.

More than a century later, TB is still a serious world threat. In fact, it kills more people today than it did a century ago.

Somewhere in the world someone dies of TB every fifteen seconds.

One third of the world's population is infected with the TB bacteria.

This year alone, TB will take more than 2 million lives, including the lives of many minorities here in the United States. The illness is particularly affecting our African American population.

This disease is a threat to all of us, including to my constituents in California, which has one of the highest rates of this illness in the country.

Therefore, it is essential that we increase funding for TB control, and increase efforts to eliminate TB in the United States.

We must call upon world leaders, including the President to commit to putting an end to this epidemic.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 67 and I commend my colleague, Mr. REYES from Texas for bringing this important issue to our attention.

Tuberculosis (TB) is a communicable disease caused by the bacteria tubercle bacillus and a related mycobacterium (Mycobacterium bovis). It is characterized by toxic or allergic symptoms that primarily affect the lungs. One third of the world's population is infected with the TB bacteria, including between 10 and 15 million people in the United States. A substantial number of states have TB rates above the national average. The highest rates are found in Texas, Hawaii, California, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, and my home state of New York. Additionally, TB rates are substantially higher among minorities in the United States. African Americans suffer from TB at a rate of eight times greater than Caucasians, Latinos at six times greater, Native Americans at five times greater and Asians at a rate of nearly fifteen times greater.

Globally, 2 million people die from TB each year. It is estimated that between 2000 and 2020, nearly one billion people will be newly infected, 200 million people will get sick, and 35 million will die from TB—if control is not further strengthened. The global epidemic is growing and becoming more dangerous. The breakdown in health services, the spread of HIV/AIDS and the emergence of multidrug-resistant TB are contributing to the worsening impact of this disease. Leading TB experts agree that in order to control the disease in the United States it is necessary to control TB in the developing countries that contribute the majority of the global TB burden and are the destination of thousands of American visitors each year.

H. Res. 67 recognizes the importance of substantially increasing the United States investment in international tuberculosis control within the foreign aid budget in fiscal year 2002 to help countries worldwide, recognizes the importance of supporting and expanding domestic efforts to eliminate tuberculosis in the United States and call upon local, national and global leaders to commit to putting an end to the worldwide tuberculosis epidemic. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and help limit the spread of this devastating disease.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of House Resolution 67, which recognizes the importance of combating tuberculosis on a worldwide basis and acknowledges the severe impact TB has had on minority populations in the United States.

Leading experts on tuberculosis agree that in order to control this deadly disease in the United States, we need to control TB in the developing countries that make up the vast majority of the global TB burden. No one thinks this will be easy, but it is possible.

The global community successfully eradicated smallpox and many soon get rid of polio. If the international community contributes the necessary resolve and resources, we can eradicate tuberculosis as well.

In 1999, there were an estimated 8.4 million new cases of tuberculosis—up from 8 million in 1997. This increase was due in large part to a 20 percent increase in incidence in African countries with high HIV/AIDS rates. Most countries with rapidly growing HIV epidemics also have high TB rates. This is true for countries such as Brazil, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. This is typically because these countries lack the proper health care personnel, infrastructure, and funding. The link between HIV and TB rates means that we can expect several million additional new cases of TB as HIV continues to spread in high-prevalence countries.

TB is the leading cause of death from infection among young women worldwide. One third of the world's population is infected with the tuberculosis bacteria—including 10–15 million people in the United States—and every year between two to three million people die of this curable disease.

On March 16, Archbishop Desmond Tutu officially launched World TB Day, and, on March 24, the international community will recognize World TB Day. The theme, ''DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment, Short-course)—TB cure for all,'' call for equitable access to TB services for anyone with this disease. Access to treatment should be available to men and women, and rich and poor alike. It should also be available to vulnerable groups such as people with HIV or drug-resistant TB. The theme of a TB cure for all contributes to the fulfillment of everyone's right to the highest possible standard of health.

TB rates tend to be significantly higher in the poor and disadvantaged worldwide, and TB rates are substantially higher for minorities in the United States. In fact, Asian Americans are fifteen times more likely to suffer from TB than Caucasians, African Americans are eight times more likely, Latinos are six times more likely, and Native Americans are five times more likely to suffer from this disease.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend an organization in my district called Results. Results is a non-profit organization that seeks solutions to world hunger and poverty. Results is actively working to eradicate TB. I support this goal, and I want to make sure Congress provides the resources to assist in this effort.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a duty to substantially increase the U.S. investment in international tuberculosis control, and to expand domestic efforts to eliminate TB in the United States. I am committed to making this happen, and I am pleased that this important resolution was brought to the House floor today.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 67 which recognizes the importance of combating tuberculosis worldwide and the severe impact of tuberculosis on minority populations in the United States. I would like to thank Congressmen SILVESTRE REYES and CIRO RODRIGUEZ for introducing this resolution.

In particular, I would like to recognize the leadership of Congressman SHERROD BROWN who has been an outspoken advocate for increased investment in tuberculosis treatment and prevention.

In last year's Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, we worked together with Chairman SONNY CALLAHAN to triple funding for international tuberculosis to $60 million. Although this was an important victory, we must do more to combat tuberculosis on a global level.

Few diseases are as widespread and as devastating as TB. TB kills 2 million people each year—and is second only to AIDS as the biggest infectious killer of adults in the world. TB will kill more people this year than any other year in history.

TB is also the leading cause of death among people with HIV. It accounts for one-third of AIDS deaths worldwide and up to 40 percent of AIDS deaths in Africa and Asia.

In the United States, TB rates are substantially higher for minorities than Caucasians. African Americans suffer from TB at a rate of eight times greater, Latinos at a rate of six times greater, and Asians at a rate of nearly fifteen times greater.

The good news is that an effective treatment does exist for TB. The World Bank has reported that DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment Shortcourse)—is one of the most cost effective health interventions available. It costs just $20–$100 to save a life. The problem is that only one in five of those ill with TB is receiving treatment.

We have a very small window of opportunity during which stopping TB would be cost effective. If we go too slowly, so much drug resistant TB will emerge that it will cost billions to control, with no guarantee of success.

I enthusiastically support this resolution and working to ensure that Congress provides adequate funding to treat and prevent this terrible disease.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 67, which recognizes the importance of combating tuberculosis on a worldwide basis, and acknowledging the impact that TB has had on the United States minority population.

Hawaii's location, population and visitor profile makes for a unique role in infectious disease developments throughout the Pacific Basin and Asia. Unfortunately, Hawaii has the distinction of having the highest rate of TB among the 50 States. Eighty percent of TB cases occur among the foreign-born. Most of these cases occur in immigrants within five years of arrival into the State.

The State of Hawaii Department of Health Tuberculosis Control Program works closely with the United States Public Health Service Honolulu Quarantine Station (USPHS HQS) to identify communicable diseases such as tuberculosis. The USPHS HQS has been responsible for the identification of communicable TB cases in immigrants that would not have been detected in their native country.

This partnership has been threatened due to recent staff cuts at the USPHS HQS. More quarantine officers are desperately needed to provide protection to the residents of Hawaii and the rest of the United States.

I am hopeful that the passage of this resolution will remind Americans that we must work with all developing nations to combat this horrific disease. We must also keep all U.S. quarantine stations staffed at appropriate levels to limit the spread of TB in our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, today I join my colleague from Texas [SILVESTRE REYES] in order to recognize the need to fight Tuberculosis (TB) across the globe. To many Americans, this is a disease of the past or one that only exists in other countries, far from us. Unfortunately, it is neither gone nor far away. Today, TB remains a dangerous disease impacting 15 million in the United States. If we are to eliminate TB within our own borders, we must work to control TB on a world wide basis.

Nearly 57 million Americans travel in any given year outside of the United States, approximately 1 million people legally immigrate to the United States, and millions of others travel here each year. This continuous movement across borders increases the possible spread of the disease and makes it an international public health threat. While the disease knows no borders, we within our borders can take action and recognize the need to combat tuberculosis globally.

I am greatly concerned that one-third of new TB cases originate in the four Southwest border states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and that minorities are disproportionately hurt by this disease. Tuberculosis occurs along the border at twice the national average. In the United States, Latinos suffer from TB at a rate that is six times that of Anglos. African-Americans suffer from TB at a rate that is eight times that of Anglos.

TB needs to be controlled now before it spreads uncontrollably, or worse yet, becomes resistant to treatments. For most of us it might seem a distant disease that few of us will encounter, but it is a real and threatening disease that can harm many in the United States if we do not take control measures now. I urge you to support this fight against tuberculosis and to support H. Res. 67.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 67, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF DEVASTATING EARTHQUAKES IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquakes that struck El Salvador on January 13, 2001, and February 13, 2001, and supporting ongoing aid efforts.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 41

Whereas on the morning of January 13, 2001, a devastating and deadly earthquake with a magnitude of 7.6 on the Richter Scale and a depth of 36 miles occurred off the coast of El Salvador, southwest of San Miguel, killing hundreds of people, injuring thousands of people, and displacing approximately 1,000,000 people;

Whereas the earthquake has left damage throughout the country, having caused significant landslides and destruction in 12 of El Salvador's 14 provinces;

Whereas almost 2,000 aftershocks and tremors have been recorded, and they continue to occur;

Whereas on the morning of February 13, 2001, a second devastating and deadly earthquake occurred with a magnitude of 6.6 on the Richter Scale and an epicenter located 15 miles east-southeast of San Salvador, El Salvador, killing more than 250 people, injuring thousands of people, and leaving thousands of other people homeless;

Whereas the people of El Salvador have displayed strength, courage, and determination in the aftermath of these earthquakes;

Whereas the people of the United States and El Salvador have developed a strong friendship based on mutual interests and respect;

Whereas El Salvador has appealed to the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the international community generally for economic assistance to meet the substantial relief and reconstruction needs of that nation in the aftermath of these earthquakes; and

Whereas the United States has offered technical and monetary assistance through the United States Agency for International Development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) expresses—

(A) deep sympathy for the people of El Salvador for the tragic losses suffered as a result of the earthquakes of January 13, 2001, and February 13, 2001; and

(B) support for the efforts of the people of El Salvador to rebuild their homes and lives;

(2) expresses support for continuing and substantially increasing, in connection with these earthquakes, relief and reconstruction assistance provided by relief agencies and the international community, including the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the United States Agency for International Development;

(3) urges the President to encourage such entities to expedite such assistance; and

(4) encourages assistance by other nations and organizations to alleviate the suffering of the people of El Salvador and to assist them in rebuilding their homes and lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam 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 H. Con. Res. 41.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letters from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY):

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,

Washington, DC, March 19, 2001.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your letter concerning H. Con. Res. 41, a resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the earthquakes in El Salvador. It is our intention that the House consider this legislation on the suspension calendar. The Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral on this resolution based on its jurisdiction over international financial and monetary organizations.

We recognize your jurisdiction, and appreciate your willingness to waive your right to consider this resolution without waiving

your jurisdiction over the general subject matter. I will support the Speaker in naming members of your committee as conferees, should it get to conference.

As you have requested, I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of the resolution.

I appreciate your assistance in getting this important legislation to the floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HENRY: I understand that you intend to bring H. Con. Res. 41, a resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the El Salvadoran earthquakes, to the floor for consideration under the suspension calendar. As you know, the Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral upon the resolution's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction over international financial and monetary organizations under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Because of the importance of this matter, I recognize your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and will waive consideration of the resolution by the Financial Services Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the resolution, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H. Con. Res. 41. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the resolution that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H. Con. Res. 41 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and I commend him for this resolution.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), my friend, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today as the sponsor in support of H. Con. Res. 41, a resolution which expresses sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquakes that struck El Salvador on January 13, 2001, and February 13, 2001, and supports ongoing aid efforts.

Two devastating and deadly earthquakes rocked the Central American nation of El Salvador on January 13 and February 13. The first quake measured 7.6 on the Richter scale and had a depth of 96 miles and occurred off the El Salvadoran coastline 65 miles southwest of San Miguel.

The second quake measured 6.6 on the Richter scale and had a depth of about 20 miles, and it occurred 48 miles east of San Salvador. Neighboring countries of Guatemala and Honduras also felt this quake.

These devastating earthquakes were responsible for over 1,100 deaths and more than 8,000 injuries. In addition, the quakes destroyed 150,000 homes and damaged another 185,000 houses. In total, over 1.5 million El Salvadorans have been affected by these national catastrophes.

The humanitarian needs of our neighbors in El Salvador are substantial. El Salvadorans need clean water, health facilities, homes, schools and paved roads. These needs are compounded by severe poverty, particularly in the rural areas, which affects 63 percent of El Salvador's rural families.

The damage assessments continue to rise. The USAID reports that the cost of rebuilding after the two earthquakes will be more than $2.8 billion. Adding to the devastation are the aftershocks that continue to occur in El Salvador.

The United States Geological Survey reports that hundreds of landslides have occurred, making the roads impassable in many places around lakes, while debris flowing around such lakes have altered drainage patterns which will cause sediment dams to form during the rainy season. In addition, many roads and bridges have been washed out or blocked by landslides or mudslides.

As of March 15, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reports that over 70,000 people lack adequate drinking water and must depend on clean water transported by trucks.

□ 1445

Currently, UNICEF is organizing the distribution of water and working closely with the Pan-American Health Organization and the World Health Organization.

After years of brutal civil war and unrest, El Salvador has emerged as one of the most stable nations in Latin America. Not only has El Salvador developed a thriving economy, but it also has instituted many significant democratic reforms. I am deeply concerned that the damage and human suffering caused by these earthquakes may threaten the future stability and economic success of El Salvador. We cannot allow this tragedy to result in socio-political backsliding.

The Washington, D.C. metropolitan area is home to approximately 135,000 Salvadoran-Americans, which is the second-largest Salvadoran community in the United States, only behind Los Angeles, California. I want to take this opportunity to commend the El Salvadoran immigrants who live in America, work honest jobs, contribute to our local economies, and also save enough to send home to their families in El Salvador. Salvadoran immigrants' contributions to their home land is laudable and substantial. They send an estimated $2 billion annually to their families, making their remittances El Salvador's main source of foreign exchange.

Saint Anthony's of Padua Catholic Church in Falls Church, Virginia, is a shining example of the community and the Church working together to bring relief to those who need it most. The congregation is where 5,000 Salvadoran-Americans worship weekly.

By the end of January, almost $93,000 was collected during the Sunday services. Subsequent to this collection, Reverend Father Jose E. Hoyos and his congregation have collected food, drinking water, blankets, and other basic necessities to distribute to earthquake victims.

Father Hoyos traveled to El Salvador in early February to inspect the damage and to report back to his parishioners on recovery efforts. In addition, Father Hoyos brought a check for $88,276 made out to the Catholic charity, Caritas, for the archdiocese of San Salvador.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for their support in quickly moving this resolution through their committees.

Finally, I believe H. Con. Res. 41 is an important resolution that deserves the support of every Member, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this resolution.

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

Madam Speaker, I first would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for introducing this important resolution. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

El Salvador has suffered two devastating earthquakes within the span of one single month. The first of these was on the 13th of January at a magnitude of 7.6. It killed 827 people, injured about 5,000 others, and destroyed or damaged 222,000 homes.

On February 13, the second earthquake, measuring 6.6, struck El Salvador again, causing more death and destruction in this beleaguered nation.

About a million and a half Salvadorans have been affected, almost one in every four of the country's population. The equivalent in the United States, Madam Speaker, would be that the entire populations of Florida and New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois would have been affected.

On top of these two massive earthquakes, Salvadorans are coping with scores of smaller quakes, now over 5,000 aftershocks. Of course this follows Hurricane Mitch in 1998 and years of civil war preceding it.

We must respond on a scale befitting both of the disasters and the respect and friendship we have for the people of El Salvador.

Now, the administration recently announced some additional assistance for El Salvador. But many of us feel that this has not been anywhere nearly adequate. We were even more surprised and concerned to learn that the earthquake aid that President Bush has pledged has simply taken away from other priorities in El Salvador and the entire region at a time when Latin America has been suffering from a spate of natural disasters.

How long, Madam Speaker, are we going to continue this policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul?

The economies of the affected countries are strained beyond endurance, and much of the progress we have made over the past 2 decades has been reversed. We spent billions during the 1980s to promote democracy in these countries. Now is the time to help them move forward.

The President declared our relationship in the Western Hemisphere to be a foreign policy priority. Yet, I ask what real commitment is there in terms of economic development assistance that we intend to put into this region?

We should vote to pass this resolution today. But more importantly, we should commit ourselves to do more and to do it soon.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 41.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today we have the resolution before us, H. Con. Res. 41, which expresses sympathy for all the victims of the two devastating earthquakes.

I would like to say that my wife and I have been working in El Salvador for 35 years and have many friends there. A few days after the earthquake, we were in our hotel, 10:33 in the evening, and that time can be confirmed by several of us that were there, we had an aftershock on the seventh floor of the hotel which was rather a fascinating way to spend the evening.

These quakes on the Richter scale, we have all discussed that. I would just like to say that, after this disaster and we got back to the United States, people in North Carolina have come forward. And this people do not know: it was the beginning of their school year. Their first school day almost, the earthquake came, and it destroyed over 1,000 of their schools. So I was able to get volunteers in North Carolina to provide three container-loads of school furniture and three container-loads of baby diapers. I look forward to this being able to help those people, because it truly is a disaster.

These quakes could not have come at a worse time. Since the end of its protracted civil war, El Salvador has been developing a thriving economy and instituting democratic reforms, making it one of the most promising nations in the region. However, the damage and human suffering caused by the earthquakes now threatens the future stability and economic success of this nation. Without immediately helping, we in the U.S. and elsewhere, the efforts made by El Salvador and its people have been made in vain.

The Department of State and USAID have informed Congress that the Bush administration intends to provide $100 million in assistance. Additionally, and a very important thing, U.S. Attorney General Ashcroft has provided temporary protective status for some 100,000 undocumented Salvadorans, which allows them to stay here and continue to work without the fear of being sent back.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

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

Madam Speaker, as others have indicated, this past January and February El Salvador was rocked by two major earthquakes and thousands of smaller aftershocks. I think it was the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) who sponsored the resolution who indicated that some 1,200 people were killed and almost 10,000 were injured.

Thousands of homes have been destroyed, and the country's infrastructure has been severely impacted. The property damage alone is estimated to be at least $3 billion, according to the most recent estimates; and these numbers, while horrific, do not tell the entire story.

I traveled with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), my friend and the chairman of the subcommittee, to El Salvador in January and witnessed the devastation firsthand. We saw people's homes destroyed. We saw a neighborhood buried under a side of a mountain. We handed out survival packages provided by USAID to hungry and homeless families. That was before the February 13 earthquake.

I think it is very important to understand that these people live in desperate fear of continued aftershocks in the coming rainy season, which only can mean further devastation in their lives. That psychological fear was truly palpable.

After the brutal civil war and the destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch, these latest disasters may seem like more than a people can bear. But I want to let my colleagues know that these people are resilient. They are brave. They are meeting the challenges. But it is so clear that they need additional assistance.

I think every American, too, should know that all Salvadorans are cooperating to rebuild their nation. Everyone from local officials to the president is working with one goal in mind, to get El Salvador back on its feet.

As part of that recovery effort, the national government, led by the center-right party, the ARENA Party, is working closely with local mayors, many of whom are FMLN, a center-left party which includes many former guerrillas.

These are the people who, 15 years ago, were literally at war with each other, and they are now working together in close coordination to recover from these earthquakes. Of course they have their differences, but they are resolving them through a democratic dialogue, much like we do every day in this institution.

So from that perspective, and I know the chairman shares my viewpoint, it was a most encouraging trip. The Salvadoran leadership representing many diverse political perspectives deserves to be commended. After many years, democracy has finally taken root in El Salvador. It is in our national interest, and I would submit it is our moral responsibility, given our long history and involvement in El Salvador to nurture that democracy, to assist them in repairing the infrastructure so necessary to advance their economy and their fledgling democratic institutions.

Salvadorans have the will to repair their country, but they need our help to do so. So much has been wrecked that they simply cannot repair the damage on their own. Now that El Salvador is finally a democracy, the kind of democracy that its people dreamed of for years, let us not turn our back on them.

So I urge my colleagues to come together as the Salvadoran people have done.

Madam Speaker, before I sit down, I would be remiss not to note the special relationship that two Members of this institution have with the people of El Salvador. One, of course, is the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere. He indicated earlier that he has spent 35 years on El Salvador. What he did not speak to is the fact that those 35 years that he has been providing diapers and roofs and schoolhouses and desks were from his own resources. It is truly a labor of love. I think it is important that our colleagues know that the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER) and his wife, Donna, are truly held in high regard by the Salvadoran people.

Of course, I also would be remiss not to acknowledge the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend and the leader of the Massachusetts delegation. His name is as well known in El Salvador as it is in South Boston, for it was the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), more than any other American, that helped to bring an end to the bloodshed in El Salvador.

So in his absence, I simply want to acknowledge that and to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for his courage, for his leadership, to let him know that we are proud of him, all of us, and to report to him that the Salvadoran people continue to be profoundly grateful to his contribution to that nation.

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

Madam Speaker, I merely wish to identify myself with the comments concerning the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) be allowed to control the balance of the time on the Democratic side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

□ 1500

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I rise as a Member of the majority of the Committee on Financial Services and on its behalf to support the resolution, H. Con. Res. 41, before us which expresses sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquakes that struck El Salvador on both January 13 and February 13 and to express our support for the ongoing aid efforts.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank and commend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), for introducing this sense of the Congress resolution and for his efforts in bringing this measure to the House floor today.

As noted, this expresses sympathy to the people of El Salvador for the tragic losses which they have incurred. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and other Members have referred to the two massive earthquakes and the hundreds of aftershocks, and also the civil war and the hurricane that have been visited upon the people of El Salvador.

Those of us who have visited that country over the years have known about the optimism and especially the energy of the Salvadoran people. No one knows it better than the gentleman from North Carolina and his wife; and as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, they have done so much to assist out of their own financial resources and their own time.

As a member of the Committee on Financial Services, we are urging the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and U.S. Agency for International Development to accentuate their aid. This Member has been in contact and will further contact the executive directors of the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank, as well as the leadership of the former, to see what we can do to be of assistance.

As a member of both the Committee on Financial Services and a member of the Committee on International Relations, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 41, and thank my colleagues for all they have done in their efforts in working with the people of El Salvador.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Committee on International Relations for bringing this resolution to the floor. I have a particular interest in this resolution because I represent well over 10,000 Salvadorans who live in my district in Los Angeles, but more importantly, because of the suffering that this poor country has endured over the last 10 years, whether it be civil wars, Hurricane Mitch, or with the recent earthquakes which continue in El Salvador.

I had the opportunity of meeting with the president of El Salvador, along with other colleagues here, to discuss some of the problems that they face there; and what I ascertained from that discussion is that we need to do better than just provide $52 million in aid that the President is going to allow this year, and more than $58 million in the following year. We need to put up at least $2 billion to help to restore that country's infrastructure.

Something that I really want to share with Members here, in my discussion with President Francisco Flores, he mentioned that yes, they are receiving aid from other countries, far more than from our very own country; and one of the problems that they are facing is transporting those items and goods and disseminating them in the municipalities. So while we hear that there is a need to coordinate and work with different factions of that country, we still find that there is a stifling effect in terms of disseminating that aid.

I would ask that the United States and our government work quickly to provide humanitarian aid, but human resource aid as well to help deliver those particular needed items to those many children and elderly and people who are now going without protection over their heads because they have no roof, they have no shelter.

Madam Speaker, I want to urge the House to go a step further and really work in partnership with the country of El Salvador. El Salvador has many, many residents here who are hardworking taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I would close my statement by also thanking President Bush for granting TPS for an 18-month period because it is very important. It is in this spirit that I ask my colleagues to move forward and ask for more assistance, to the tune of at least $2 billion, for those Salvadorans who are in current need of restoration and support.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to offer to the gentlewoman from California that Myers Shipping Lines, out of California and out of the East Coast, will be happy to deliver at a cut rate, not a free rate, anything that the gentlewoman might collect in California.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I rise today to speak in support of H. Con. Res. 41. It is a resolution that expresses sympathy for the victims of the recent and terrible earthquakes in El Salvador.

Madam Speaker, many people are unaware and uninformed about the recent earthquakes. On January 13, 2001, the earthquake struck with a terrible thunder; and without a doubt the aftermath shall be felt for many years. Landslides, mudslides, aftershocks and tremors continued after the first earthquake. Then exactly 1 month later on February 13, a second devastating earthquake shook El Salvador.

El Salvador is a country that is no longer itself. It is a country that has been transformed by terrible and irreversible events. Without our help, it will be unable to recover, and the result will be thousands upon thousands of displaced persons.

Throughout our history, Americans have always been a people who extended their hands to those in need. After World War II, we extended our hands through the Marshall Plan. After the Korean War, we helped to rebuild South Korea. Now after this tragedy, we must help El Salvador.

Madam Speaker, this concurrent resolution accomplishes two basic goals. It expresses our sympathy and solidarity with the people of El Salvador. At the same time, it encourages support for ongoing relief and reconstruction assistance offered by the United States, other nations, and multinational organizations.

I am not one to blindly support the efforts of these multinational organizations, but in this case the direct reconstruction aid offered by them can only

result in good. At the same time, I must clarify that I am strongly opposed to the United Nations' population fund effort in El Salvador to distribute reproductive health kits.

Madam Speaker, 1,159 people have lost their lives and 70,000 people are without drinking water. Only by offering the real assistance required and so easily provided by a country with our resources shall we be able to preserve and expand democracy for our posterity.

Madam Speaker, now is the time. We must pass House Concurrent Resolution 41. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has given us this opportunity to extend our own hand in friendship to a neighbor. We must reach out and grasp theirs.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for that generous introduction.

I would also like to thank the ranking member from Massachusetts for his leadership here on the floor, and also for the leadership that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has given all of us in regards to El Salvador and so many other issues for a long time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and offer my strong support to the people of El Salvador as they rebuild their lives, their homes, and their communities from the havoc created by two disastrous earthquakes, one on January 13 and the other on February 13. These disasters resulted in the deaths of several hundred people, with thousands of injured, and over a million homeless or displaced.

I had the opportunity to meet yesterday with a group of young people in my district who are members of a youth organization affiliated with Peace through Inter-American Action based in Bangor, Maine. These students are working with their counterparts in El Salvador to forge practical solutions to a range of domestic and foreign policy problems.

Last year, they hosted three young people from El Salvador, and the group plans to send a delegation there this summer. The importance of their mission is heightened by the current efforts to rebuild El Salvador after these devastating earthquakes.

I urge my colleagues to support this important humanitarian resolution.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of voices from this House expressing our condolences to the people of El Salvador. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families, those who died, were injured, displaced by the earthquake and aftershocks last January and February. Our thoughts are also with those worldwide who have committed to lend relief and assistance to those affected by this disaster.

We in the United States appreciate the support of other countries when such disasters happen here, and I am proud that Americans are among those who are helping El Salvador, both by providing immediate relief but also by studying what happened during and after the quakes. By increasing our understanding of the mechanics of earthquakes, we increase our chances of mitigating the damage of future quakes worldwide.

Inevitably, there will be lessons learned from these disasters, as there are with others, including our own. It is important for us in the United States to continue to study these quakes to help mitigate the risks they pose. Let us not forget, earthquakes are a threat to nearly 75 million people in 39 States in the U.S.

Institutions and Federal programs, like the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, do a credible job of contributing to our store of knowledge about the causes and effects of earthquakes and can reduce vulnerability to them through engineering research and new building design.

Technology also holds the promise of providing additional real-time warning of an earthquake to countries around the world. Indeed, countries working together have the potential of improving earthquake advance warnings. Additional seconds of advanced warning can mean the mitigation of destruction and can mean the difference between life and death. Our Subcommittee on Research, in the Committee on Science, will address some of these issues at a hearing tomorrow in room 2318 at 2 p.m.

The point I make, Madam Speaker, is we must not only help now but develop and share new technology with the rest of the world. The people of El Salvador have shown great courage and strength in dealing with the effects of this disaster. They deserve our deep sympathy and support, and I join my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, who has shown such an interest throughout Latin America, and to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), who has really personally extended himself to make a real difference in the lives of millions of people in Latin America and particularly in El Salvador.

I am glad to obviously support this resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquakes, two of them, with approximately 1,200 people having been killed, injuring thousands more, and displacing over a million individuals. El Salvador has faced unbelievable hardships and challenges over the last several years. Think about Hurricane Mitch just 2 years ago, and now two deadly earthquakes just seem like a horrible twist of fate.

It is encouraging to see that the Bush administration is granting extension of the temporary protected status for Salvadorans living in the United States. That affects thousands of Salvadorans in my district alone, who are working very hard not just to make ends meet for their own families but to give everything they can possibly afford back to their country people in El Salvador. In yesterday's Washington Post, they estimated that as much as $2 billion is being sent home.

Now, that might be one thing if it was coming from some constituents, for example the Irish in America, who by now ought to be doing pretty well, but this is coming from the Salvadorans, who are in very low-paid work. I caused a little laugh there; but everybody knows it is true, and we ought to do more. But this is coming from people who are really providing underpinning for our economy. They are certainly contributing more than they are taking out of our economy; and yet with everything they can afford, they are sending it back.

My point is they are doing their part. We need to do our part for our neighbors. What we really need, as important as this resolution of sympathy is, we need a supplemental of a substantial amount to help the people in El Salvador. We ought to do it now. We put $6 billion into supporting right-wing dictatorships. Now that they have a stable economy and society, we ought to provide substantial funds to help our neighbors.

□ 1515

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his sponsorship of this legislation, as I also thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who has also been a leader in this, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and the others.

I am a sponsor of this legislation and have, like many of my colleagues, been to El Salvador and seen the difficulties that these very brave people have every single day. To think that they believe in esperanza, hope, demonstrates how brave they are. They believe in family. They believe in hard work. They believe in sharing.

I want to join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy for the victims

and their families of this devastating earthquake that struck El Salvador in January.

As of February 2, the National Emergency Committee of El Salvador reported over 1,000 deaths, over 4,000 injured, and over 1 million people that have been made homeless. This earthquake was particularly destructive because of its widespread impact which caused damage throughout 12 of the country's 14 provinces. In fact, the earthquake has affected 20 percent of El Salvador's citizens.

Emergency relief to our neighbors has not been sufficient to deal with the extent of the destruction and human suffering that the people of El Salvador continue to endure. Beyond simply providing emergency relief, the cost of reconstruction will be extensive and long lasting. In my community, there are many Salvadorans, many who are now American citizens, who are helping. Also, my county and State have joined forces, just as all Americans should, to help.

I want to commend the President for his demonstration of kindness to the President of El Salvador, Francisco Flores, when he granted temporary protected status to the nationals of El Salvador who are currently residing in the United States.

We, too, can lend a hand to those suffering from this tragedy. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution and any further efforts to improve the conditions for our neighbors in need.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has had a long and abiding interest in matters in Central and Latin America and the former ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership in providing assistance to the people in El Salvador at this very difficult time. I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) as well for his leadership on this. It is a very important issue.

I know about earthquakes, coming from San Francisco, and I know about El Salvador because I have had a long interest there. In fact, Madam Speaker, my first speech on the floor was about El Salvador, following the lead of our great chairman then of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has again exercised leadership, sending a letter signed by 75 colleagues to President Bush asking for significant multiyear assistance for El Salvador. While there is a strong initial response to the crisis, we go through this, those of us in earthquake territory, the emergency response and a strong emotional response from the world, there is no initiative to assist in a longer term with assistance and reconstruction. President Flores has estimated that the relief and reconstruction efforts will cost well over a billion dollars from the international community.

El Salvador has a special significance for the American people. Approximately 1 million Salvadorans live in the United States, thousands of them in my district, I am proud to say. Our nations have close historical ties. We should do everything in our power, and that is significant, everything in our power, to provide sustainable development assistance to lift up the Salvadoran people out of this devastation.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), earlier mentioned, and many of us who visited El Salvador can agree, about the optimism and the spirit of the Salvadoran people. They are ready to lift themselves up, but they need some help. In coordination with the international community, we must provide a long-term reconstruction assistance package aimed at the areas of housing, crop assistance, clean water and health care.

Madam Speaker, there are many heroes involved in this effort. I named the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), who has long been a hero on the subject of El Salvador, actually joined by his staff person, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), when he was on his staff, now a hero in the Congress on this issue in his own right. I commend them, USAID, the Red Cross, the World Bank, UNICEF, the Inter-American Development Bank, UNDP, OXFAM and World Vision for the important roles that they play.

I once again commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for his very important leadership on this issue.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my dear friend and also a leader prior to his coming to Congress on issues involving El Salvador.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), for yielding me the time and for his incredible leadership on this issue. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), for his leadership.

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I have often thought that the people of El Salvador are constantly being tested. After having survived more than 12 years of a brutal civil war, a peace agreement was reached; and the people of El Salvador began to rebuild their country. In October of 1998, the country was hit by Hurricane Mitch. In November of 1999, I traveled with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) to the region of the Lower Lempa River. There we saw firsthand how hard the people, very poor people, were working to rebuild their communities. Quite frankly, their courage, commitment and community spirit was inspiring. And, while still in the throes of recovering from Hurricane Mitch, El Salvador, in the space of 30 days, was brutally battered not by just one major earthquake but by two. In addition, over 2,000 aftershocks have rocked this tiny country.

We have heard the statistics from previous speakers. As the facts come in, the harsh reality is that once again the poorest sector of the country, the most vulnerable, and the rural poor have suffered the greatest loss in terms of housing and economic survival. Nearly 20 percent of the population was rendered homeless by the two earthquakes, and finding adequate housing for them will be a major challenge. If we do not do something to help reactivate the rural community, the rural poor will move even more quickly to the slums of San Salvador and to the United States.

To revive the local economy, people need houses and help to plant their next harvest, to restart their small microenterprises and a long-term plan to lift them out of poverty. And worse is yet to come. Soon the rainy season will start. Over 570 landslides resulted from the first earthquake in January. More followed the second earthquake.

This bill calls upon the international community to respond, quickly and generously. It also calls upon us all to respond not only to the urgent emergency needs of El Salvador but to commit ourselves to the longer term work of reconstruction.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this call. I want to urgently underscore the need for the United States to lead the international community in the effort to rebuild El Salvador by providing our own long-term and generous contribution to El Salvador's recovery, reconstruction and development. As my colleague from Virginia said earlier, the United States played a very major role in El Salvador in the 1980s, a role, quite frankly, that I questioned whether it was the right role for us to play, but we owe this country a great deal, and I think the very least we need to do is come forward and help them during this very difficult time.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 41, and I wish to thank the strong bipartisan coalition of members who have worked to bring this bill to the floor especially Representative DAVIS of Virginia, Representatives BALLENGER and DELAHUNT, Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS.

I have often thought that the people of El Salvador are constantly being tested. After

having survived more than twelve years of a brutal civil war, a peace agreement was reached and the people of El Salvador began to rebuild their country. In October 1998, the country was hit by Hurricane Mitch. In November 1999, I traveled with Congressman JOE MOAKLEY to the region of the Lower Lempa River. There, we saw first-hand how hard the people—very poor people—were working to rebuild their communities. Quite frankly, their courage, commitment and community spirit was inspiring.

And, while still in the throes of recovering from Hurricane Mitch, El Salvador, in the space of thirty days, was brutally battered not by just one major earthquake, but by two. In addition, over 2,000 aftershocks have rocked this tiny country.

You have heard the statistics from previous speakers. As the facts come in, the harsh reality is that once again the poorest sector of the country, the most vulnerable, and the rural poor have suffered the greatest loss in terms of housing and economic survival. Nearly 20% of the population was rendered homeless by the two earthquakes and finding adequate housing for them will be a major challenge. If we don't do something to help reactivate the rural economy, the rural poor will move even more quickly to the slums of El Salvador and to the United States.

To revive the local economy, people need houses, and help to plant their next harvest and to restart their small micro-enterprises, and a long-term plan to lift them out of poverty.

And worse is yet to come. Soon, the rainy season will start. Over 570 landslides resulted from the first earthquake in January. With the rains, earth barely holding onto the tops and sides of hills and mountains will slide down on rural communities. The homeless, protected now only by plastic sheeting, will be even more vulnerable to the elements.

This bill calls upon the international community to respond—quickly and generously. It also calls upon us all to respond not only to the urgent emergency needs of El Salvador, but to commit ourselves to the longer-term work of reconstruction.

I support this call.

After the 1986 earthquake, President Reagan approved $50 million in emergency aid. Three months later, the Congress approved an additional $98 million. We can do no less now when the nation-wide effects of the January and February 2001 earthquakes are so much more severe than those experienced in 1986.

I want to urgently underscore the need for the United States to lead the international community in the effort to rebuild El Salvador by providing our own long term and generous contribution to El Salvador's recovery, reconstruction and development.

I urge support of this important bill.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 2001]

SUPPORTING EL SALVADOR

It wasn't so long ago that day-to-day events in El Salvador were capable of commanding Washington's attention. Now even a major natural disaster in that country close to our borders can go virtually unheeded. In the past six weeks El Salvador has suffered not one but two large earthquakes that have destroyed a large part of the country outside San Salvador, killed at least 1,100 people and left at least 1.3 million homeless in a population of only 6 million. Yet so far the country that has taken the lead in foreign assistance is . . . Spain, which has contributed $25 million in emergency relief and organized a donor conference in Madrid next month. The United States, in contrast, has offered only $10 million so far; the Bush administration says that any additional aid will have to be drawn from existing aid budgets.

This is a poor showing, given both the needs and the past and present ties of the United States to El Salvador. The earthquake threatens to reverse years of recent progress: Officials say that some 120,000 homes have been destroyed, along with scores of schools, local health clinics, roads and agricultural crops. Preliminary studies by the United Nations and the U.S. Agency for International Development suggest that reconstruction costs could rise to $3 billion—or about $2,000 for every person in a country where the per capita income is only $1,100. Unless a vigorous reconstruction program is launched in the coming months, much of the country's economy may simply collapse—likely sending a large new wave of refugees northward.

In 1986, when Central America was at war and a focus of U.S. policy, a smaller earthquake struck San Salvador. Then-Secretary of State George Shultz immediately visited the country to pledge $50 million in emergency aid, and Congress followed up with another $98 million in reconstruction funds. With U.S. help, San Salvador rebuilt and over the next few years successfully ended its war with Marxist insurgents, establishing a democracy that has remained stable. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of Salvadorans have settled in the United States, and the $1.7 billion they send home every year is a mainstay of the economy.

Salvadoran President Francisco Flores will be visiting Washington next week in search not only of U.S. help for reconstruction but an administration decision to grant ''temporary protected status'' to undocumented Salvadorans now in the United States. This measure, which would shield Salvadorans from deportation and allow them to work legally for a limited time, would likely lead to a large increase in remittances; it was used to help Honduras and Nicaragua after Hurricane Mitch in 1998. The Bush administration should embrace this legal relief as well as substantial new aid—and demonstrate that the United States is committed to an El Salvador that is peaceful and democratic, and not only to one at war.

FEBRUARY 20, 2001.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,

President of the United States of America, The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: The earthquake that shook El Salvador on January 13th and February 13th have had devastating consequences for a country recently hit by Hurricane Mitch, and only beginning to recover from twelve years of civil war. More than 1200 people were killed in the earthquake. Estimates vary about how many homes were destroyed—although recent estimates put the number at about 300,000. This means that over a million people, more than 15% of the population, are homeless. Some are living in refugee camps and shelters, and some are simply sleeping outdoors. There are tremendous humanitarian needs.

This tragedy has a special meaning for U.S. citizens—as many as a million Salvadorans live here, and El Salvador is one of our closest neighbors. What happens there will affect us, and we should do what we can to help our neighbor recover.

We applaud the efforts that USAID and other agencies of the U.S. government undertook in response to the immediate emergency in El Salvador: sending teams to help dig people out of the rubble, helping with air transport to areas blocked off by landslides, providing emergency food packages, providing temporary housing, etc.

But El Salvador faces difficult long-term challenges. Housing must be re-built, infrastructure repaired and replaced. Environmental problems that increased the severity of the impact of the earthquake must be addressed. And the long-term problems of poverty, especially rural poverty, which have made El Salvador so vulnerable to natural disasters, must be overcome. Rebuilding El Salvador after the earthquake will require a long-term commitment by the Salvadoran people and the Salvadoran government.

Following Hurricane Mitch in October, 1998, the United States joined with other international donors to make a substantial commitment to reconstruction in the region. In addition to generous financial support, the donors adopted a set of important principles to guide their reconstruction efforts. According to these principles, reduction of social and environmental vulnerability, transparency and accountability, decentralization, democracy, debt relief, and human rights are key to the effective reconstruction and transformation of the region. We believe that the same generosity and the same principles should guide our response to the earthquake in El Salvador.

We urge you to support mid-term and long-term development assistance that will enable economically and environmentally sustainable reconstruction in El Salvador.

This will require Congressional support for increased funding of USAID programs for reconstruction in El Salvador over a period of several years.

In addition, it is our view that the extensive damage and negative effects of the earthquake warrant a designation of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for El Salvador. As you know, Congress has authorized the Attorney General to grant TPS to nationals of a country if they would face ''ongoing armed conflict,'' ''natural disaster,'' or ''extraordinary temporary conditions'' if returned to their homeland. A TPS designation stays deportation of designated nationals and grants them work authorization for a specific amount of time, either six, twelve, or eighteen months. In this situation, a TPS designation would ensure that Salvadorans in this country could work and send important remittances back to relatives in El Salvador to assist in the reconstruction.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns, and for your support of our neighbors in El Salvador.

Sincerely,

Ambassador Robert E. White, President, Center for International Policy.

Jose Artiga, Executive Director, SHARE Foundation.

Raymond C. Offenheiser, President, Oxfam America.

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director, Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA).

Jim Winkler, General Secretary, General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church.

Raul Yzaguirre, President, National Council of La Raza.

Rev. Bob Edgar, General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA.

Nancy Lindborg, Acting CEO, MercyCorps.

Father Charles Currie, SJ, Director, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

Rabbi Dan Polish, Director, Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.

Rev. John McCullough, Executive Director, Church World Service.

Marie Dennis, Director, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns.

George Vickers, Executive Director, Washington Office on Latin America.

Kathy Thornton, RSM, National Coordinator, NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby.

Bev Abma, Disaster Response Administrator, Christian Reformed World Relief Committee.

Tom Hart, Director of Government Relations, The Episcopal Church.

Wesley P. Callender, Director, Voices on the Border.

Jim Matlack, Director, Washington Office American Friends Service Committee.

Rev. Mark B. Brown, Asst. Director, International Affairs and Human Rights, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Dr. John L. Williams, President & CEO, Holt International Children's Services.

Steve Bennett, Executive Director, Witness for Peace.

Linda Shelly, Program Director for Latin America/Caribbean, Mennonite Central Committee.

Dr. Valora Washington, Executive Director, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee.

Kathryn Wolford, President, Lutheran World Relief.

Paul Montacute, Director, Baptist World Aid, Baptist World Alliance.

Ralston H. Deffenbaugh, President, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

William Goodfellow, Executive Director, Center for International Policy.

Angela Kelley, Deputy Director, National Immigration Forum.

Barbara Larcom, Coordinator, Casa Baltimore/Limay.

Greg Laszakovits, Director, Church of the Brethren, Washington Office.

John Lindsay-Poland, Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation Task Force on Latin America and the Caribbean.

Kathy Ogle, Coordinator, Ecumenical Program on Central America and the Caribbean (EPICA).

The Rev. Dr. Theodore F. Schneider, Bishop, Metropolitan Washington, DC, Synod Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Margaret Swedish, Director, Religious Task Force on Central America and Mexico.

Edith Villastrigo, Legislative Director, Women Strike for Peace.

David A. Velásquez, President & CEO, DBFS International, LLC.

Rev. Bill Quigly, Missionhurst-CICM, Office of the Provincial.

Deborah Sanders, Capitol Area Immigrants' Rights, Coalition.

Martha Pierce, Director, Chicago Metropolitan Sanctuary Alliance.

Gary Cozette, Director, Chicago Religious Leadership Network on Latin America.

Alice Zachman, Director, Guatemala Human Rights, Commission/USA.

Cristina Espinel and Barbara Gerlach, Co-Chair, Colombia Human Rights Committee.

Rev. Kim Erno, Chair, The Latin America Task Force of the Metropolitan Washington, DC, Synod Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the important resolution considered on the Floor of the House today expressing the deep sympathy of Congress for the people of El Salvador and for the tragic losses suffered as a result of the earthquakes of January 13 and February 13, 2001.

I strongly support the continuing and substantial increase of relief and reconstruction assistance provided by representatives of the international community as well as the United States.

As we all know, in a cruel act of fate, two powerful earthquakes hit Central America this winter causing catastrophic losses in El Salvador. The full extent of the damage is still difficult to fathom. In all, these catastrophic natural occurrences left at least 1,200 people dead. More than one million people have been declared homeless. An estimated 200,000 homes were destroyed. Roads and bridges were completely washed out or severely damaged by the landslides. Many school and health care facilities had to be closed. Running and clean water is much needed. Most of the agricultural supply has been severely threatened. Moreover, survivors are threatened by serious epidemic and disease. Such an environmental disaster has resulted in a substantial and immediate disruption of living conditions in El Salvador and warrants our government's continued support and assistance. In short, the needs of El Salvador at this time are enormous and we need to act accordingly and generously.

I applaud the decision announced by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) following this tragedy to grant Temporary Protected Status (TPS) to all Salvadoran nationals living in this country. This will be a relief for many Salvadorans who depend financially on their relatives living in the United States.

On March 7, I joined more than fifty of my colleagues to ask the President to address the needs of El Salvador in this time of need. We requested that the administration develop a significant multi-year relief package for El Salvador, targeted toward areas of housing, crop assistance, clean water and health care. We suggest that this plan be considered as part of an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. We will continue to press the administration to act accordingly.

The resolution we are adopting today is a step in the right direction and one of many that should be taken by this House to provide a compassionate and generous response from the United States toward El Salvador to help maintain the stability of the entire region.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of those I represent for the people of El Salvador. I am saddened that El Salvador was struck by the devastating earthquake on January 13th and February 13th of this year. These earthquakes tragically ripped through El Salvador.

Madam Speaker, this earthquake is not the first time in recent memory that a natural disaster has brought devastation on such a wide scale to the people of El Salvador. In addition to this terrible earthquake, there has also been a serious outbreak of dengue fever, which is a very debilitating disease. And it was only two years ago that Hurricane Mitch tore through Central America, leaving an unbearable toll on an already fragile region. In the countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua, more than 11,000 lives were swept away in the rain, winds, and massive landslides that Mitch wrought. In some areas, more than 70 percent of crops were demolished. The price tag of that devastating hurricane soared to more than $4 billion once a full accounting was made.

Madam Speaker, the people of El Salvador never lost hope in the wake of the devastation wrought by Mitch. They worked to improve their lives. They rebuilt roads, and schools, and homes. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to pull themselves, with the help of international monetary and humanitarian assistance. These earthquakes simply threaten to stifle the development and progress El Salvador has made.

We cannot and should not ask the government of El Salvador, or their people, to walk the path toward recovery alone. We must not turn away from their suffering, but rather must respond swiftly and effectively.

I am pleased that the United States Government is actively participating in these international efforts through the work of USAID. To date, USAID assistance to El Salvador totals more than $5 million, the majority of which was allocated for temporary shelter programs. In addition, the World Food Programme has provided 900 metric tons of rations, the International Federation of the Red Cross has released $100,000 of disaster relief funds as well as sent a delegation of relief workers to assist the 1,200 person Salvadoran Red Cross. Every ounce of help from the international community helps.

Madam Speaker, the people of El Salvador need our help. We have assisted many nations in desperate times of need. As a Nation of immigrants, we are well aware of the strong ties between El Salvador and the United States. Those ties have flourished in our Nation as the Salvadoran community has grown and prospered. Let us all do our share in helping rebuild and develop the affected areas that were struck by the earthquake.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise to in strong support of H. Con. Res 41, of which I am a proud sponsor. This resolution sends an important message of support to the people of El Salvador, who are experiencing great hardship as a result of recent earthquakes.

Most of us will never know the heartbreaking trauma of losing everything important to us—possessions, homes, and especially loved ones—within a span of 30 seconds.

This resolution is necessary to publicly express our country's deep sympathy for the plight of El Salvadorans and to highlight the critical need for the timely delivery of much-needed relief and reconstruction assistance from the international community.

The United States is a Nation fortunate enough to be rich in resources and, I believe, rich in compassion. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to encourage our own Federal Government and others across the Nation to join international efforts to provide El Salvador with needed resources for recovery.

In this time of crisis, the Salvadorans have acted with amazing courage and strength. I

urge all of my colleagues to join me in expressing our support to the people of El Salvador who are trying to rebuild their lives and their communities, by passing this resolution.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before the House, H. Con. Res. 41, which speaks on behalf of the good people of El Salvador who are struggling to recover from two devastating earthquakes that struck the nation in January and February of this year.

I commend the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS, and the Chairman and Ranking Democratic Member of the House International Relations Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. MENENDEZ, for introducing this important measure. I further commend the Chairman and Ranking Democratic Member of the International Relations Committee, Mr. HYDE and Mr. LANTOS, for their leadership in bringing the legislation to the floor. I am honored to join our colleagues in expressing concern and sympathy for the victims of the earthquakes in El Salvador and to support ongoing aid and relief efforts.

Madam Speaker, the people of El Salvador have had more than their share of suffering. In recent decades, El Salvador has been torn apart by civil war, a deadly and costly conflict which claimed the lives of more than 70,000 men, women and children before a peace accord was reached in 1992.

A little over two years ago, one of the most destructive natural disasters ever to hit the region, Hurricane Mitch, wreaked havoc on El Salvador. In the aftermath of Hurricane Mitch's 180 mph winds and massive flooding, El Salvador and her neighbors, Nicaragua and Honduras, lost over 11,000 citizens with damages totaling over $4 billion.

Madam Speaker, despite these major setbacks, the people of El Salvador have worked diligently and courageously to rebuild their nation and democracy. It is a tragedy and cruel fate that they have had to suffer once again.

On January 13th of this year, a huge earthquake registering 7.6 on the Richter Scale struck off the coast of El Salvador, southwest of the city of San Miguel. Exactly a month later, a second crushing earthquake with a magnitude of 6.6 struck east of San Salvador.

Madam Speaker, these devastating earthquakes have taken a tremendous toll on the people of El Salvador and resulted in a humanitarian catastrophe.

Over 1,500 Salvadorans have lost their lives, with thousands more injured. At least 200,000 homes have been destroyed, displacing over a million Salvadorans. More than fifteen hundred schools and dozens of hospitals, as well as essential segments of the country's infrastructure including water systems and the Pan-American Highway, have been badly damaged.

The destruction to El Salvador is estimated to exceed $2 billion in costs.

Madam Speaker, I would urge our colleagues to adopt this legislation which evidences our heartfelt concern for the people of El Salvador and their tragic losses.

The legislation further supports relief efforts of the United States Agency for International Development for El Salvador's reconstruction, along with the assistance of the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the international community.

To this effect, I commend President Bush for committing $110 million in relief aid when meeting early this month with the President of El Salvador, Francisco Flores. This is a good beginning but more aid is needed. Also important has been President Bush's work permit initiative for Salvadoran immigrants, which has allowed many Salvadorans to continue sending home substantial sums for reconstruction efforts in El Salvador.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the measure before us.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today I must vote against HCR 41. While I certainly offer my personal sympathy to the victims in El Salvador, and also join in encouraging relief agencies to increase their assistance to these individuals, I cannot support this resolution.

In the past I have complained that similar bills have come to the House Floor without going through the committee process. In this instance the committees were included and I applaud the Chairman for ensuring we had an opportunity to discuss this issue at committee. I am also grateful to the committee staff who worked with me in helping facilitate that discussion.

At the subcommittee I introduced an amendment for discussion purposes only. That amendment would have deleted the specific references to governmental assistance contained in this bill. Had that amendment been adopted I could have supported this resolution. Simply, I believe it is not proper for us to force taxpayers in this country to provide this kind of assistance by having the IRS collect these funds. Next, I believe that the Red Cross, for example, would not only be a more sympathetic entity for the purposes of collecting funds used for relief, but also that it would be a more efficient distributor of such funds than are the plethora of government agencies referenced in this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 41.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 NOTE), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission:

Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (P.L. 106–173), I hereby appoint the following individual to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: Mr. Phelps, IL.

Yours Very Truly,
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group:

Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 5(d) of Public Law 93–642 (20 U.S.C. 2004(b)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation:

Mrs. EMERSON of Missouri; and
Mr. SKELTON of Missouri.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 67, by the yeas and nays; and
H. Con. Res. 41, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF COMBATTING TUBERCULOSIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 67, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 67, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Goode
Paul

NOT VOTING—25

Becerra
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Cannon
Cramer
Fattah
Filner
Hilleary
Keller
Manzullo
Matsui
Millender-McDonald
Moakley
Murtha
Owens
Rothman
Rush
Scarborough
Serrano
Sisisky
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Tiahrt
Vitter

□ 1826

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia changed his vote from ''present'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 51, I was unavoidably delayed by flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF DEVASTATING EARTHQUAKES IN EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 41.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 41, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla

Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman
Becerra
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Cannon
Cramer
Dunn
Fattah
Filner
Gordon
Hilleary
Keller
Manzullo
Matsui
Millender-McDonald
Moakley
Murtha
Owens
Rothman
Rush
Scarborough
Sisisky
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt
Vitter

□ 1837

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 52, I was unavoidably delayed by flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–23) on the resolution (H. Res. 92) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 247, TORNADO SHELTER ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–24) on the resolution (H. Res. 93) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 247) to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 526

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 526. My name was mistaken for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROBERT BRADY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IMPROVING SERVICE AND SAFETY OF FIRE FIGHTERS THROUGH THE ACCESS TO THERMAL IMAGING CAMERAS ACT

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Madam Speaker, it takes approximately 28 minutes for responding fire fighters to search the average home by conventional means, which requires fire fighters to crawl on their hands and their knees, feeling for victims. Thermal imaging cameras reduce the search time to 2 or 3 minutes, letting fire fighters see through the darkness to the location of the fire and, more importantly, to the location of the victims.

According to the National Fire Data Center, each year in the United States 5,000 people die and 25,000 are injured in fires, and approximately 100 fire fighters are killed annually in duty-related incidences. Thermal imaging cameras can help save the lives of both the victims of a fire and the fire fighters themselves. However, only a handful of our Nation's fire departments can afford the more than $15,000 for this technology.

For this reason, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I have introduced the Access to Thermal Imaging Cameras Act, which authorizes the director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, to make competitive grants to local fire departments for the purposes of acquiring thermal imaging cameras. Similar legislation was very popular with fire fighting organizations and had over 45 cosponsors in the 106th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in providing our local fire fighting departments with the opportunity to improve the quality of their lives and service.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MARKING 180TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREECE'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the country where democracy was born and where democracy returned 180 years ago.

March 25, 2001, marks the 180 anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire. Before then, Greece had been ruled by the Ottoman Empire for almost 400 years, during which time Greeks were deprived of their civil rights.

It is with great pride that Hellenic Americans recount the stories of how their ancestors in Greece stood together and fought against repression by continuing to educate Greek children in their culture, their language, and their religion, even under the threat of death.

This year, the Federation of Hellenic Societies of Greater New York has as its parade theme the Hellenic-American educational system. It is especially important that they are paying tribute to education, cultural heritage, religious learning, and the Hellenic-American values and ideals that are taught in the United States Hellenic parochial schools.

□ 1845

Education has always been the key to preserving Hellenic culture, values, and religion.

This year I have the honor of being selected grand marshal, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who cochairs the Hellenic Caucus with me, and Assemblyman Michael Giannaris from New York and California Secretary of State Phillip Ajjedilis and Honorary Grand Marshal Lucas Tsilas. We will have the privilege of marching with many members of my Astoria community, the largest Hellenic community outside of Athens.

The Hellenic and Phil-Hellenic community has a great deal to celebrate. They will celebrate the coming Olympics and the continued efforts of the Hellenic Caucus to seek a peaceful understanding with Turkey on the issues of the Greek Islands and Cyprus occupation. Here in the United States, we often take democracy for granted. In the world, there are still countries fighting for basic human rights. On this day of Greek independence, let us remember the words of Plato, and I quote: ''Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike.''

Is that not a great way to describe democracy?

The best way to express the feeling of the Hellenic community is the Greek National Anthem that tells of their struggle for independence.

I thank the Federation of Hellenic Societies of Greater New York for all of the contributions they have made to our community and in their efforts to make each year's Greek Independence Day celebration more exciting than the last. I know that I will remember this year. Zeto E Eleftheria. Long live freedom in Greece and in the entire world.

CELEBRATING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, today I, too, proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and the strong ties that bind the nations of Greece and the United States.

It was 180 years ago when the people of Greece began a journey that would mark the symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused. The word ''democracy'' stems from two Greek words: ''demos,'' meaning ''of the people'' and ''kratos,'' meaning ''power'' and ''strength.'' On this anniversary, it is the power and strength of the Greek people and their courage and commitment to the principles of human government and self-determination that we celebrate.

Revolutions embody a sense of heroism, bringing forth the greatness of the human spirit in the struggle against oppression. It was Thomas Jefferson who said that, and I quote, ''one man with courage is a majority.'' Quoting Jefferson on the anniversary of Greek independence is particularly appropriate. Jefferson and the rest of the Founding Fathers looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft a strong democratic state. And in 1821, it was the Founding Fathers of our Nation to whom the Greeks looked for inspiration as they began their journey toward freedom.

Encouraged by the American revolution, the Greeks began their rebellion after 4 centuries of Turkish oppression, facing what appeared to be insurmountable odds. Like the United States, Greece faced the prospect of having to defeat an empire to obtain liberty. Many lives were sacrificed at the altar of freedom. In the face of impending defeat, the Greek people showed great courage and rallied around the battle cry, ''Eleftheria I Thanatos,'' liberty or death.

Similar words, ''Give me liberty or give me death,'' spoken in America only 5 decades before by Patrick Henry, embodied the Greek patriots' unmitigated desire to be free.

News of the Greek revolution met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. The Founding Fathers eagerly expressed sentiments of support for the fledgling uprising. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress. William Harrison, our ninth President, expressed his belief in freedom for Greece saying, ''We must send our free will offering. The 'Star-spangled Banner,' '' he went on to say, ''must wave in the Aegean, a messenger for eternity and friendship to Greece.''

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greek struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence. Among the most vocal was Daniel Webster from Massachusetts, who frequently aroused the sympathetic interests of his colleagues and other Americans in the Greek revolution. It should not surprise us that the Founding Fathers would express such keen support for Greek independence, for they themselves had been inspired by the ancient Greeks and their own struggle for freedom. As Thomas Jefferson once said, ''To the ancient Greeks, we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, the American colonists, out of gothic darkness.'' Our two nations share a brotherhood bonded by the common blood of democracy, birthed by Lady Liberty, and committed to the ideal that each individual deserves the right of self-determination.

We all know that the price of liberty can be very high. History is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it. Socrates, Plato, Pericles, and many other great scholars throughout history warned that we maintain democracy only at great cost. The freedom we enjoy today is due to a large degree to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past in Greece, in America, and all over the world.

Madam Speaker, on this 180th birthday of Greek independence, when we celebrate the restoration of democracy to the land of its conception, we also celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. The goals and values that the people of Greece share with the people of the United States reaffirm our common democratic heritage. This occasion also serves to remind us that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

Remembering the sacrifice of the brave Greeks who gave their lives for liberty helps us all realize, Madam Speaker, how important it is to be an active participant in our own democracy, and that is why we honor those

who secured independence for Greece so many years ago.

Madam Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and the strong ties that bind the nation of Greece and the United States.

One hundred and eighty years ago, the people of Greece began a journey that would mark the symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused. The word democracy stems from two Greek words; demos, meaning of the people, and kratos, meaning power and strength. On this anniversary, it is the power and strength of the Greek people and their courage and commitment to the principles of human government and self-determination that we celebrate.

Revolutions are often violent affairs. They come about when a people, who have too long suffered under the yoke of oppression and been denied the very basic tenets of human dignity, rise up in the name of self-determination. The concepts of self-determination and revolution were first espoused by the ancient Greek philosophers. Men such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Euripides developed the then-unique notion that men could, if left to their own devices, lead themselves rather than be subject to the will of a sovereign. It was Aristotle who said: ''We make war that we may live in peace.'' On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras embodied the spirit of those words when he raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free.

Revolutions also embody a sense of heroism, bringing forth the greatness of the human spirit in the struggle against oppression. It was Thomas Jefferson who said that, ''One man with courage is a majority.'' Quoting Jefferson on the anniversary of Greek independence is particularly appropriate. Jefferson, and the rest of the Founding Fathers, looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft a strong democratic state. And in 1821, it was the Founding Fathers of our nation to whom the Greeks looked for inspiration as they began their journey toward freedom.

The history of Greek Independence, like that of the American Revolution, is filled with many stories of courage and heroism. There are many parallels between the American and Greek Revolutions. I would like to take the opportunity to recount some of these tales with you now.

Encouraged by the American Revolution, the Greeks began their rebellion after four centuries of Turkish oppression, facing what appeared to be insurmountable odds. Both nations faced the prospect of having to defeat an empire to obtain liberty. And if Samuel Adams, the American revolutionary leader who lighted the first spark of rebellion by leading the Boston Tea Party, had a Greek counterpart, that man would be Alexander Ypsilantis.

Ypsilantis was a Greek who was born in Istanbul, and whose family was later exiled to Russia. Ypsilantis served in the Russian army, and it was there, during his military service, that he became involved with a secret society called the ''Philike Hetairia'' which translated means ''friendly society.'' The ''friendly society'' was made up of merchants and other Greek leaders, but the intent of the society was to seek freedom for Greece and her people.

The group planned a secret uprising for 1821 to be led by Ypsilantis. He and 4,500 volunteers assembled near the Russian border to launch an insurrection against the Turks. The Turkish army massacred the ill-prepared Greek volunteers, and Ypsilantis was caught and placed in prison, where he subsequently died. However, the first bells of liberty had been rung, and Greek independence would not be stopped.

When news of Greeks uprisings spread, the Turks killed Greek clergymen, clerics, and laity in a frightening display of force. In a vicious act of vengeance, the Turks invaded the island of Chios and slaughtered 25,000 of the local residents. The invaders enslaved half the island's population of 100,000.

Althought many lives were sacrificed at the altar of freedom, the Greek people rallied around the battle cry ''Eleftheria I Thanatos''—liberty or death. Those same words, spoken in America only five decades before by Patrick Henry, who said: ''Give me liberty or give me death,'' embodied the Greek patriots' unmitigated desire to be free.

Another heroic Greek whom many believe was the most important figure in the revolution was Theodoros Kolokotronis. Kolokotronis was the leader of the Klephts, a group of rebellious and resilient Greeks who refused to submit to Turkish subjugation. Kolokotronis used military strategy he learned while in the service of the English Army to organize a force of over 7,000 men. The Klephts swooped down on the Turks from their mountain strongholds, battering their oppressors into submission.

One battle in particular, where Kolokotronis led his vastly outnumbered forces against the Turks, stands out. The Turks had invaded the Peloponnese with 30,000 men. Kolokotronis led his force, which was outnumbered by a ratio of 4 to 1, against the Turkish army. A fierce battle ensued and many lives were lost, but after a few weeks, the Turks were forced to retreat. Kolokotronis is a revered Greek leader, because he embodied the hopes and dreams of the common man, while displaying extraordinary courage and moral fiber in the face of overwhelming odds.

Athanasios Diakos was another legendary hero, a priest, a patriot, and a soldier. He led 500 of his men in a noble stand against 8,000 Ottoman soldiers. Diakos' men were wiped out and he fell into the enemy's hands, where he was severely tortured before his death. He is the image of a Greek who gave all for love of faith and homeland.

While individual acts of bravery and leadership are often noted, the Greek Revolution was remarkable for the bravery and fortitude displayed by the typical Greek citizen. This heroic ideal of sacrifice and service is best demonstrated through the story of the Suliotes, villagers who took refuge from Turkish authorities in the mountains of Epiros. The fiercely patriotic Suliotes bravely fought the Turks in several battles. News of their victories spread throughout the region and encouraged other villages to revolt. The Turkish Army acted swiftly and with overwhelming force to quell the Suliote uprising.

The Suliote women were alone as their husbands battled the Turks at the front. When they learned that Turkish troops were fast approaching their village, they began to dance the ''Syrtos,'' a patriotic Greek dance. One by one, rather than face torture or enslavement at the hands of the Turks, they committed suicide by throwing themselves and their children off Mount Zalongo. They chose to die rather than surrender their freedom.

The sacrifice of the Suliotes was repeated in the Arkadi Monastery of Crete. Hundreds of non-combatants, mainly the families of the Cretan freedom fighters, had taken refuge in the Monastery to escape Turkish reprisals. The Turkish army was informed that the Monastery was used by the Cretan freedom fighters as an arsenal for their war material, and they set out to seize it. As the Turkish troops were closing in, the priest gathered all the refugees in the cellar around him. With their consent, he set fire to the gunpowder kegs stored there, killing all but a few. The ruins of the Arkadi Monastery, like the ruins of our Alamo, still stand as a monument to liberty.

News of the Greek revolution met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. The Founding Fathers, eagerly expressed sentiments of support for the fledgling uprising. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress. William Harrison, our ninth president, expressed his belief in freedom for Greece, saying: ''We must send our free will offering. 'The Star-spangled Banner' must wave in the Aegean . . . a messenger of fraternity and friendship to Greece.''

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greeks' struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence. Among the most vocal was Daniel Webster from Massachusetts, who frequently roused the sympathetic interest of his colleagues and other Americans in the Greek revolution.

It should not surprise us that the Founding Fathers would express such keen support for Greek independence, for they themselves had been inspired by the ancient Greeks in their own struggle for freedom. As Thomas Jefferson once said, ''To the ancient Greeks . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves . . . American colonists, out of gothic darkness.'' Our two nations share a brotherhood bonded by the common blood of democracy, birthed by Lady Liberty, and committed to the ideal that each individual deserves the right to self-determination.

We all know that the price of liberty can be very high—history is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it. Socrates, Plato, Pericles, and many other great scholars throughout history warned that we maintain democracy only at great cost. The freedom we enjoy today is due to a large degree to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past—in Greece, in America, and all over the world.

Madam Speaker, on this 180th birthday of Greek Independence, when we celebrate the restoration of democracy to the land of its conception, we also celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. The goals and values that the people of

Greece share with the people of the United States reaffirms our common democratic heritage. This occasion also serves to remind us that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

As Aristotle stated: ''If liberty and equality, as is thought by some are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.''

Remembering the sacrifice of the brave Greeks who gave their lives for liberty helps us all realize how important it is to be an active participant in our own democracy. That is why we honor those who secured independence for Greece so many years ago.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 180th anniversary of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. Although there are no final victories in the long struggle to extend the principles of equality and democracy, we should take advantage of this opportunity to celebrate the triumphs of freedom over tyranny.

I would like to thank the co-Chairs of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congressman MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, for their efforts to organize these statements for Greek Independence Day.

For almost 400 years (1453–1821), the Greek people lived under the brutal domination of the Ottoman Empire. This dark period was characterized by the denial of all civil rights, the closing of Greek schools and churches, and rampant kidnappings of Christian and Jewish children. The Greek Revolution marked the beginning of the struggle that freed the Greek people and reestablished democracy in Greece.

Since their war of independence, Greece has been a strong ally to the United States. In turn, the U.S. has opened its heart to multitudes of Greek immigrants. The contributions of the Greek community in the United States are immeasurable. Greek-Americans have played a significant role in all aspects of American life including our arts, sports, medicine, religion, and politics. In the House of Representatives, the children of Greek immigrants have brought their legacy and inspiration. Congress has been made a better place for their contributions.

In San Francisco, the Greek-American community is a vital, historic, and vibrant component of our world-renowned diversity. The social fabric of San Francisco has benefited from the civic leadership of our late Mayor George Christopher, former Mayor and HUD Regional Director Art Agnos, and former Golden Gate Bridge District Board Member Stephan C. Leonoudakis.

Ancient and modern Greece stand as examples to people around the world of overcoming tyranny. They taught the world that the supreme power to govern is vested in the people through self-governance. Wherever tyranny and ethnic cleansing occur, the principles of equality and democracy are also under siege.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I am proud to stand in recognition of the 180th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today and to speak with pride about 180 years of freedom and independence for the people of Greece. Like the Fourth of July, Greek Independence Day reminds us of our duty to defend freedom—whatever the cost.

Every year at this time, my colleagues and I reflect and remember the great influence Greece and Greek democracy had on the founders of the United States. This year, I would like to underscore the fact that Greece, the first democracy, continues its march to become fully integrated into the European Union.

On January 1, 2001, Greece became the twelfth member of the European Monetary Union—the euro-zone. Shops in Greece, ahead of the required deadlines, are already displaying prices in the old drachmas and new euros. Euro banknotes will begin to circulate in January 2002, with the drachma, Europe's oldest currency, ceasing to be legal tender the following March. I myself am sentimental about seeing an end to the drachma, but I admire and respect the economic progress and financial stability Greece has demonstrated in order to meet the criteria of membership in the European Monetary Union.

The recent achievements of the Greek economy were praised by the U.S. Ambassador to Greece, Nicholas Burns, at a late-January business conference in Thessaloniki. Greece, he said, was an example to all its northern neighbors who look forward to members in the European Union. Ambassador Burns spoke of the interest now evidenced by American businesses in investment in Greece, especially its northern region. U.S. investments in Greece currently total $2.2 billion, while bilateral trade increased by some 20 percent.

So we celebrate today not just the glorious past of Greece, but the promising future.

I also want to say a few words about the contributions of Greek-Americans to our own society and communities. In Worcester, there is no better example of this rich heritage than the parish of St. Spyridon Greek Orthodox Church and the leadership of the Reverend Dean N. Paleologos. Located at 102 Russell Street in Worcester, Massachusetts, St. Spyridon is known for its many services and contributions to the community. In addition to running two schools and hosting a food bank, the church is the home for a number of neighborhood gatherings and meetings where plans are made to meet the needs of the community. Father Paleologos is an active member in the Worcester Interfaith Council, a coordinating group for public action and service by the religious community.

And St. Spyridon's parish also knows how to celebrate Greek Independence and Greek heritage. Every two years, more than 60,000 visitors participate in the church's Greek Festival. This year, on March 25, the Worcester Greek community will join the Greek Parade in Boston, which is supported by the Greek Consulate, many Greek and American organizations, and by the Metropolitan Metahodios. On April 1, 2001, St. Spyridon's Greek School will celebrate Greek Independence Day with a special Doxology, honoring both Greece and America, and by hosting a community program of poetry, songs and traditional dances.

On behalf of the more than 1,000 families of Worcester who celebrate their Greek heritage, I am honored to be able to support 180 years of Greek Independence. I want to thank Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congresswoman MALONEY for their leadership in organizing today's tributes. They are an inspiration to all of us in Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I join with my colleagues in celebration of the 180th anniversary of Greek independence. At this time, I would like to thank my colleagues from Florida and New York who have once again shown great leadership in initiating this Special Order and organizing the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues.

Greece has often been called the ''cradle of democracy,'' and rightfully so. In an address that could have been written by one of our founding fathers, Pericles wrote over 2,000 years ago, ''Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of the minority, but of the whole people . . . equal before the law.'' The dream that was born so many years ago in ancient Athens is still alive and well today, here in the United States, and around the world.

Without the example of Greece, the United States might not even be in existence today. As we looked to them for inspiration and guidance in our early, fragile years, so they looked to us on March 25, 1821, when they shook off the repressive bonds of the Ottoman Empire and declared themselves a democracy once again. Since then, they have developed into a strong ally and stabilizing force in their region of the world.

The United States has felt the impact of Greece in many other ways, most notably in the dedication and hard work of its sons and daughters who have immigrated to our nation. These immigrants have contributed greatly to their communities. In my home state of Rhode Island, there are thriving Greek communities in Providence, Pawtucket and Newport. There—as they have done across the United States—they became active participants in their community, and we are richer today because of their great contributions.

Because of all that Greece has given to not only the United States, but also the entire world, it is fitting that we honor our strong ally and its sons and daughters within our nation. Once again, I commend my colleagues for their dedication in making this annual Special Order possible, and look forward to continuing my work with the Hellenic Caucus.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, a declaration of independence is much more than one man standing his ground against another, or a woman raising a flag in protest, or even signatures on a written statement. A declaration of independence is the heart and soul of democracy. Throughout history, people have stood in the face of oppression and demanded to be heard.

It was ancient Greece that originated the basic concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern is vested in the people. The United States adopted this philosophy in the framing of our government, and in 1821 your ancestors enshrined this philosophy in their pursuit of freedom.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire. Although true freedom was not earned for many years, it was March 25, 1821

that will be remembered for all time. These brave men and women will forever remain a symbol to the people of Greece and to many around the globe.

The United States and Greece have been at the forefront of efforts to promote freedom, democracy and human rights throughout the world. These common ideals have forged a bond between the people of Greece and the United States. It is only appropriate that America join in celebration with all Greek-Americans on this special occasion.

It is important to teach America's youth about the many different backgrounds that combine to create our American Heritage, and today it is appropriate to highlight Greek-American heritage.

We have reached a period in time that rivals no other. There are more democratic nations than ever before, but we must continue to make certain that those people still living under the hand of oppressive governments, such as the occupied 40% of the beautiful island of Cyprus, have the tools and resources necessary to achieve their own self-determination.

I would like to extend my best wishes to all Greek-Americans on this day of celebration.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. March 25, 2001 will mark the 180th anniversary of the start of Greece's struggle for independence from the Turks.

The struggle of the Greek people against the Ottoman Empire exemplifies the remarkable ability of a people to overcome all obstacles if the will to endure is strong enough and the goal, freedom, bright enough.

The parallels between the United States and Greece are substantial. American political thought was influenced just as much by Greek philosophy as the Greek revolution of 1821 was inspired by the American fight for freedom in 1776. In fact, Greek intellectuals used the U.S. Constitution as the basis for its own constitution in the 1820's.

Moreover, the common struggles of our countries have given rise to a bond that spans the generations. The United States and Greece have long-standing historical, political, and cultural ties based on a common heritage, shared democratic values, and alliances during World War II, the Korean War, the Cold War and the Persian Gulf War.

Greece is a country of 11.5 million citizens. Its gross domestic product measures approximately $120.25 billion per year, and it is estimated that Greece's economy will grow at a rate of five percent annually over the next few years. Furthermore, Greece has major export markets in the United States, Germany, Italy, France and the United Kingdom. And as we all know, Greece has among the richest cultural histories of all nations. The Greek language dates back at least 3,500 years and university education, including books, is free.

The citizens of Greece are now preparing to host the 2004 Olympic Games, an honor that holds particular historical significance for them. Beginning in 776 B.C., the Olympic Games were held in the valley of Olympia in Greece every four years for almost 1200 years. The modern Olympic Games were created by Baron Pierre de Coubertin and inspired by the ancient games. First staged in 1896 in Athens, the games attracted about 245 athletes to participate in 43 events. At the Sydney 2000 Games, more than 10,000 athletes took part in 300 events. The Olympic Movement has survived wars, boycotts and terrorism to become a symbol of the ability of the people of all nations to come together in peace and friendship. And in 2004, the games return to their home.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent a large and active Greek-American community in the Fifth District of Massachusetts. U.S. participation in Cyprus settlement efforts, the fight for freedom and human rights for the people of Cyprus, the inclusion of Greece in the Visa Waiver Pilot Program, and the presentation of the Congressional Gold medal to His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew have all been priorities for the Greek-American community and worthy initiatives I've been proud to support. I will continue to fight for the interests of Greece and Greek-Americans and encourage other Members of Congress to join me.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of the 180th anniversary of Greek Independence. This is a great day, for it commemorates the return of democracy to this, the cradle of Western Civilization, after nearly four hundred years of foreign trade.

Greece has always been proud and independent by nature. Its people were a powerful force both culturally and militarily, as evidenced by the works of Homer and the multitude of Greek philosophers. The pinnacle of Greek influence was Alexander the Great and his unification of the eastern Mediterranean and ancient Middle East. Greek culture was spread throughout the new empire and for the first time, people were communicating with a common language, sharing ideas in a way never before possible. This hellenization was an idea that transformed every place it touched.

Nearly two thousand years later, another important concept from ancient Greece came to the forefront of modern thought. The concept of ''rule by the people,'' an alien idea in a time still dominated by kings and queens, gained prominence in the young United States. This was the desire of the framers of our Constitution, and they found their inspiration in the principles of the polis of Athens.

Thirty years later, in 1821, spurred on by the American example, the people of Greece acted upon a desire to be free. The Ottoman Turks had conquered the region in 1453, bringing an end to over a thousand years of rule by the Orthodox-Christian Byzantine Empire and its resurgence of Greek culture. After a bloody eleven-year war, Greece was finally free once again.

In the modern era, one of the most important reminders of Greek heritage is the Olympic Games, which are finally returning to their origins in Athens in 2004 for the 25th Summer Olympic Games. Every four years, the Olympics have symbolized peace and excellence for people the world over, reassuring us that even the smallest nation can compete on an equal ground with the largest country.

Madam Speaker, it is this feeling that I believe is the greatest contribution Greece has given to our world. We are all equal, whether it is in our democratic government, or in friendly competition, and we can come together in friendship even during the most difficult of times. With that, I would like to thank my colleagues for holding this special order and once again congratulate Greece on the anniversary of its independence and all of the gifts it has given us.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 180th anniversary of Greek independence. One hundred and eighty years ago, after nearly 400 years of oppression under the Ottoman Empire, the courage and commitment to freedom of the Greek people prevailed in a revolution for independence. It is an honor today to celebrate Greek Independence Day in the House of Representatives.

Greece and the Greek people have made remarkable contributions to the United States and societies throughout the world. The achievements of Greek civilization in art, architecture, science, philosophy, mathematics, and literature have become legacies for nations across the globe. In addition, and most importantly, the Greek commitment to freedom and the birth of democracy remains an essential contribution for which we as Americans are eternally grateful.

Greek civilization has inspired the American passion for truth, justice, and the rule of law by the will of the people. The forefathers of our nation recognized the spirit and idealism of ancient Greece when fighting for American independence and drafting our Constitution. Forty-five years after our own revolution for independence, this tradition and commitment to freedom was carried forward by the Greek people through their successful revolutionary struggle for sovereignty.

Greek Americans can take pride today in the contributions of Greek culture and in their ancestors' sacrifice. The effects of the vibrant Greek people can be witnesses throughout the United States in our government, culture, and economy, as well as in our commitment to freedom and democracy throughout the world. We, as Americans, are grateful for these gifts.

Madam Speaker, it is important for us to recognize and celebrate this day together with Greece to reaffirm our common democratic heritage. I am proud to join in this celebration and offer my congratulations to Greece and Greeks throughout the world on this very special day.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in celebration of Greek Independence Day, March 25th. All of us who love liberty are justified in noting this important day. Greece is the birthplace of the democratic ideal, the principle upon which all our work here depends. The genius of the American republic and the concept of liberty, which sustained our fight for independence, cannot be separated from the great works of the philosophers of ancient Greece.

Every ethnic group in the United States can claim a special bond to our nation's essence. But Greek-Americans can take special pride in knowing that our constitution's organizing principle, ''a government of the people, by the people and for the people'' came to our shores from the heart of the Aegean.

Madam Speaker, Greece has been a friend and ally to the United States longer than many

countries have been in existence. And, through immigration, our nation has been the great beneficiary of the strength, wisdom and creativity of Greece's sons and daughters. Millions of Americans who can trace their family roots back to Greece have contributed in countless ways, large and small, to the greatness, prosperity and harmony of the United States.

I believe the influence of Greece on our nation is underappreciated because it is so ubiquitous. We see it in our nation's architecture, it surrounds us in our theater and humanities, it is instilled in our national intellect at all of our great universities. We need only look around this chamber to sense how critical Greece's legacy to our country has been.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Representative MICHAEL BILIRAKIS and Representative CAROLYN MALONEY, for helping to organize this salute to Greek Independence Day. I know that the whole House will join me in congratulating the Greek people, and all Americans of Hellenic descent, on this special occasion.

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to commemorate the 180th Anniversary of the Greek revolution. In 1821, the Greeks, after nearly 400 years of slavery under the Ottoman Empire took up arms and fought for their freedom. March 25, 1821 marked the beginning of this Greek revolution and their struggle for independence.

For many centuries, Greece, the birthplace of democracy, was subject to foreign domination and political control under the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, the Greeks did not enjoy the freedoms given in a democracy and so, with a strong determination for liberty, they began a lengthy crusade. When the fighting began, Greece came under fire in several areas ranging from its Northern province of Macedonia, to a near-war that began over the island of Imia near the coast-land of Turkey. The prospects for the rebels' success were not always promising. In fact, they were aided by several of their European neighbors who came to their assistance. England, France and Russia sent their naval fleets to help defuse the Egyptian navy, which was helping the Ottoman Turks exploit internal strife within the Greek ranks. These nations came together to break the bonds of the Ottomans' tyranny, and help the Greek people win the right of self determination. On March 22, 1829, Greece emerged from their fierce campaign for democracy and created the modern Greek state.

Here in the United States we owe a debt of gratitude to the many Greeks whose labor has helped to build this great nation. Throughout our history, the United States and Greece have shared a unique bond in that both nations have struggled for the right to freedom and self-governance. Clearly, our Founding Fathers had a deep admiration for the ancient Greeks who championed their own independence and modeled the American form of government upon the principles of Greek democracy. The ideology of Greece can be found in our own Constitution and these common ideals have promoted a strong bond between our two nations. We share a similar devotion for additional nations to join in our mutual values, goals and respect by embracing the rights and liberties we hold dear. Greek Independence Day is a celebration for both Greek and American freedom.

I would like to thank the other members of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, and particularly the co-chairs, my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for their efforts in organizing this fitting tribute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, on March 25th, 1821, 180 years ago this week, the Greek people declared their independence, throwing off the yoke of four centuries of Ottoman oppression.

Greek freedom fighters looked to the American revolution and American democracy for inspiration, and adopted their own declaration of independence. Our Founding Fathers in turn were guided by the democratic principles that first arose in Greece. They took to heart the ideals of ancient Greece, the birthplace of democracy.

This is a day for us to reflect on the vital alliance between Greece and the United States and to pay our debt to Hellenic ideals and to Hellenic culture. It is a day for Greek Americans to take pride in the independence of Greece and in the ancient culture of all Hellenes.

Since its liberation, Greece has stood by America. It is my hope and belief that the United Sates will continue to stand by its ally. Greece is one of three nations in the world beyond the former British Empire that has been allied with the United States in every major international conflict of this century. One out of every 9 Greeks lost their lives fighting the Nazis during World War II. And through U.S. generosity, through the Marshall plan, Greece was able to rebuild its war-ravaged economy.

We must also remember that there remain problems in the eastern Mediterranean, problems between Greece and the successor to its former colonial master, Turkey. We must work to bring peace to the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean.

I hope that our new Administration will use its considerable influence with Ankara to convince the leadership there to support a peaceful and just resolution to the outstanding problems between our two allies. Most importantly, I hope that our government can convince the Turkish side to negotiate in good faith on the continued occupation and division of Cyprus.

Madam Speaker, again, I want to urge all my colleagues to pay tribute to Greek Independence and to all of the contributions made by Hellenes throughout history.

Mr. SCHROCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 180th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Over 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers turned to the scholarly teachings of ancient Greek philosophers and statesmen in order to form "a more perfect Union." These inspirational teachings about the virtues of democracy served as the basis of our own representative form of government.

On March 25, 1821, these teachings came full circle when the Greeks fought to regain the freedom, liberty, and individual rights they first taught to the world. Now, 180 years later, the Greek system of democracy is in full force and serves as an inspiration to us all.

The celebration of Greek Independence Day should not be reserved to only those of Greek descent; it is a day that should also honor our own nation's democratic principles.

Greece and the United States have shared a common past. We have fought wars together, we are NATO partners, we maintain sound diplomatic relations. We are successful partners on the world stage.

The citizens of the United States are eager to celebrate the Games of the 28th Olympiad in Athens.

Therefore, all Americans celebrate Greek Independence Day, for it is the commemoration of all that we believe in, and all that our forefathers fought for—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Greek Independence Day. One hundred and eighty years ago Greece began the struggle against the Ottoman empire that would lead to their independence. Americans have celebrated our connection with Greece throughout our history. Thomas Jefferson once said, ". . . To the ancient Greeks . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves [American colonists] out of Gothic darkness."

Our nations have a common democratic bond that have led us to look to one another for examples for our governing bodies. It is of course the philosophies of the ancient Greeks that inspired our founding fathers to pursue freedom through the Declaration of Independence. In turn it is this same document that the Greeks used to declare their freedom from the Ottoman Empire.

It is not only our form of government that we have learned from the Greeks. One only has to look around our nation's capital to see how we have been influenced by Greek art. From the Capitol building to the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, we have incorporated their styles. In addition, a large part of our culture has been shaped by ancient Greek philosophy and their approach to science. In recent history Greece has been 1 of only 3 nation's that have allied with the United States in every major international conflict. During World War II, 600,000 Greeks gave their lives in the fight for freedom.

The contributions that Greek-Americans have made in communities around the United States are to be commended. Greek-Americans commonly establish groups that form ties to maintain appreciation of their cultural heritage, provide opportunities for social interaction, while preserving traditions and the Greek language for future generations. Additionally, the contributions that Greek-Americans have made in the business community are unsurpassed. Through the utilization of the American tradition of small, family owned businesses the Greek-American community has prospered.

Madam Speaker, the eighth congressional district of Maryland, which I represent, has the 17th largest population of Greek-Americans in the United States. I am proud of the contributions that these community leaders have made to Montgomery County and our nation. I join with them in celebrating Greek Independence Day and urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the achievements of Greek-Americans.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join in marking the 180th anniversary of the

independence of Greece today. The winning of independence almost two centuries ago marked the culmination of struggle of the Greek people to restore the ideals of democracy established by their ancestors.

In 1821, under the leadership of Alexandros Ypsilantis, the Greek people fought together to establish Greek sovereignty. The courageous efforts of Ypsilantis planted a seed in the hearts of the Greek people. This seed grew into a flourishing movement that led to religious freedom, a reinvigorated sense of cultural and national identity, and the long awaited return to the democratic ideals born in Ancient Greece.

Madam Speaker, while we are here today to pay tribute to the anniversary of Greek Independence, I want also to pay tribute to the Greek-American community, which offers us a cultural bridge between our two countries. This community justly takes pride that Greek ideals contributed to America's revolution even before the Greeks themselves had the opportunity to succeed in their campaign for freedom. It is important for us to commemorate this day together to reaffirm our common democratic heritage.

The Founding Fathers of our nation were inspired and motivated by the Athenian model of democracy. In 370 B.C., Plato wrote in The Republic, ''Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike.'' As participants in a representative democracy, those of us in this Congress recognize our great debt to the ancient Greek philosophers who provided much of the foundation of American democracy.

Madam Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in observing Greek Independence Day. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I take this opportunity to salute the Greek people for their historic achievement of independence nearly two centuries ago, and I recommit myself to work for closer ties between the people of the United States and the people of Greece.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day. March 25, 2001 marks the 180th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire—a struggle that would last without relief for eight years.

For nearly 400 years, Greece remained under the control of this oppressive regime. During this time, they were stripped of all civil rights. Their schools were closed down, their young boys were kidnapped and raised as Muslems to serve in the Turkish army, and millions of their people were executed as the Ottoman Empire sought to maintain control.

But the people of Greece persevered. They began secretly educating their children in churches and chapels across the country. By the early 1800's, the Greeks' desire for independence was fueled by this continued education. They became deeply interested in their ancient past and their folk culture. In 1814, Greek merchants in Odessa, Russia, formed the Friendly Society which eventually organized a movement against the Ottoman Turks that led to a Greek revolt. Fighting with what was once described as ''suicidal courage despite meager resources'', the Greeks won their independence after eight years of all-out war and four centuries of oppression.

In their fight for independence, the Greeks looked to the American Revolution as their ideal, even translating the Declaration of Independence and using it as their own. In an 1821 address, Greek Commander in Chief Petros Mavromichalis said to American citizens, ''. . . it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode . . . trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you . . .''

While the Greeks may have looked to the American Revolution as a blueprint for their own revolution, it is us, the citizens of the United States, who will forever be in debt to the Greeks. For it is they who forged the very notion of democracy. And without that notion, the United States may have never come to be what it is today. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, ''. . . to the ancient Greeks . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness . . .''

It is my hope that the relationship between the people of Greece and the people of America will continue to advance our understanding of democracy and that the hardships experienced by those in both countries will offer hope to all nations struggling for justice today.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in commending those of Greek heritage for all they have overcome and for all they have contributed in the hope of making the world around them better for everyone.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great nation of Greece and celebrate with its citizens 180 years of independence from the Ottoman Empire.

When we think about democracy in Greece, inevitably our thoughts drift to the country's venerable ancients: Solon, the lawmaker who framed Athens' constitution; the philosopher Socrates and his disciple Plato; Pericles, the leader of democratic politics in Athens. These men helped shape our concepts of philosophy, art, science and drama. Their writings and teachings influenced generations of great thinkers and are still in use at colleges and universities around the world today. They provided the basis for our founding fathers' essays and treaties on life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

However, despite the fact that these men helped develop the ideals of democracy that we Americans hold so dear, it was not until 1821 that the Greek people declared independence and moved from beneath the thumb of the Ottoman Empire. This movement marked the beginning of true democratic freedom within the modern nation of Greece, and it is this courageous action that we honor today.

The rebellion began in March 1821 when Alexandros Ypsilantis, the leader of the revolutionary Philiki Etaireia crossed the Prut River into Turkish-held Moldavia with a small force of troops. Although Ypsilantis was defeated, his actions sparked a number of revolts against the Turks on March 25, 1821, the traditional date of Greek independence.

The Greeks' struggle for freedom inspired many Americans, who left our country to fight for Greece's Independence. Our great Congress also sent money and supplies to assist in Greece's struggle for autonomy. And over the years, we have worked side-by-side with Greek leaders to oppose tyranny and oppression and advance the cause of democracy worldwide.

But our ties with Greece do not end with this shared commitment to the principles of democracy. Indeed, today more than 1 million people of Greek descent live in the United States. These men and women have made innumerable contributions to our society and way of life, and for this we thank them.

Colleagues, please join me in saluting the people of Greece for their tremendous commitment to democracy and the principles that helped to found our nation.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Hellenic Caucus I am pleased to address the House in recognition of the 180th anniversary of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. This Sunday, on March 25th, people of Greek heritage all over the world will celebrate Greek Independence Day.

In 1821, the Greeks rose up against the oppressive Ottoman Empire, which had occupied Greece for nearly four centuries. This was the beginning of a successful struggle for freedom and independence. The Greek people sought the right to govern themselves and to determine their own destiny.

It is important that we recognize this day not only because the Greek people are a vibrant community which has made lasting contributions to the United States, but also because the ancient Greeks forged the notion of democracy. They believed in the right of self-governance—one of the pillars of our great nation. In fact, when forming a fledgling democracy, our Founding Fathers relied heavily on the political wisdom of the ancient Greeks. Thomas Jefferson once called ancient Greece ''the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.''

This day is doubly significant for many in Greece and for Greek-Americans, because it was on this day in the Orthodox calendar that the archangel Gabriel appeared to Mary and announced that she was pregnant with the divine child. Churches in Greece celebrate the Festival of the Annunciation with pomp and circumstance, and Greek Independence Day is celebrated with parades and celebrations in cities across Greece and the United States.

Greek Independence Day is historically significant in other ways as well. It marks the first major war of liberation after the American Revolution. It was also the first successful struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we have taken time out today to recognize this very important day in Greek history.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, three years before Prince Ypsilantis and Archbishop Germanos embarked on thier crusades to liberate Greece from the Ottomans, the English poet Lord Byron released the fourth canto of his work Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. Two lines from that work resonate powerfully with me on this the 180th Greek Independence Day:

''Yet Freedom, yet thy banner, torn, but flying,
Streams like the thunder-storm against the wind.''

Of course, Bryon was a passionate philhellene who tirelessly promoted the cause of Greek independence. In fact, few may actually know, but the renowned romantic poet was named commander-in-chief of the Greek Army of Independence in January of 1824 in recognition of his enormous contributions to the cause of freedom and liberty for all Greeks.

Byron eloquently conveyed the undying yearning for liberty that beat in the breast of every Greek two centuries ago. Like a call to arms, the words of his poems inflamed the spirit of Freedom within patriots throughout the Balkans. And, Byron's ability to recruit a regiment of liberation troops, and fund many others, served to take these emboldened men to victory. By 1829, the Ottoman sultan had been forced to sign the Treaty of Adrianople liberating Greece and insuring that the birthplace of democracy would be set on a path of democratic renewal herself.

On this day every year, Greeks celebrate the momentous acts that led to the birth of the Hellenic Republic. Over one million Greek Americans join in that celebration. I am proud to do so this year, as well.

Yet, I want to take this moment to thank and celebrate those Americans, Britons and others who adopted the cause of Greece as their own. While Lord Byron lost his life in the cause of Greek Independence, succumbing to an illness he recklessly disregarded earlier to join the Greek crusade, he was not the only philhellene to sacrifice greatly that the Greek people may live free of foreign tyranny. Without all of them, Greece would not have returned to the fold of free nations. Without them the land that birthed democracy, in a very real sense, would have died under the weight of foreign oppression.

So on this joyful day, let me say thank you to the philhellenes, as a Greek American, and as one who cherishes the inalienable right of all men to live free.

Madam Speaker, I submit a recitation of another poem. A poem the late Lord Byron wrote in lament of an enslaved Greece. Could the Commander in Chief have truly known how profoundly thankful generations to come would be for his words and deeds?

THE ISLES OF GREECE

(By Lord Byron)

''The isles of Greece, the isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung,
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose and Phoebus sprung!
Eternal summer gilds them yet,
But all, except their sun, is set.

The Scian and the Teian muse,
The hero's harp, the lover's lute,
Have found the fame your shores refuse:
Their place of birth alone is mute
To sounds which echo further west
Then your sires' 'Islands of the Blest.'

The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon looks on to sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dream'd that Greece might still be free;
For standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave.

A king sate on the rocky brow
Which looks o'er the sea-born Salamis;
And ships, by thousands, lay below,
And men in nations;—all were his!
He counted them at break of day—
And when the sun set where were they?

And where are they? and where are thou,
My country? On thy voiceless shore
The heroic lay is tuneless now—
The heroic bosom beats no more!
And must thy lyre, so long devine,
Degenerate into hands like mine?

'Tis something, in the dearth of fame,
Though link'd among a fetter'd race,
To feel at least a patriot's shame,
Even as I sing, suffuse my face;
For what is left the poet here?
For Greeks a blush—For Greece a tear.

Must we but weep o'er days more blest?
Must we but blush?—Our fathers bled.
Earth! render back from out thy breast
A remnant of our Spartan dead!
Of the three hundred grant but three,
To make a new Thermoplyae!

What, silent still? and silent all?
Ah! no;—the voices of the dead
Sound like a distant torrent's fall,
And answer, 'Let one living head,
But one arise,—we come, we come!'
'Tis but the living who are dumb.

In vain—in vain: strike other chords;
Fill high the cup with Samian wine!
Leave battles to the Turkish hordes,
And shed the blood of Scio's vine!
Hark! rising to the ignoble call—
How answers each bold Bacchanal!

You have the Pyrrhic dance as yet;
Where is the Pyrrhic phalanx gone?
Of two such lessons, why forget
The nobler and the manlier one?
You have the letters Cadmus gave—
Think ye he meant them for a slave?

Fill high the bowl with Samian wine!
We will not think of themes like these!
It made Anacreon's song devine:
He served—but served Polycrates—
A tyrant; but our masters then
Were still, at least, our countrymen.

The tyrant of the Chersonese
Was freedom's best and bravest friend;
That tyrant was Miltiades!
Oh! that the present hour would lend
Another despot of the kind!
Such chains as his were sure to bind.

Fill high the bowl with Samian wine!
On Suli's rock, and Parga's shore,
Exists the remnant of a line
Such as the Doric mothers bore;
And there, perhaps, some seed is sown,
The Heracleidan blood might own.

Trust not for freedom to the Franks—
They have a king who buys and sells;
In native swords, and native ranks,
The only hope of courage dwells:
But Turkish force, and Lation fraud,
Would break your shield, however broad.

Fill high the bowl with Samian wine!
Our virgins dance beneath the shade—
I see their glorious black eyes shine;
But gazing on each glowing maid,
My own the burning tear-drop laves,
To think such breasts must suckle slaves.

Place me on Sunium's marbled steep,
Where nothing, saves the waves and I,
May hear our mutual murmurs sweep;
There, swan-like, let me sing and die:
A land of slaves shall ne'er be mine—
Dash down yon cup of Samian wine.''

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to take a moment to observe the 180th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. March 25th, 1821, marked the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, today should be a international celebration not just of Greek freedom and independence, but it should be a celebration democracy throughout the world.

History tells us that it was the ancient Greeks who developed the concept of democracy. In itself, democracy was a revolutionary ideal, placing the power to govern in the hands of the people. After 2,500 years, mankind is only beginning to grasp the magnitude of what the ancient Greeks achieved. Through dozens of generations, through the rise and fall of great empires, through wars and plagues, through depressions and economic revolutions, through the triumphs and travails of human affairs, one thing has endured: the dream of democracy.

Greek-Americans have enriched our country enormously, in every profession, in every region, in every walk of life. Cities across America take their names from such places as Athens and Corinth and Delphi and Sparta.

And of course, our country would not exist if the ancient Greek city-states had not developed the world's most revolutionary idea—democracy. Our founding fathers studied history closely and revered deeply the works of the ancient Greeks. Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, once observed, ''Greece was the first of civilized nations, presenting examples of what man should be.''

Although democracy is a significant common value that strengthens the bond between the United States and Greece, we must realize there is more to this relationship. Greece's major role in World War II provided tremendous setbacks to the Axis offensive. Furthermore, Greece remained an important ally throughout the Cold War and the struggle to promote our democratic values around the globe.

Today, the United States and Greece are leaders in the pursuit to promote democracy, human rights, freedom, and peace. President Clinton referred to Greece as ''a beacon of democracy, a regional leader for stability, prosperity and freedom.''

Greece has been a friend and ally for more than the last century and we will stand by her to peacefully resolve the situation in Cyprus and other challenges that the twenty-first century may bring.

So today, I am proud to join with Greek Americans and the Greek people in celebration of Greek Independence Day, reaffirming the democratic principles from which our two nations were born and which have shaped our world. America and Greece have special responsibilities in this quest—the United States as the world's strongest democracy, Greece as the world's first. But if we engage fully in the changing world beyond our borders, we can build a future in which all nations enjoy prosperity, democracy, and peace.

Mr. COYNE. Madam Speaker, I am honored today to join in this special order commemorating the 180th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire.

180 years ago, in 1831, Greek patriots rose up against their Ottoman overlords in a long and bloody revolution that lasted nearly eight years. The cause of Greek independence required great courage, perseverance and sacrifice. The Greek people experienced frequent adversity and hardships, but their struggle continued. Many brave men and women lost their lives in this fight, and freedom was not won without considerable cost. In the end,

however, the Greek people never wavered in their struggle for freedom, and the land that was once the cradle of democracy was again free.

This day is very special to the people of America because Greece and the United States have much in common. Our shared democratic ideals have formed a basis for a strong and sustained friendship. Furthermore, the writings of early Greek philosophers like Plato and Polybius were adopted by many patriots of the American Revolution, who used their words as inspiration. Even today, Greece remains one of our most loyal partners and democratic allies in the global community.

In recognition of this historic event, the House has repeatedly observed this annual commemoration of Greek independence. Recently, the Senate passed a resolution designating March 25, 2001, as ''Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy''.

Madam Speaker, it is only appropriate that we recognize these Greek patriots who shed blood for the same principles of freedom and self-government that inspired the patriots of our own revolution here in America. Consequently, it is appropriate that all of us, as Americans, share in the celebration of this momentous occasion. I am honored to join my colleagues in commemorating the 180th anniversary of Greek independence.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 180th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day. The annual celebration commemorates the day the Greek people took up arms against the Ottoman Empire in 1821. And today, it stands as the defining moment in the establishment and preservation of modern democratic ideals espoused by Greek society.

The Greek and American people share a common heritage that cannot be overlooked. The foundation of America's democracy is based on the democratic principles established by the ancient Greeks. The political and philosophical beliefs of the ancient Greeks enabled our Founding Fathers to craft a Constitution and to establish a government that holds high the ideals of equality and justice. During its struggle for independence, Greece looked to the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution for inspiration.

The annual Greek Independence Day parade will be held on Sunday, March 25, 2001. On that day, the streets of New York City will overflow with the pride and passion of the Greek-American community. Greek Independence Day is not only significant because it marks the beginning of the liberation of Greece from Ottoman rule, but also because it presents an opportunity for all Greek-Americans to reflect on the important economic and cultural contributions their community has made to American society.

It is especially comforting to see the support and guidance that the National Coordinated Effort of Helenes and the Federation of Hellenic Societies, as well as other Greek-American organizations provide their community members—ensuring that past accomplishments are celebrated and commemorated, while also ensuring future success by providing opportunities for advancement in education and the workplace.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Greek Independence Day and the common democratic heritage of Greeks and Americans.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in celebrating 180 years of Greek Independence.

March 25, the official Greek independence day, is a proud day for Greeks across the world. It is a powerful reminder of the strength and determination inspired by the ideals of freedom and self governance, and an important opportunity for Congress to rise and recognize the shared values and goals between Greece and the United States.

Greece is a remarkable country with an exceptional past and a tremendous future. Its proud heritage as the ancient founder of democracy has evolved with great accomplishments like the war of independence, membership in NATO, and partnership in the European Union.

I join my colleagues in recognition of this special occasion and the strong U.S.-Greece relationship. The ties between our two countries are underscored by strategic economic, military, and diplomatic ties, and are continually enhanced by the activism of vibrant Hellenic-American communities across the United States.

HONORING THE 180TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today and join my colleagues who spoke just prior to me in honor of the 180th anniversary of the Greek independence. As a Member of the congressional caucus on Hellenic issues, I once again join those colleagues and others in paying tribute to the nation of Greece and its people.

As we all know, as was so eloquently put forth by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), ancient Greece was the fountain of democratic ideals and values for the rest of the world, and her modern counterpart has been steadfast in ensuring that the philosophic traditions of the past are actively practiced.

Today, we celebrate the triumph of the ideal of self-government in recognizing the achievements of the Greeks who so valiantly fought for independence. We also recognize the debt of gratitude that the citizens of the United States and many other nations owe for the ideals upon which the American democratic experiment is based.

Greece, at the juncture between continents, continues to be actively involved in the international community, maintaining excellent relations with the United States, Europe and other nations. We all remember the recent response to the devastating earthquake in Turkey as an example of the commitment of goodwill that the Greek people continually demonstrate. It is my hope that this spirit of rising above differences will serve to inspire other nations as we move forward into the 21st century.

On behalf of the people of the 6th Congressional District of Massachusetts, I wish to extend congratulations to the people of Greece and all of the people of Greek heritage in the United States on this important holiday.

I am honored to have been selected to be an honorary grand marshal in this year's independence day parade in Boston. I look forward to sharing in the celebration once again with my constituents. It is my hope that the new millennium will bring forth many more years of positive and productive relations between the United States and Greece.

LESSONS OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in a Chamber that has for centuries witnessed on a daily basis the dreams and the fruits of American independence. Today, we remember that it was March 25, 1821, that the Greeks rose up to seek their independence. As has always been the case, the price of that independence was high.

Greek independence is a matter of special interest to me because of my family and, in particular, my wife, Heidi. My wife, Heidi, is the great, great granddaughter of a young 4-year-old survivor of the Battle of Missolongi. For those of my colleagues who recall those events, it was Missolongi that rose up against Ottoman rule. It was Missolongi that captured the attention of Lord Byron, and it was Missolongi where some of the harshest battles of Greek independence were fought.

When Missolongi finally fell, the survivors numbered only a few thousand women and children, one of them the 4-year-old great, great grandmother of my wife, Catherine, or Haidine, ''the forsaken one,'' as she was known. She was impressed into the household of an Egyptian admiral and relocated to Alexandria, Egypt, where 3 years later, at the age of 7, she came to the attention of a British diplomat. The British diplomat offered to buy her out of slavery, but the offer was refused, until a few months later, she became sick, at which point the offer was accepted and the sick little girl was delivered to the diplomat's family. He and his wife nursed her back to health, they relocated to England where she was adopted, educated, raised up, and eventually married to the son of an admiral. They relocated to Canada and eventually to the United States.

So, Madam Speaker, the story of Greek independence is also the story of

America and of Americans and of our families. It is a story of the struggle for freedom, the struggle for democracy, and the struggle for a better life for our families, our friends, and our neighbors.

As we gather in this great Chamber, this cradle of democracy here in these United States, we should never forget the lessons of Greeks and the lessons of Greek independence.

CELEBRATING 180 YEARS OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, as has been mentioned, Greece celebrates its 180th year of independence. I am here tonight to praise the society that represents, in a historical sense, the origins of what we call Western culture and, in a contemporary sense, one of the staunchest defenders of Western society and values. There are many of us in Congress, on both sides of the spectrum, who are staunchly committed to strengthening and preserving the ties between the Greek and American people. I would particularly like to thank the co-chairs of our Hellenic Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for their fine leadership and tireless efforts to strengthen the ties between our two countries.

Just 200 years ago, after the Greek people began the revolution that would lead to their freedom, one of our predecessors in this Chamber, Congressman Daniel Webster, referring to the 400 years during which the Greeks were ruled by the Ottoman Empire, observed, and I quote, ''These people,'' the Greeks, ''a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit and enterprise, have been for centuries under the atrocious and unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race.''

The words Congressman Webster chose then to describe the Greek people, intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit and enterprise, are as apt today as they ever have been. In the years since, Americans and Greeks have grown ever closer, bound by ties of strategic and military alliance, common values of democracy, individual freedom, human rights, and close personal friendship.

In the early 20th century, Greece stood by the United States in World War I when Hitler's war machine decimated Europe in the middle of this century. Greece again stood on the same side of the United States to repulse the greatest threat to freedom and human decency the world as ever seen and, I might add, at great cost to the Greek people and the Greek nation.

□ 1900

History has shown that the historic battle of Crete, in which the indomitable spirit of the Greek people forced Hitler to delay his planned invasion of Russia, was one of the most important battles of the Second World War. From the outset of that war, Greece showed its true character as a nation of courage and honor, devoted to freedom and self-determination.

World War II's aftermath left Europe mired in the Cold War; and Greece, a NATO ally to this day, once again answered the call. Greece showed its national valor and sense of historic mission, joining forces with the United States and preserving and protecting the freedoms enjoyed today by an unprecedented number of the world's people.

The qualities exhibited by the nation of Greece, Mr. Speaker, are a reflection of the strong character and values of its individual citizens. The United States has been greatly enriched as many sons and daughters of Greece made a new life in America. They and their children and grandchildren have enriched our country in countless ways, contributing to our cultural, professional, commercial, academic and political life.

The timeless values of Greek culture have endured for centuries, indeed for millenia. As Daniel Webster noted, 400 years of control by the Ottoman Empire could not overcome the Greek people's determination to be free.

But I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, to this day the Greek people must battle against oppression. For almost 24 years now, Greece has stood firm in its determination to bring freedom and independence to the illegally occupied nation of Cyprus. Like their forefathers who were under the control of a hostile foreign power for four centuries, the Cypriot people hold fast in defiance of their Turkish aggressors with every confidence that they will again be a sovereign nation, and they will.

The United States must be on their side in both the fight to secure that freedom and the celebration to mark the day when it finally arrives.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to congratulate the Greek people for 180 years of independence and thank them for their contributions to American life.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to switch subjects for a moment to talk about another matter during this month of women's history. As the Republican chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss an issue that affects thousands of women each year, violence against women.

There are two types of violence against women that need to be addressed: domestic violence and sexual assault. Scratch the surface of any of our Nation's most challenging social problems, from crime in the schools to gang violence and homelessness, and you are likely to find a root cause of domestic violence.

Law enforcement officials are reporting that domestic violence situations are among their most frequent calls. Judges find that children first seen in their courts as victims of domestic violence return later as adult criminal defendants. Schools are noticing that children with emotional problems often come from an environment where violence is the norm.

Violence begets violence, and we must break the cycle. We have begun to address the problem, but there is still much work to be done. Reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act in the 106th Congress was a giant step in the right direction.

Since it passed in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has been effective. In fact, the Justice Department estimates that violence against women has decreased by 21 percent since the law was originally passed. The law also has been credited with providing shelter space for more than 300,000 women and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my many colleagues here in the House who supported and fought for this important legislation, both in 1994 and the reauthorization last year. I am proud that reauthorization received such strong bipartisan support, and I am hopeful that our future efforts to address this tremendous problem will receive similar levels of support from both sides of the aisle.

The reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act brought much-needed attention to these issues, attention that will be translated into greater public awareness of this issue and a greater public commitment to solving the problems of violence against women.

But another particular area of violence against women that needs more congressional attention is sexual assault. The statistics on this issue are staggering. A rape occurs every 90 seconds, and estimates show that one out of every three women will be sexually assaulted in her lifetime.

Seven out of every 10 rapes are committed by someone the victim knows. Seventy-six percent of the women over 18 who are raped and/or physically assaulted are assaulted by a current or former husband, cohabitating partner or date.

What can we do to address this horrendous problem? We must talk about it. We must raise public awareness. For

years, these problems have been swept under the table, and women have been hesitant about talking about them in public or even reporting them.

I am thankful that this trend is in reverse and the public is becoming more outraged about these heinous crimes against women. We, as leaders, must be willing to bring more attention to the fight against sexual assault and domestic violence.

By focusing public attention on these acts of brutality against women, we can raise public awareness. We can make a difference. We have already seen positive effects of the Violence Against Women Act, but that is just a start.

As the month of March draws to a close, I would like to point out that the month of April is nationally known as National Sexual Assault Awareness Month. I would like to see this designation made official.

Officially designating April as National Sexual Assault Awareness Month would raise public awareness. Violence against women is a large, unrecognized and all-too-often ignored problem in all of our communities. The costs of these violent acts is borne not only by the women who experience it, but by their families, communities and our Nation as a whole.

This is a national issue, and it must receive national attention. We must continue our congressional commitment to making our streets and homes safe for women and children.

A TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR JOAN FINNEY

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to convey my thoughts and prayers for the former governor of our State, Governor Joan Finney, and her family. Last month, Governor Finney was diagnosed with liver cancer. I wish her strength and courage as she fights this devastating disease.

Governor Finney has had a long and distinguished career in service to the public. She was a trailblazer for women in elective office, and her example has served as inspiration and a role model for others in our State and around the country.

Joan Finney served our State for 16 years as Kansas Treasurer. She started her career as a Republican and switched to become a Democrat.

In 1990, she became the first women ever elected governor of our State. Governor Finney is truly a woman of the people.

Throughout her years of public service, she was able to connect to everyday Kansans in a way all of us who hold elective office can respect and admire.

I was privileged to serve in the Kansas Senate during Governor Finney's term as governor. During that time, she always had the well-being of the people of our State as her priority.

While we sometimes disagreed, I always knew where the Governor stood on each and every issue. She was honest and straightforward. No public opinion polls, no focus groups, just Joan Finney doing what she thought was best for the people she loved, the people of Kansas.

Governor Finney was always respectful, and her heart was always in the right place. She believed passionately in her positions and worked hard for the hard-working people of Kansas.

Family is very important to Governor Finney. Members of her family played key roles in her campaigns and in her administration.

I know that her family is with her now as she faces this great challenge. May the strength and goodwill that she displayed in her years as public service now help her defeat this terrible disease.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Governor Finney, to her husband Spencer and to her children, Sally Finney, Richard Finney and Mary Holliday.

Kansans care greatly for you, Mrs. Finney, and we pray God will bless you and give you courage and strength.

AMERICA'S FARMERS AND RANCHERS NEED A NEW FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the 276 million of us who do not work in the farming and ranching sectors need to take time today on National Agriculture Day to give thanks to the 700,000 men and women of American agriculture for all they do to feed our Nation and, indeed, much of the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay highest tribute to some of the hardest working people in America. I know of no other people who take such great financial risks, give more of themselves each and every day, and who do so with great discipline and dignity.

With the depression that is afflicting rural regions of our country, America needs a new declaration of economic independence, and that declaration should insist that America's farmers and ranchers are not expendable. Their husbandry and stewardship are central pillars of our national security and freedom.

Today, we are witnessing an alarming hollowing out of America's countryside and a wanton destruction of precious arable lands that have sustained us and on which future generations will depend.

Rural America is on life support. The current farm depression, now in its fourth year, is the deepest since 1915. This year's prices were at a 27-year low.

The average age of our farmers is 57 years, and now they are getting over three-fourths of their earnings in public support because the market does not work for them.

And up until today, National Agriculture Day, what have we heard from the new administration? Silence. Not the peacefulness of the countryside, but the eerie solemnness of the graveyard.

President Bush, when he delivered his State of the Union address just a few weeks ago in this Chamber, had nothing to offer America's farmers. No plans. No solutions. No ideas. The budget that he has submitted so far suggests that agriculture's crisis will be taken care of out of something called a contingency fund. That sounds like it is tangential. Now, how exactly is that supposed to happen?

The President has talked largely about estate taxes, implying that farmers can leave their properties to sons and daughters. But what does that do to earn a living today and hold on for the rest of their productive years?

Anyone who saw the New York Times story this past weekend saw the heartwrenching story about potato growers in Idaho facing their lowest prices in decades. They are worried about having an income. What will a tax cut do for them?

Then yesterday the President spoke on our Nation's energy policy. But, for agriculture, it was again the sound of silence. America has the ability to convert many of our crops into ethanol and biodiesel, throwing off the yoke of international fuel dependency. In fact, if we just converted our strategic petroleum reserve to a strategic fuels reserve and only fill 2 percent of it with biofuels, we would double the production of both ethanol and biodiesel in this country, helping to build that new industry from inside this Nation.

But the President did not mention it, not a word. But he did express his appreciation just yesterday to the OPEC ministers who agreed to hold price increases to only 7 percent for imported fuel. He thought that gesture by them was comforting. It is not comforting to me.

Mr. President, why do you not offer some comfort to America's farmers and ranchers and help them get their prices up the same 7 percent that you are willing to accept for oil? Why do you not help them develop new products like ethanol and biodiesel? Why do you not tell them what you propose to break them out of the cycle of dependency on government farm payments? Why do you not offer an agriculture policy that our farmers and ranchers can look toward the future?

Let me start in this way. America's farmers and ranchers need a new farm

bill that gives equal footing to them in our global marketplace, starting out with contracting rights. We need a budget from the executive branch that addresses the farm crisis and positions American agriculture for the future.

We need to meet America's energy crisis with a major national commitment to biofuels. We must invest in new ways for farmers and ranchers to move their products to the market domestically and internationally. We need to restore a free market in agriculture and enforce antitrust laws.

We must give farmers and ranchers a place at the bargaining table in global trade negotiations, starting with the reform of NAFTA and the proposal for the free trade agreement of the Americas. We must launch a new homesteading program that ties the chance to retain your farm or to own a farm mortgage and title to conservation and holding and preserving our arable land for future generations who will depend on it.

Mr. President, it is National Agriculture Day. Help us celebrate it by giving America's farmers and ranchers the respect and the attention they deserve at the highest levels.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not directly to the President.

MANIPULATION OF INTEREST RATES CAUSE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Reserve lowered interest rates by a half a percentage point. They have been asked to lower the interest rates by just about everybody in the country. Whether they are investors or politicians, everybody literally has been screaming at the Fed and Alan Greenspan to lower the interest rates, lower the interest rates.

□ 1915

It was anticipated that he would, and he did. He lowered the interest rates by 50 basis points. The stock market promptly went down 236 points. So obviously just lowering interest rates is not the solution to the problems we face. As a matter of fact, I believe it is the problem.

Interest rates have been manipulated by the Federal Reserve as long as I can remember, especially in the last 30 years since we have had a total fiat monetary system. So it is the manipulation of interest rates that causes a problem.

In a free market economy, you do not have a central bank pretending it has knowledge it does not have, that it knows exactly what the money supply should be and what the interest rate should be. That is a prescription for disaster; and it leads to booms and busts, speculations in the stock markets, crashes in the stock markets. This is a well-known phenomenon. It has been with us since 1913, since we have had the Federal Reserve. We have seen it in the speculation in the 1920s and the depression of the 1930s. It is ongoing.

We have a responsibility here in the Congress to deal with this. We have a responsibility to maintain the integrity of the money. Yet we up that responsibility to a secretive body that works on its own, deliberating and deciding how much money supply we should have.

To lower interest rates, a central bank has to increase the money. That is debasement. That is devaluing the money deliberately. In the old days, when the king would do this, they would clip coins. Literally coin debasement, stealing value from coinage in the old days was a capital crime. Today, though, it is accepted practice in all economies of the world. We have had no linkage of any currency of the world in the last 30 years to anything of real value.

The economies have functioned relatively well. But just in the last 6 years, we have had eight financial international crises, all patched together by more inflation, more printing of more money. Let me tell my colleagues, I am convinced it will not last, it will not continue.

Take a look at what is happening in Japan today. Japan lowered their interest rates, too. They have been doing this for a long time. They are down to 0 percent, and nothing seems to be happening. Their stock market is at a level it was 16 years ago. We have to decide whether or not we may be moving into a similar situation. I think it is a very serious problem.

We talk about interest rates. We talk about stimulating the economy. But we really do not talk about the problem, and that is the monetary system and the nature of the dollar.

The money supply right now is currently rising at the rate of 20 percent, as measured by MZN. This is horrendous inflation. This is inflation. Everybody says no, there are reassurances. The Federal Reserve and all the statisticians say there is no inflation. The CPI is okay and the PPI is okay. But there is inflation. Because if one increases the supply of money, one is creating inflation.

The most important aspect of that is the instability it creates in the marketplace. It does not always lead to a CPI increasing at 10 or 15 percent. Our CPI is rising significantly. We have other prices going up significantly, like education costs and medical care costs, housing costs. So there is a lot of inflation even when one measures it by prices.

But the real problem with the inflation when one allows a central bank to destroy its money is twofold. One, it creates an overcapacity or overinvestment, excessive debt that always has to be wiped out and cleaned out of the situation, or economic growth cannot be resumed. Japan has not permitted this to happen, and economic growth has not resumed. That is the most important aspect because that causes the unemployment and that causes the harm to so many people.

Now, there is another aspect of inflation, that is the monetary debasement that I have great concern about. That is, when it goes to extremes, it inevitably wipes out the middle class. It destroys the middle class. We are just starting to see that happening in this country.

Low middle-income earners, individuals who are still not on the dole but willing to work, they are having a tough time paying their bills. That is the early stages of what happens when a currency is destroyed.

Last year, for the first time in our history of keeping this record since 1945, in 55 years, the wealth of the American people went down 2 percent.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE 107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to transmit herewith the Rules of Procedure for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the 107th Congress. The enclosed rules were adopted by the Committee, Thursday, March 1, 2001.

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I request that the enclosed Rules of Procedure be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

1. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Generally

(1) Creation of subcommittees and the working group shall be by majority vote of the Committee.

(2) Subcommittees and the working group shall deal with such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct.

(3) Subcommittees and the working group shall be governed by these rules.

For purposes of these rules, any reference herein to the ''Committee'' shall be interpreted to include subcommittees and the working group, unless otherwise specifically provided.

(b) Establishment of Subcommittees

The Committee establishes the following subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence; and

(3) Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security.

For purposes of these rules, any reference herein to the ''Committee'' shall be interpreted to include subcommittees, unless otherwise specifically provided.

(c) Establishment of Working Group

(1) The Committee establishes the Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as the ''working group''). For purposes of these rules, any reference to the ''Committee'' shall be interpreted to include the Working Group, unless otherwise specifically provided.

(2) The working group may not authorize or issue a subpoena.

(d) Subcommittee Membership

(1) Generally. Each Member of the Committee may be assigned to at least one of the three subcommittees and the working group.

(2) Ex Officio Membership. In the event that the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee do not choose to sit as regular voting members of one or more of the subcommittees, each is authorized to sit as an ex officio Member of the subcommittees or the working group and participate in the work of the subcommittees or the working group. When sitting ex officio, however, they—

(A) shall not have a vote in the subcommittee or in the working group; and

(B) shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

2. MEETING DAY

(a) Regular Meeting Day for the Full Committee

(1) Generally. The regular meeting day of the Committee for the transaction of Committee business shall be the first Wednesday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

(2) Notice Required. Such regular business meetings shall not occur, unless Members are provided reasonable notice under these rules.

(a) Regular Meeting Day for Subcommittees or Working Group

There is no regular meeting day for subcommittees or the working group.

3. NOTICE FOR MEETINGS

(a) Generally

In the case of any meeting of the Committee, the Chief Clerk of the Committee shall provide reasonable notice to every Member of the Committee. Such notice shall provide the time and place of the meeting.

(b) Definition

For purposes of this rule, ''reasonable notice'' means:

(1) written notification;

(2) delivered by facsimile transmission or regular mail, which is

(A) delivered no less than 24 hours prior to the event for which notice is being given, if the event is to be held in Washington, DC; or

(B) delivered no less than 48 hours prior to the event for which notice is being given, if the event is to be held outside Washington, DC.

(c) Exception

In extraordinary circumstances only, the Chairman may, after consulting with the Ranking Minority Member, call a meeting of the committee without providing notice, as defined in subparagraph (b), to Members of the Committee.

4. PREPARATIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Generally

Designated Committee Staff, as directed by the Chairman, shall brief Members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting in order to:

(1) assist Committee Members in preparation for such meeting; and

(2) determine which matters Members wish considered during any meeting.

(b) Briefing Materials

(1) Such a briefing shall, at the request of a Member, include a list of all pertinent papers, and such other materials, that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting; and

(2) The staff director shall also recommend to the Chairman any testimony, papers, or other materials to be presented to the Committee at any meetings of the Committee.

5. OPEN MEETINGS

(a) Generally

Pursuant to Rule XI of the House, but subject to the limitations of subsection (b), Committee meetings held for the transaction of business, and Committee hearings, shall be open to the public.

(b) Exceptions

Any meeting or portion thereof, for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or any hearing or portion thereof, shall be closed to the public, if:

(1) the Committee determines by record vote, in open session with a majority of the Committee present, that disclosure of the matters to be discussed may:

(A) endanger national security;

(B) compromise sensitive law enforcement information;

(C) tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; or

(D) otherwise violate any law or Rule of the House.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a vote to close a Committee hearing, pursuant to this subsection and House Rule XI shall be taken in open session—

(A) with a majority of the Committee being present; or

(B) pursuant to House Rule X, clause 11(d)(2), regardless of whether a majority is present, so long as at least two Members of the Committee are present, one of whom is a member of the Minority, and votes upon the motion.

(c) Briefings

All Committee briefings shall be closed to the public.

6. QUORUM

(a) Hearings

For purposes of taking testimony, or receiving evidence, a quorum shall consist of two Committee Members.

(b) Other Committee Proceedings

For purposes of the transaction of all other Committee business, other than the consideration of a motion to close a hearing as described in rule 5(b)(2)(B), a quorum shall consist of a majority of Members.

7. REPORTING RECORD VOTES

Whenever the Committee reports any measure or matter by record vote, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of, and the votes cast in opposition to, such measure or matter.

8. PROCEDURES FOR TAKING TESTIMONY OR RECEIVING EVIDENCE

(a) Notice

Adequate notice shall be given to all witnesses appearing before the Committee.

(b) Oath or Affirmation

The Chairman may require testimony of witnesses to be given under oath or affirmation.

(c) Administration of Oath or Affirmation

Upon the determination that a witness shall testify under oath or affirmation, any Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman may administer the oath or affirmation.

(d) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) Generally. Interrogation of witnesses before the Committee shall be conducted by Members of the Committee.

(2) Exceptions.

(A) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may determine that Committee Staff will be authorized to question witnesses at a hearing in accordance with clause (2)(j) of House Rule XI.

(B) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member are each authorized to designate Committee Staff to conduct such questioning.

(e) Counsel for the Witness

(1) Generally. Witnesses before the Committee may be accompanied by counsel, subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).

(2) Counsel Clearances Required. In the event that a meeting of the Committee has been closed because the subject to be discussed deals with classified information, counsel accompanying a witness before the Committee must possess the requisite security clearance and provide proof of such clearance to the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at which the counsel intends to be present.

(3) Failure to Obtain Counsel. Any witness who is unable to obtain counsel should notify the Committee. If such notification occurs at least 24 hours prior to the witness' appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain counsel, however, will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(4) Conduct of Counsel for Witnesses. Counsel for witnesses appearing before the Committee shall conduct themselves ethically and professionally at all times in their dealings with the Committee.

(A) A majority of Members of the Committee may, should circumstances warrant, find that counsel for a witness before the Committee failed to conduct himself or herself in an ethical or professional manner.

(B) Upon such finding, counsel may be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

(5) Temporary Removal of Counsel. The Chairman may remove counsel during any proceeding before the Committee for failure to act in an ethical and professional manner.

(6) Committee Reversal. A majority of the members of the Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chairman to remove counsel for a witness.

(7) Role of Counsel for Witness.

(A) Counsel for a witness:

(i) shall not be allowed to examine witnesses before the Committee, either directly or through cross-examination; but

(ii) may submit questions in writing to the Committee that counsel wishes propounded to a witness; or

(iii) may suggest, in writing to the Committee, the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses.

(B) The Committee may make such use of any such questions, or suggestions, as the Committee deems appropriate.

(f) Statements by Witnesses

(1) Generally. A witness may make a statement, which shall be brief and relevant, at

the beginning and at the conclusion of the witness' testimony.

(2) Length. Each such statements shall not exceed five minutes in length, unless otherwise determined by the Chairman.

(3) Submission to the Committee. Any witness desiring to submit a written statement for the record of the proceedings shall submit a copy of the statement to the Chief Clerk of the Committee.

(A) Such statements shall ordinarily be submitted no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness' appearance before the Committee.

(B) In the event that the hearing was called with less than 24 hours notice, written statements should be submitted as soon as practicable prior to the hearing.

(g) Objections and Ruling

(1) Generally. Any objection raised by a witness, or counsel for the witness, shall be ruled upon by the Chairman, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee.

(2) Committee Action. A ruling by the Chairman may be overturned upon a majority vote of the Committee.

(h) Transcripts

(1) Transcript Required. A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during any hearing of the Committee.

(2) Opportunity to Inspect. Any witness testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of the hearing, and may be accompanied by counsel to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. Such counsel:

(A) shall have the appropriate clearance necessary to review any classified aspect of the transcript; and

(B) should, to the extent possible, be the same counsel that was present for such classified testimony.

(3) Corrections.

(A) Pursuant to Rule XI of the House Rules, any corrections the witness desires to make in a transcript shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical.

(B) Corrections may not be made to change the substance of the testimony.

(C) Such corrections shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within 7 days after the transcript is made available to the witness.

(D) Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chairman.

(4) Copy for the Witness. At the request of the witness, any portion of the witness' testimony given in executive session shall be made available to that witness if that testimony is subsequently quoted or intended to be made part of a public record. Such testimony shall be made available to the witness at the witness' expense.

(i) Requests to Testify

(1) Generally. The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee.

(2) Recommendations for Additional Evidence. Any person who believes that testimony, other evidence, or commentary, presented at a public hearing may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation may submit to the Committee, in writing:

(A) a request to appear personally before the Committee;

(B) a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or commentary; or

(C) proposed questions for the cross-examination of other witnesses.

(3) Committee's Discretion. The Committee may take those actions it deems appropriate with respect to such requests.

(j) Contempt Procedures

Citations for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House, only if:

(1) reasonable notice is provided to all Members of the Committee of a meeting to be held to consider any such contempt recommendations;

(2) the Committee has met and considered the contempt allegations;

(3) the subject of the allegations was afforded an opportunity to state, either in writing or in person, why he or she should not be held in contempt; and

(4) the Committee agreed by majority vote to forward the citation recommendations to the House.

(k) Release of Name of Witness

(1) Generally. At the request of a witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee, the name of that witness shall not be released publicly prior to, or after, the witness' appearance before the Committee.

(2) Exceptions. Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Chairman may authorize the release to the public of the name of any witness scheduled to appear before the Committee.

9. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Commencing Investigations

(1) Generally. The Committee shall conduct investigations only if approved by the full Committee. An investigation may be initiated either:

(A) by a vote of the full Committee;

(B) at the direction of the Chairman of the full Committee, with notice to the Ranking Minority Member; or

(C) by written request of at least five Members of the full Committee, which is submitted to the Chairman.

(2) Full Committee Ratification Required. Any investigation initiated by the Chairman pursuant to paragraphs (B) and (C) must be brought to the attention of the full Committee for approval, at the next regular meeting of the full Committee.

(b) Conducting Investigations

An authorized investigation may be conducted by Members of the Committee or Committee Staff members designated by the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to undertake any such investigation.

10. SUBPOENAS

(a) Generally

All subpoenas shall be authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or by vote of the Committee.

(b) Subpoena Contents

Any subpoena authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, or the Committee, may compel:

(1) the attendance of witnesses and testimony before the Committee; or

(2) the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other tangible item.

(c) Signing of Subpoenas

A subpoena authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be signed by the Chairman, or by any Member of the Committee designated to do so by the Committee.

(d) Subpoena Service

A subpoena authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, or the Committee, may be served by any person designated to do so by the Chairman.

(e) Other Requirements

Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of these rules.

(f) Limitation

(1) The working group may not authorize nor issue a subpoena.

(2) A subpoena authorized and issued by the Committee shall not compel the attendance of a witness before the working group, or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other tangible item to the working group.

11. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Definition

For the purpose of these rules, ''Committee Staff'' or ''staff of the Committee' means:

(1) employees of the Committee;

(2) consultants to the Committee;

(3) employees of other Government agencies detailed to the Committee; or

(4) any other person engaged by contract, or otherwise, to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee.

(b) Appointment of Committee Staff

(1) Chairman's Authority. The appointment of Committee Staff shall be by the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman shall certify Committee Staff appointments to the Clerk of the House in writing.

(2) Security Clearance Required. All offers of employment for prospective Committee Staff positions shall be contingent upon:

(A) the result of a background investigation; and

(B) a determination by the Chairman that requirements for the appropriate security clearances have been met.

(C) RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMITTEE STAFF

(1) Generally. The Committee Staff works for the Committee as a whole, under the supervision and direction of the Chairman of the Committee.

(2) Authority of the Staff Director.

(A) Unless otherwise determined by the Committee, the duties of Committee Staff shall be performed under the direct supervision and control of the staff director.

(B) Committee Staff personnel affairs and day-to-day Committee Staff administrative matters, including the security and control of classified documents and material, shall be administered under the direct supervision and control of the staff director.

(3) Staff Assistance to Minority Membership. The Committee Staff shall assist the Minority as fully as the Majority of the Committee in all matters of Committee business, and in the preparation and filing of supplemental, minority, or additional views, to the end that all points of view may be fully considered by the Committee and the House.

12. LIMIT ON DISCUSSION OF CLASSIFIED WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

(a) Prohibition

(1) Generally. Except as otherwise provided by these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, Members and Committee Staff shall not at any time, either during that person's tenure as a Member of the Committee or as Committee Staff, or anytime thereafter, discuss or disclose:

(A) the classified substance of the work of the Committee;

(B) any information received by the Committee in executive session;

(C) any classified information received by the Committee for any source; or

(D) the substance of any hearing that was closed to the public pursuant to these rules or the Rules of the House.

(2) Non-Disclosure in Proceedings.

(A) Members of the Committee and the Committee Staff shall not discuss either the

substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a Member of the Committee or the Committee Staff in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during the person's tenure as a Member of the Committee, or of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(B) In the event of the termination of the Committee, Members and Committee Staff shall be governed in these matters in a manner determined by the House concerning discussions of the classified work of the Committee.

(3) Exceptions.

(A) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), Members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose those matters described in subsection (a)(1) with

(i) Members and staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence designated by the chairman of that committee;

(ii) the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and staff of those committees designated by the chairmen of those committees; and

(iii) the chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chairman of that subcommittee.

(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), Members of the Committee and the Committee Staff may discuss and disclose only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of the annual defense authorization bill with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and the staff of those committees designated by the chairmen of those committees.

(C) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a)(1), Members of the Committee and the Committee staff may discuss with and disclose to the chairman and ranking minority member of a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee with jurisdiction over an agency or program within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), and staff of that subcommittee as designated by the chairman of that subcommittee, only that budget-related information necessary to facilitate the enactment of an appropriations bill within which is included an appropriation for an agency or program within the NFIP.

(D) The Chairman may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, upon the written request to the Chairman from the Inspector General of an element of the Intelligence Community, grant access to Committee transcripts or documents that are relevant to an investigation of an allegation of possible false testimony or other inappropriate conduct before the Committee, or that are otherwise relevant to the Inspector General's investigation.

(E) Upon the written request of the head of an Intelligence Community element, the Chairman may, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, make available Committee briefing or hearing transcripts to that element for review by that element if a representative of that element testified, presented information to the Committee, or was present at the briefing or hearing the transcript of which is requested for review.

(F) Members and Committee Staff may discuss and disclose such matters as otherwise directed by the Committee.

(b) Non-Disclosure Agreement

(1) Generally. All Committee Staff must, before joining the Committee, agree in writing, as a condition of employment, not to divulge any classified information, which comes into such person's possession while a member of the Committee Staff, to any person not a Member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(2) Other Requirements. In the event of the termination of the Committee, Members and Committee Staff must follow any determination by the House of Representatives, with respect to the protection of classified information received while a Member of the Committee or as Committee Staff.

(3) Requests for Testimony of Staff.

(A) All Committee Staff must, as a condition of employment, agree in writing, to notify the Committee immediately of any request for testimony received while a member of the Committee Staff, or at any time thereafter, concerning any classified information received by such person while a member of the Committee Staff.

(B) Committee Staff shall not disclose, in response to any such request for testimony, any such classified information, except as authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(C) In the event of the termination of the Committee, Committee Staff will be subject to any determination made by the House of Representatives with respect to any requests for testimony involving classified information received while a member of the Committee Staff.

13. CLASSIFIED MATERIAL

(a) Receipt of Classified Information

(1) Generally. In the case of any information that has been classified under established security procedures and submitted to the Committee by any source, the Committee shall receive such classified information as executive session material.

(2) Staff Receipt of Classified Materials. For purposes of receiving classified information, the Committee Staff is authorized to accept information on behalf of the Committee.

(b) Non-Disclosure of Classified Information

Generally. Any classified information received by the Committee, from any source, shall not be disclosed to any person not a Member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, or otherwise released, except as authorized by the Committee in accord with the Rules of the House and these rules.

14. PROCEDURES RELATED TO HANDLING OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Security Measures

(1) Strict Security. The Committee's offices shall operate under strict security procedures administered by the Director of Security and Registry of the Committee under the direct supervision of the staff director.

(2) U.S. Capitol Police Presence Required. At least one U.S. Capitol Police officer shall be on duty at all times outside the entrance to Committee offices to control entry of all persons to such offices.

(3) Identification Required. Before entering the Committee's offices all persons shall identify themselves to the U.S. Capitol Police officer described in paragraph (2) and to a Member of the Committee or Committee Staff.

(4) Maintenance of Classified Materials. Classified documents shall be segregated and maintained in approved security storage locations.

(5) Examination of Classified Materials. Classified documents in the Committee's possession shall be examined in an appropriately secure manner.

(6) Prohibition on Removal of Classified Materials. Removal of any classified document from the Committee's offices is strictly prohibited, except as provided by these rules.

(7) Exception. Notwithstanding the prohibition set forth in paragraph (6), a classified document, or copy thereof, may be removed from the Committee's offices in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures shall govern the handling of any classified documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(b) Access to Classified Information by Members

All Members of the Committee shall at all times have access to all classified papers and other material received by the Committee from any source.

(c) Need-to-know

(1 Generally. Committee Staff shall have access to any classified information provided to the Committee on a strict ''need-to-know'' basis, as determined by the Committee, and under the Committee's direction by the staff director.

(2 Appropriate Clearances Required. Committee Staff must have the appropriate clearances prior to any access to compartmental information.

(d) Oath

(1) Requirement. Before any Member of the Committee, or the Committee Staff, shall have access to classified information, the following oath shall be executed:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, except when authorized to do so by the Committee or the House of Representatives.

(2) Copy. A copy of such executed oath shall be retained in the files of the Committee.

(e) Registry.

(1) Generally. The Committee shall maintain a registry that:

(A) provides a brief description of the content of all classified documents provided to the Committee by the executive branch that remain in the possession of the Committee; and

(B) lists by number all such documents.

(2) Designation by the Staff Director. The staff director shall designate a member of the Committee Staff to be responsible for the organization and daily maintenance of such registry.

(3) Availability. Such registry shall be available to all Members of the Committee and Committee Staff.

(f) Requests by Members of Other Committees

Pursuant to the Rules of the House, Members who are not Members of the Committee may be granted access to such classified transcripts, records, data, charts, or files of the Committee, and be admitted on a non-participatory basis to classified hearings of the Committee involving discussions of classified material in the following manner:

(1) Written Notification Required. Members who desire to examine classified materials in the possession of the Committee, or to attend Committee hearings or briefings on a non-participatory basis, must notify the Chief Clerk of the Committee in writing.

(2) Committee Consideration. The Committee shall consider each such request by

non-Committee Members at the earliest practicable opportunity. The Committee shall determine, by roll call vote, what action it deems appropriate in light of all of the circumstances of each request. In its determination, the Committee shall consider:

(A) the sensitivity to the national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States of the information sought;

(B) the likelihood of its being directly or indirectly disclosed;

(C) the jurisdictional interest of the Member making the request; and

(D) such other concerns, constitutional or otherwise, as may affect the public interest of the United States.

(3) Committee Action. After consideration of the Member's request, the Committee may take any action it may deem appropriate under the circumstances, including but not limited to:

(A) approving the request, in whole or part;

(B) denying the request; or

(C) providing the requested information or material in a different form than that sought by the Member.

(4) Requirements for Access by Non-Committee Members.

Prior to a non-Committee Member being given access to classified information pursuant to this subsection, the requesting Member shall—

(A) provide the Committee a copy of the oath executed by such Member pursuant to House Rule XXIII, clause 13; and

(B) agree in writing not to divulge any classified information provided to the Member pursuant to this subsection to any person not a Member of the Committee or the Committee Staff, except as otherwise authorized by the Committee in accordance with the Rules of the House and these rules.

(5) Consultation Authorized. When considering a Member's request, the Committee may consult the Director of Central Intelligence and such other officials it considers necessary.

(6) Finality of Committee Decision.

(A) Should the Member making such a request disagree with the Committee's determination with respect to that request, or any part thereof, that Member must notify the Committee in writing of such disagreement.

(B) The Committee shall subsequently consider the matter and decide, by record vote, what further action or recommendation, if any, the Committee will take.

(g) Advising the House or Other Committees

Pursuant to Section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. §413), and not the Rules of the House, the Committee shall call to the attention of the House, or to any other appropriate committee of the House, those matters requiring the attention of the House, or such other committee, on the basis of the following provisions:

(1) By Request of Committee Member. At the request of any Member of the Committee to call to the attention of the House, or any other committee, executive session material in the Committee's possession, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity to consider that request.

(2) Committee Consideration of Request. The Committee shall consider the following factors, among any others it deems appropriate:

(A) the effect of the matter in question on the national defense or the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) whether the matter in question involves sensitive intelligence sources and methods;

(C) whether the matter in question otherwise raises serious questions affecting the national interest; and

(D) whether the matter in question affects matters within the jurisdiction of another Committee of the House.

(3) Views of Other Committees. In examining such factors, the Committee may seek the opinion of Members of the Committee appointed from standing committees of the House with jurisdiction over the matter in question, or submissions from such other committees.

(4) Other Advice. The Committee may, during its deliberations on such requests, seek the advice of any executive branch official.

(h) Reasonable Opportunity to Examine Materials

Before the Committee makes any decision regarding any request for access to any classified information in its possession, or a proposal to bring any matter to the attention of the House or another committee, Members of the Committee shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, documents, or other materials in the Committee's possession that may inform their decision on the question.

(i) Notification to the House

The Committee may bring a matter to the attention of the House when, after consideration of the factors set forth in this rule, it considers the matter in question so grave that it requires the attention of all Members of the House, and time is of the essence, or for any reason the Committee finds compelling.

(j) Method of Disclosure to the House

(1) Should the Committee decide by roll call vote that a matter requires the attention of the House as described in subsection (i), it shall make arrangements to notify the House promptly.

(2) In such cases, the Committee shall consider whether:

(A) to request an immediate secret session of the House (with time equally divided between the Majority and the Minority); or

(B) to publicly disclose the matter in question pursuant to clause 11(g) of House Rule X.

(k) Requirement to Protect Sources and Methods

In bringing a matter to the attention of the House, or another committee, the Committee, with due regard for the protection of intelligence sources and methods, shall take all necessary steps to safeguard materials or information relating to the matter in question.

(l) Availability of Information to Other Committees

The Committee, having determined that a matter shall be brought to the attention of another committee, shall ensure that such matter, including all classified information related to that matter, is promptly made available to the chairman and ranking minority member of such other committee.

(m) Provision of Materials

The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall provide a copy of these rules, and the applicable portions of the Rules of the House of Representatives governing the handling of classified information, along with those materials determined by the Committee to be made available to such other committee of the House or Member (not a Member of the Committee)

(n) Ensuring Clearance and Secure Storage

The Director of Security and Registry shall ensure that such other committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee) receiving such classified materials may properly store classified materials in a manner consistent with all governing rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and statutes.

(o) Log

The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall maintain a written record identifying the particular classified document or material provided to such other committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee), the reasons agreed upon by the Committee for approving such transmission, and the name of the committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee) receiving such document or material.

(p) Miscellaneous Requirements

(1) Staff Director's Additional Authority. The staff director is further empowered to provide for such additional measures, which he or she deems necessary, to protect such classified information authorized by the Committee to be provided to such other committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee).

(2) Notice to Originating Agency. In the event that the Committee authorizes the disclosure of classified information provided to the Committee by an agency of the executive branch to a Member (not a Member of the Committee) or to another committee, the Chairman may notify the providing agency of the Committee's action prior to the transmission of such classified information.

15. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

(a) Generally

The Chief Clerk, under the direction of the staff director, shall maintain a printed calendar that lists:

(1) the legislative measures introduced and referred to the Committee;

(2) the status of such measures; and

(3) such other matters that the Committee may require.

(b) Revisions to the Calendar

The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes.

(c) Availability

A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each Member, upon request.

(d) Consultation with Appropriate Government Entities

Unless otherwise directed by the Committee, legislative measures referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chief Clerk to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

16. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

(a) Authority

The Chairman may authorize Members and Committee Staff to travel on Committee business.

(b) Requests

(1) Member Requests. Members requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request directly to the Chairman.

(2) Committee Staff Request. Committee Staff requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request through their supervisors to the staff director and the Chairman.

(c) Notification to Members

(1) Generally. Members shall be notified of all foreign travel of Committee Staff not accompanying a Member.

(2) Content. All Members are to be advised, prior to the commencement of such travel, of its length, nature, and purpose.

(d) Trip Reports

(1) Generally. A full report of all issues discussed during any Committee travel shall be submitted to the Chief Clerk of the Committee within a reasonable period of time following the completion of such trip.

(2) Availability of Reports. Such report shall be:

(A) available for the review of any Member or Committee Staff; and

(B) considered executive session material for purposes of these rules.

(e) Limitations on Travel

(1) Generally. The Chairman is not authorized to permit travel on Committee business of Committee Staff who have not satisfied the requirements of subsection (d) of this rule.

(2) Exception. The Chairman may authorize Committee Staff to travel on Committee business, notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (d) and (e) of this rule—

(A) at the specific request of a Member of the Committee; or

(B) in the event there are circumstances beyond the control of the Committee Staff hindering compliance with such requirements.

(f) Definitions

For purposes of this rule the term ''reasonable period of time'' means:

(1) no later than 60 days after returning from a foreign trip; and

(2) no later than 30 days after returning from a domestic trip.

17. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

(a) Generally

The Committee shall immediately consider whether disciplinary action shall be taken in the case of any member of the Committee Staff alleged to have failed to conform to any Rule of the House of Representatives or to these rules.

(b) Exception

In the event the House of Representatives is:

(1) in a recess period in excess of 3 days; or

(2) has ajdourned sine die; the Chairman on the full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may take such immediate disciplinary actions deemed necessary.

(C) Available Actions

Such disciplinary action may include immediate dismissal from the Committee Staff.

(d) Notice to Members

All Members shall be notified as soon as practicable, either by facsimile transmission or regular mail, of any disciplinary action taken by the Chairman pursuant to subsection (b).

(e) Reconsideration of Chairman's Actions

A majority of the Members of the full Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chairman to take disciplinary action pursuant to subsection (b).

18. BROADCASTING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, a majority of the Committee may permit that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions and in accordance with the spirit of the purposes enumerated in the Rules of the House.

19. COMMITTEE RECORDS TRANSFERRED TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(a) Generally

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Notice of withholding

The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the full Committee for a determination of the question of public availability on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

20. CHANGES IN RULES

(a) Generally

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by vote of the full Committee.

(b) Notice of Proposed Changes

A notice, in writing, of the proposed change shall be given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to any meeting at which action on the proposed rule change is to be taken.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the women's caucus to add my strong support to the struggle against domestic violence.

It is important for all Americans to understand we are all impacted by this violence, even if we are not directly victims. Domestic violence undermines the very foundation of our American society, the family. And it undermines our quality of life of all of us because in one way or another our society pays the price, through the increased homelessness, substance abuse, dependence on welfare, juvenile delinquency, and lower productivity in our workplaces that often results from domestic violence.

These negative effects are documented by research which shows that domestic violence dramatically affects a woman's ability to work and support herself and her children. This often forces her to rely on welfare, or even worse, to return to her batterer for financial support.

To help stop this cycle of violence, I will once again introduce the Battered Women's Employment Protection Act, which will help abused women retain their jobs and the financial independence necessary to escape a violent environment.

This act achieves these goals by allowing employed victims of domestic violence, without penalty, access to reasonable time off from work in order to seek legal and medical assistance, make necessary court appearances, and attend to personal security.

Further, to ensure that battered women can remain financially independent, it requires states to provide unemployment benefits to women who are forced to leave their work as a result of domestic violence.

For women attempting to escape abuse, these safeguards are often a matter of life and death. Our society cannot afford to ignore this crisis of violence in so many of our families. Nor can we afford to continue paying the price of its ultimate consequences. I will continue to fight in the 107th Congress to get these provisions enacted into law, and I hope my colleagues and all Americans will join me.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because Sunday marks the 180th anniversary of the revolution that earned the independence of the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. Nearly 400 years ago, after the fall of Constantinople, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the Greek flag at Agia Lavras, sparking a powerful revolution against the Ottoman oppressors.

Citing the values and priorities that led to the establishment of our own country here in the United States, the Greek commander chief, Petros Mavromichalis, once proclaimed that ''in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you . . . it is for you, citizens of America, to crown this glory.''

Following the triumphs of 1821, Greece continued to prove itself as a loyal ally of the United States and an internationally recognized advocate of democracy. Greece is one of only three nations in the world beyond those of the former British Empire to be allied with the United States in every major international conflict of the 20th century.

From the trenches of World War I to the barren fields of Desert Storm, Greece remains faithful to the implementation and sustainment of democracy. Most recently in the Balkans, Greece has played a steady hand of democracy in the face of regional unrest and instability.

Mr. Speaker, we depend on Greece more than ever today. As conflict spreads in the neighboring former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Greece's role as a stable democracy and key NATO ally becomes more important. All eyes now turn to young leaders in the Mediterranean like Greece's Foreign Minister Papandreou to advise us on the path of peace.

A path to peace. Would that we could have one in Cyprus, divided by a cold war barrier that is as ugly as it is outdated.

We look with hope at the new Bush administration and their role in bringing together the leaders from Ankara, Nicosia, Athens to find peace.

Greece is a special jewel of beauty in the Mediterranean from the ecology of Patmos to the vibrant Rembetiko of the Plaka.

I want to wish a hearty congratulations to the Greek people and pay special regards to one of the leading Greek-Americans of northern Illinois, State Senator Adeline Geo-Karis of Zion, who is one of our true leaders. I

am sure she will correct all of my pronunciation in the Greek language.

We wish the Greek people well. To Greece, we say to a free and democratic ally: Cronia polla hellas.

AIDS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. 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 subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to begin by thanking Minority Leader GEPHARDT for allowing tonight's Special Orders to be held to increase the awareness of the AIDS pandemic which is reeking havoc on Africa, the Caribbean, and many other developing nations throughout the world. Africa, however, is the epicenter of this human tragedy.

I rise tonight to express my strong opposition to the lawsuit filed against the South African government by 39 pharmaceutical companies. In 1997, the South African government passed the Medicines Act which would allow the manufacturing and the importation of generic life-saving AIDS medicines. Through this lawsuit, however, the pharmaceuticals would all but halt those opportunities; and this is just downright wrong.

While this suit has been postponed at the request of the pharmaceutical companies, it is slated to be heard by the South African Justice Department in the near future. Should this lawsuit proceed, there is a dangerous potential for life-saving AIDS medicines to be pushed further out of reach for AIDS patients and communities throughout the world and for those who need them the most.

While some pharmaceutical companies have taken steps to lower the costs of these medications, and I applaud their initiatives, life-saving medications still remain far out of reach for millions of people living with AIDS. Ninety percent of the world's 36 million people with HIV face a death sentence, a death sentence because they cannot afford medication because they are poor and because they live in the developing world.

For example, in countries like Zimbabwe and Swaziland, the average life expectancy was 65 to 70 years of age. As a direct impact of AIDS, those rates have decreased to 30 to 35 years of age. This is staggering. In Zimbabwe, it is estimated that one-quarter of all Zimbabweans are infected with HIV. In Botswana, there is a 50 percent chance that teenage girls and boys will contract HIV if a sustained strategy to prevent new HIV infections is not instituted.

In wealthy countries, including the United States, people living with AIDS is treatable. In all of Africa, where more than 70 percent of HIV cases are concentrated and where more than 70 percent of AIDS deaths have already occurred, HIV-infected people face painful, painful death, with no hope of treatment because the essential AIDS medications are just too expensive. They want the drugs but cannot afford the prices set by drug companies.

We must not tolerate the current policy which dictates that life with a manageable illness is possible if one is wealthy or if one has money; however, death from AIDS is certain if one is poor.

The African AIDS crisis has spurred a tremendous public outcry for relief, and AIDS patients are demanding the right to live and demanding the basic human right to affordable treatment.

The South Africa Medicines Act provides the crucial legal clearance required for South Africa to obtain affordable life-extending generic HIV drugs. But the drug companies claim that the South African Medicines Act is criminal and unfairly robs them of their rights to unfettered patent monopoly. But I say that this lawsuit is criminal.

Everyone from international patent experts to the World Health Organization agrees that the South African Medicine Act is perfectly legally sound. While drug companies paralyze the Medicines Act in court, South Africans face preventable deaths.

According to UNAIDS, every day, 6,000, 6,000 more South Africans die from AIDS. The continent of Africa accounts for only 1.3 percent of the global pharmaceutical market in part because the average person lives on less than $300 per year. That is $300 per year, while the average AIDS treatment may cost as much as $15,000 per year.

The multinational pharmaceutical industry is not concerned with African profits. But the drug industry fears the growing awareness on the part of American taxpayers that pills cost pennies to manufacture. The drug industry also fears that the growing awareness that a large percentage of research and development costs are born by United States taxpayers, and the taxpayer-funded inventions are often licensed for a pittance to the world's most profitable industry.

The drug industry fears that this growing awareness will reduce the willingness of United States consumers and public programs to continue to pay the extraordinarily high prices in our own country.

While I call on the United States Congress to stand with the South African government and with people living with AIDS fighting this lawsuit, we must also redouble our efforts in ending this devastating crisis in South Africa, in the Caribbean, everywhere where drug company profiteering keeps essential drugs out of reach of the poor.

We must oppose the lawsuit in South Africa, instead offer concrete support to countries committed to curtailing the AIDS crisis through access to affordable treatment.

□ 1930

We need life-saving action, not litigation, not lawsuits.

HIV-infected persons have a basic right to vital medicines for prevention and treatment of AIDS and must have access to drugs for treatment of opportunistic infections. These are infections related to HIV and AIDS such as tuberculosis, pneumonia, shingles and to anti-retroviral agents.

In this debate, it is extremely important to recognize that access to HIV and AIDS medications is only one part of the solution to our devastating human tragedy in Africa and throughout the world. The United Nations' program on HIV and AIDS estimates that it will cost $3 billion to address HIV prevention in sub-Saharan Africa alone. That is $3 billion in 1 year only.

We need a comprehensive effort to address HIV and AIDS throughout the developing world. While we provide some support for HIV–AIDS education and prevention initiatives, we must increase development and infrastructure building, particularly as it relates to health care delivery systems and long-term health management strategies.

A severe lack of basic health and economic infrastructure does impede our ability to combat the HIV and AIDS crisis in Africa, the Caribbean and throughout the world. Building the bridge between public and private sectors and bringing foreign investors to the table is also central to our strategy in eradicating this disease. These are the crucial elements that are called for in the AIDS Marshall Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my predecessor, Congressman Ron Dellums, for his clarity on this issue and his vision in determining a comprehensive response, and for beating the drug in every village, in every community and on every continent.

This bridge must be built swiftly, otherwise our efforts will be for naught. The AIDS Marshall Plan and the World Bank AIDS trust fund provide a road map that leads to that bridge.

Finally, heavily affected HIV and AIDS countries must receive complete multilateral and bilateral debt cancellation this year so they can respond to this crisis effectively. AIDS is decimating the continent of Africa and

leaving behind millions of orphans in its wake. By 2010, there will be more AIDS orphans in Africa than there are children in America's public schools. This is truly mind boggling.

We cannot sacrifice this generation of children on the altar of indifference. The AIDS epidemic has cut life expectancy by 25 years in some countries. It is a crisis of biblical proportions in Africa and puts the very survival of the continent at stake.

This is not only a humanitarian crisis, it is a looming economic, political and social catastrophe. It is a national security threat. We must continue to raise awareness about the global crisis and this deadly disease and escalate our efforts to find solutions. HIV–AIDS is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is a disease that threatens the entire human family.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must continue its bipartisan efforts as we began last year under the strong leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and my colleagues in the Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), who chairs the Congressional Black Caucus' Health Brain Trust. She is a physician from the Virgin Islands, a region of our world where the epidemic is second in its hardest hit numbers in terms of infection rates.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this issue of the HIV and AIDS pandemic is one that needs to be on the forefront of our agenda every day. I want to use this time to publicly applaud my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for reserving this hour to focus on this issue on the floor of the House, and for her hard work and all of the leadership she has given to the issue of international AIDS.

This Special Order is timely. On the one hand it is timely because of the unfortunate and misguided South Africa case, and on the other hand because of the recent commendable responses by several pharmaceutical companies to the pandemic and the need to make treatment accessible.

Because it does not get much focus, Mr. Speaker, let me use this opportunity to interject some information about my region, the Caribbean. Although many of my colleagues do not recognize it, one of the regions hardest hit by the epidemic is the Caribbean where the HIV infection rates are among the highest in the world, with an adult prevalence rate of 2.3 percent, second only to that of sub-Saharan Africa.

Official estimates show that as of December 2000, there were reported 390,000 persons living with HIV or AIDS in the Caribbean. However, because there are reporting barriers, the real number is estimated to be closer to 600,000. In the English-speaking Caribbean, AIDS is the leading cause of death among men between the ages of 15 and 44; 35 percent of HIV-positive adults are women. A child is either born HIV positive or is infected through breast milk every day in the English-speaking Caribbean.

In my own district in the U.S. Virgin Islands, there is a cumulative total of 380 persons living with AIDS reported since we began tracking HIV and AIDS. That seemingly small number becomes much larger when you put it against our small population of 110,000 people, bringing the Virgin Islands into the top 10 of U.S. States and territories in terms of incidence of AIDS.

Our neighbor, Puerto Rico, ranks among the top five in incidence of AIDS among U.S. States and territories. Major challenges exist in the fight against HIV and AIDS in the Caribbean, not unlike those in Africa and our communities of color here at home.

Yesterday I was visited by representatives of the Global Network of People living with AIDS, which is a network by and for people with HIV–AIDS in Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America, Europe, North America and the Caribbean. With them were representatives of the Caribbean Regional Network of people living with AIDS.

I am always impressed by the commitment, despite severe odds, and the tireless work of these organizations, as well as others, and all of the work that they are doing to stem the tide of this terrible pandemic around the world. I applaud them, and with them I also applaud the many community, faith-based, and advocacy organizations that are on the front lines of the pandemic here in the United States where the epidemic in African American communities bears many resemblances to the global one.

It is on all of these shores that the battle must be fought; and the CBC will continue to be an integral part of it, because whether here or elsewhere, the persons affected are disproportionately people of African descent. And while prevention must be the bulwark of our efforts, we must do all that is possible to make treatment available to those infected regardless of where they live, how they live, and their or their government's ability to pay.

That is why we are here this evening, to call attention, one, to the need to continue the process begun last year with the passage of the Marshall Plan for Africa, and the creation of the trust fund. Now we must fully fund our share and encourage our international partners, both public and private, to contribute to create a trust fund that will be large enough to make a difference.

The provision of effective drugs must be a part of the equation. We hear too many reasons why folks say drugs do not have to be made readily available to the countries that are being devastated in sub-Saharan Africa. They tell us, well, the infrastructure is not in place. Some say there is no way to ensure that the drugs will reach those in need. Others complain that the magnitude of the epidemic is such that we will never be able to provide medicine in the volume needed. I cannot say strongly enough that these excuses are completely unacceptable and unsupportable, as is the lawsuit referred to by my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Our humanity demands we respond on all levels to reduce any barrier to life that this epidemic creates. In doing so we will also be able to address the other obstacles, treating other diseases, such as malaria, sleeping sickness, and the others that also take a mighty toll. Mr. Speaker, we must care about human lives lost. We must care about the effect of those losses on the ability of these countries to grow, to stabilize and to take their place on the world's stage. If nothing else, we must care about the orphaned children to whom parental love and nurturing have been lost forever.

But more than care, we must do something about it. So I also applaud the companies that have stepped up the efforts to make life-saving drugs available, especially those who have recognized the need to allow some drugs to be provided in their generic form, as Bristol Myers Squibb has done in the one instance. This is the kind of example, Mr. Speaker, that we hope others will understand, accept the need for, and follow.

As one of the companies' spokespersons has been quoted as saying last week, this is not about profits. It should not be about profits. It is about poverty and devastating disease. The nature of this pandemic demands that business as usual and even profits be put aside and that every sector respond fully. If we can rise to the occasion demanded by this pandemic everywhere, including in our own communities of color here at home, not only will we bring this pandemic under control, we will significantly improve the health of people and communities beyond this one disease and far into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I yield back to her.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement and also for her major contributions in bringing her medical expertise and her commitment to the body politic here in the United States Congress.

Now, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a real leader on consumer issues, on banking issues, and on women's health issues. She has been very focused in terms of her commitment to access to medicines and to treatment for those living with HIV and AIDS.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today with the gentlewoman from California and other distinguished Members who are concerned about the scourge of AIDS and HIV in sub-Saharan Africa and around the globe.

I am glad we decided to work on this issue from the outset of the 107th Congress. Much discussion but, even more, action needs to occur in the next 2 years if we are serious about combatting the spread of HIV–AIDS and if we want to aggressively work to provide relief to those who are already suffering from this terrible disease.

Those of us here tonight are familiar with the staggering statistics. However, I believe that at least some of them need to be repeated time and again until necessary results are achieved. Since the HIV–AIDS pandemic began, it has claimed 21.8 million lives. Over 17 million men, women and children have died due to AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa alone. Over 36 million people are infected with the HIV virus today. Over 25 million of them live in sub-Saharan Africa. By 2010, approximately 40 million children worldwide will have lost one or both of their parents to HIV–AIDS.

If there is anyone who thinks it does not affect them, let me just point out that one of the side effects of HIV–AIDS has been the development of drug-resistant TB, tuberculosis. One does not have to engage in IV drug use or unprotected sex to get drug-resistant TB. Just sit next to someone on an airplane who coughs on you, and then you have it. So all of us are at risk.

I find it unspeakably offensive that 39 pharmaceutical companies filed suit against South Africa in order to prevent that country from implementing aggressive strategies to make life-saving drugs available and affordable.

□ 1945

I would say that that lawsuit needs to be immediately dropped. As the world's leader, the United States must set the moral example for other nations to follow.

We have to think about this. We are facing a worldwide pandemic that has the potential of eclipsing all plagues of the past, all wars, can destabilize nations and continents and the world, and has been declared a security risk by the United Nations Security Council. The very idea that profits and patents and intellectual property rights would be placed up here while the health of the people of this planet is placed down here is unimaginable. This is a time in history that requires the people of the world to sit down at a table and together to develop the strategies that will end this threat.

I welcome the news that the Bush administration will honor the policies implemented by the Clinton administration on the subject of the access to drugs in developing countries, or at least in sub-Saharan Africa. However, I believe that there is more that can and must be done. President Bush should use existing authority to give the World Health Organization the right to use HIV/AIDS patents where the United States Government has rights to those inventions.

Great progress has been made in developing products to treat HIV and AIDS, and many of those products were developed with taxpayer funding. These publicly financed products should be accessible and affordable to consumers both in the United States and in other countries. Along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), I wrote to President Clinton on this subject last year and intend to raise this issue again with President Bush.

A recent Washington Post editorial stated, ''The administration should lead an international effort to clarify poor countries' right to fight emergencies with generic drugs, and it should declare its sympathy for the South African government in the pending case.'' The editorial went on to say that Robert Zoellick, the U.S. Trade Representative, should come out publicly and declare this administration's support for the Clinton administration's executive order on pharmaceuticals for sub-Saharan Africa.

The Congress and the administration need to work together to form a budget that includes increased HIV/AIDS funding for numerous programs. We also have a number of legislative initiatives that deserve action.

We need full funding for the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund legislation sponsored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH). With this bill, which is a public-private partnership dedicated to fighting HIV/AIDS and developing vaccines, we have the ability to leverage more than $1 billion in U.S. contributions. This bill was authorized for 2 years and funded for this year, and we need to make sure it is included in our appropriations priorities this year.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for her work and for reintroducing the HIV/AIDS Medicines for Poor Countries Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, and which would make it illegal for the United States Government to use the TRIPS agreement, the World Trade Organization agreement, to challenge another country's efforts to make HIV/AIDS drugs available at lower prices. The bill would also prohibit any agency of the U.S. Government from using Federal funds to seek to revoke any law or policy of a developing country that promotes access to HIV/AIDS medicines. Finally, the bill would require the U.S. to urge the World Trade Organization to exempt developing countries from the application of provisions of the TRIPS agreement that restrict their ability to make HIV/AIDS medicines available to their populations at affordable prices.

The Congress, President Bush and his Trade Representative have a responsibility to South Africa and to the rest of the world. It should be the policy of this administration and this Congress to denounce efforts that limit access to lifesaving drugs and to attack the AIDS crisis to the fullest extent. Anything less would be unconscionable.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for a very clear, very passionate statement and for her consistent work on behalf of all humanity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), a sponsor of the Affordable HIV/AIDS Medicines for Poor Countries Act. I also want to make sure that we recognize her tonight for actually leading the Congressional Black Caucus' effort in our initiatives on the whole HIV/AIDS pandemic on a global basis, a strong supporter of the AIDS Marshall Plan, and a leader in our debt relief efforts.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for organizing this effort tonight to address this critical issue of the global HIV/AIDS pandemic. I would like to also thank all of my colleagues who have extended their day to be here this evening to help draw additional attention to this issue.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic is having a severe impact on many developing countries, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa. Approximately 17 million Africans have died of AIDS, including 2.4 million who lost their lives in the year 2000 and an estimated 25 million people in sub-Saharan Africa are living with HIV. In South Africa alone, over 4 million people are living with HIV. That is almost 10 percent of the country's population.

In 1997, the South African government passed a law to make HIV/AIDS drugs more affordable and available for its people. This law allows the importation of commercial drugs from sources other than the manufacturers, a practice called parallel importing, and authorizes the South African government to license local companies to manufacture generic drugs, a practice called compulsory licensing.

International pharmaceutical companies opposed this law, and no less than 39 pharmaceutical companies sued the South African government to block its implementation. Hearings on this lawsuit are scheduled to resume in April. Two of the largest companies participating in the lawsuit, Merck and Bristol-Myers Squibb, have recently cut the prices they charge African countries for their AIDS drugs, but their

prices remain well beyond the reach of the people of South Africa.

I urge all 39 pharmaceutical companies to drop this case before the trial resumes next month. It is absolutely unconscionable that some of the world's wealthiest corporations are trying to prevent an African country from manufacturing or purchasing lifesaving medicines. These are the very same corporations that have steadfastly refused to make HIV/AIDS medicines available to impoverished people in sub-Saharan Africa at reasonable prices. It is time to let African countries take care of their people.

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, known as TRIPS, is one of the international agreements enforced by the World Trade Organization, commonly referred to as WTO. The TRIPS agreement allows pharmaceutical companies to use their patents to prevent poor countries from producing and distributing affordable HIV/AIDS medicines. As a result of the TRIPS agreement and pressure from the pharmaceutical companies, many people in developing countries have been denied lifesaving HIV/AIDS medicines because they simply cannot afford to pay the prices these companies demand.

On March 7, 2001, I introduced H.R. 933, the Affordable HIV/AIDS Medicines for Poor Countries Act. This bill would allow developing countries faced with an HIV/AIDS crisis to enact legislation to expand the availability and affordability of HIV/AIDS medicines without worrying about whether the U.S. Government, the WTO or the multinational pharmaceutical companies will challenge their laws. This bill has over 35 cosponsors; and, of course, I urge all of my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 933.

It would be indefensible for the WTO, which is dominated by the world's richest multinational companies, to deny poor people in the world's poorest countries simple life-prolonging medicines. It would also be indefensible for the United States to support pharmaceutical companies' efforts to prevent poor countries from making AIDS medicines available to their people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying, many of us spent a considerable amount of our time working to dismantle apartheid in South Africa. Many of us were involved at the State level in tremendous divestment of our pension funds from companies that were doing business in South Africa. Some of my colleagues who were here in Congress, I think, led by Congressman Ron Dellums, produced the sanctions bill on South Africa and basically helped to draw attention to what was going on there around the world. We were leaders and we helped to galvanize the world community on the atrocities of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we did not do that work to simply stand by and watch all of these people who suffered for so many years, who fought and died for the right just to live in their country, who fought and died for the right to vote, who fought and died to release political prisoners from prison, we did not do all of that work, joining with this world effort, to stand by and watch 39 pharmaceutical companies try and enforce their intellectual property right and then, after they are confronted by the world activist community, say, ''Okay, we're going to reduce the price of drugs, but the court case remains open.''

Mr. Speaker, we will once again join hands around the world, and just as we fought and we won on the issue of apartheid in South Africa, just as we fought for the release of Nelson Mandela and all of the political prisoners, just as we fought for the right for the ANC to determine the direction of the people of South Africa, we will fight to make sure that people in South Africa and other parts of sub-Saharan Africa and people in other developing nations are not denied the right to simply live because pharmaceutical companies, protecting their intellectual property rights, their patent rights, will not allow them to have access to the medicines they need to live.

I would like to send a signal and a warning to the pharmaceuticals: You cannot get away with tokenism, knowing it is not enough to reduce the price of drugs when still the price that you have reduced it to is not low enough. They still cannot afford it. We want you to get out of the way.

We have seen what can be done in India. We have seen what can be done in Brazil. We are watching them as they deal with HIV/AIDS, as they put together wonderful programs to provide their people with the medicine that they need, reducing the caseloads, helping to prevent HIV and AIDS. We see what can be done if people have access to the basic medicines that they need.

So we will engage one more time in the same kind of battle that we engaged in to get rid of apartheid on this issue. We do not care how powerful the pharmaceuticals are. We do not care how many campaign contributions have been made. We do not care what claims they have with the WTO. We will fight, and we will win. We will win because this is an issue of life and death and morality. This is an issue where the people will not be denied.

So, Mr. Speaker, I close this evening by saying once again, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and all my colleagues who have decided that they are going to take time in their legislative priorities and put this at the top of their priorities. They are doing this, we are doing this, because we believe in the right for human beings to live when we know we have the medicines and the assistance and the resources to help them live rather than die. It is a fight and a struggle we do not wish to be engaged in if we did not have to be. But I think, based on what we have seen, we have been left with no choice; and we will engage in that struggle.

□ 2000

Ms. LEE. I would like to thank the gentlewoman for that very eloquent statement, and also for putting this in a historical context for us and reminding us that we have waged war before on a very ruthless system, and we won, and it is important that we do keep hope alive, because we will win this battle also.

Mr. Speaker, let me now yield to the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), an individual whose life has been committed to social, economic and political justice. He is an individual who constantly speaks the truth on behalf of a variety of issues here in Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) not only for yielding but certainly for organizing this special order and for the tremendous work she has done on behalf of all people who are seeking truth and justice, not only in South Africa but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this discussion with my colleagues, a discussion concerning an epidemic that is negatively impacting the lives of millions of people throughout the world.

Across the Atlantic, millions of Africans are battling with an epidemic that has ravaged the human capital infrastructure, leaving homes and communities barren. The dreams and hopes of millions of people have been deferred as men, women and children engage in a losing battle with the silent but powerful enemy that is sweeping and dismantling Africa at an alarming rate.

It is without question that the HIV–AIDS crisis has rocked Africa. And, yes, I cringe when I hear that 36 million people are infected with the HIV virus today, while 25 million people live in Sub-Saharan Africa alone.

This deleterious enemy has no compassion and strikes without prejudice. HIV–AIDS will have a devastating impact on the fruit of Africa's future, the children. It is estimated that by the year 2010, 35 million children will be infected with HIV–AIDS. Moreover, in the same year approximately 40 million children will have lost one or both of their parents to HIV–AIDS.

I hasten to mention several socioeconomic problems linked to the spread of HIV–AIDS. Millions of children will be left orphaned; industry will suffer due to the decline of a healthy workforce; we will see the sharp decrease of young adult and middle age populations, which will reduce

consumption and halt local economies; we will see the fiscal ruin of poor countries attempting to bear the exorbitant health service delivery costs. Furthermore, communities and homes will be left divided due to the destruction and devastation caused by HIV–AIDS.

In North America and in other countries of wealth, HIV–AIDS is being somewhat controlled. Through collaboration, the road for a brighter tomorrow is chartered. Because we place a priority in stopping this disease in more wealthy countries, citizens have benefitted directly from innovative research and best practices. They have better access to affordable medication, and their quality of life has been greatly enhanced.

Yet this is not the case for Africa. In all of Africa, where more than 80 percent of HIV cases are concentrated and where more than 70 percent of AIDS deaths have already occurred, HIV-infected people face painful death with no hope of treatment because critical AIDS medications are too expensive.

We must unite and work on a solution that provides affordable treatment and needed drugs to treat every African man, woman and child.

The huge discrepancy in the delivery of health services in rich and poor countries begs the question, are we truly serious about assisting our brothers and sisters in Africa? If we are serious about finding solutions to this epidemic, then I charge us to commit ourselves to fighting for the humanity of our African brothers and sisters, at whatever the cost. We must provide life-saving drugs at reasonable cost. We must support funding for innovative research in finding a cure. We must support the regulation of affordable drugs for all Africans infected by this deadly disease. We must support the development of a comprehensive HIV–AIDS policy for Africa.

As a civil society, we ourselves must unite to confront this dilemma head on, to defeat this plague which has us anxious and on the run. It is time for us to stop running and begin to act. That time is now.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) again for not only yielding but for providing this opportunity to discuss such an important issue.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very powerful statement, and also for providing a road map in terms of what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who has been a leader and is a leader on a variety of issues here in this Congress and at home in North Carolina. Specifically, she is working very diligently on the HIV–AIDS crisis in rural communities, and she always reminds us that rural communities have the same types of diseases and same types of disparities that urban communities have to deal with, and oftentimes in greater numbers.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who not only has organized this special order to allow us to express our concern and passion and outrage that we are putting profit over saving lives, but for her tireless and continuous leadership in this area. I am looking forward to the gentlewoman showing us how to make sure we do things in rural America as well.

The gentlewoman has asked us to concentrate on the whole issue of the AIDS epidemic in Africa. The AIDS epidemic has devastated many countries in Africa, leaving few men, women and children untouched. Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely affected by AIDS than any other part of the world. In 16 countries, all, all in Sub-Saharan Africa, more than one in 10 adults is affected by the HIV virus. That is one out of 10.

According to a joint report issued by the Joint United Nations Report on HIV and AIDS, one-half, in fact maybe more than one-half, of all children, 15-year-olds, will either die from AIDS or be affected by it. We cannot accept that as normal.

I want to quote from a recent article in the paper that says this:

> The question of how to provide affordable AIDS medicine to impoverished people is plaguing governments throughout sub-Saharan Africa, where 25.3 million of 36.1 million people with HIV live, according to United Nations estimates. In neighboring Botswana, where 36 percent of adults are infected with the HIV virus, which causes AIDS, the government announced today it hoped to provide antiretroviral medication by the year's end to all who need it.

However, Botswana does not know how they will afford it.

> Botswana has the highest rate of HIV infection in the world, but the country's entire population of 1.6 million is less than the number of HIV patients here.

Their entire population. We need to understand that this is not insignificant. This is a very, very serious problem.

Secretary Colin Powell has indicated that AIDS is a national security problem and an economic problem. I hope this remains a concern of the administration. But, more than that, I hope this translates into real, meaningful policy action that will make a difference in treating those in Africa.

Given the loss of lives that AIDS has caused, the devastation of entire communities and the long-term impact of economic growth, we must step up our effort to fight this devastating disease. With children dying at the age of 15 and with a life expectancy of no more than 45 years for a child born in many of these countries, what should be done should never be a question of other than to save lives. The moral right to save lives outweighs any profit consideration. Saving lives is far more important than protecting the profit rights of the individual companies. We need to accelerate the efforts to increase AIDS awareness in all of these countries as well, particularly in Africa and particularly in rural Africa as well.

In a recent Washington Post story, it was said that information came to a local community some 20 years after the epidemic started, and that information could have saved hundreds and thousands of lives. To demonstrate how slowly information moved, that same article said that it took 3 years for critical information to move from a devastated health center just 3 miles down a paved road. By then, 30 percent of the entire town's population was suffering from HIV, and they need not have had that happen. We have to work to ensure that stories like this are no longer the norm.

Everyone, including governments in Africa, the United States and other governments around the world, must assist in this effort. More support should be given to volunteer counseling, testing and treatment. These programs enable African men and women, not only in terms of prevention but also to learn of their HIV status.

In the United States, people have lived much longer and in improved health with HIV because we indeed have had drug treatment that has increased the quality of life. These drug treatments, however, are too costly and not accessible for most people living in Africa. Until we find a cure, this treatment must be made not only for those of us who live in a developed country but those who live in Africa as well.

Treatment can prolong life, it can add to the quality of life, and, significantly, it can improve the family's opportunity to participate in that. In fact, AIDS-related mortality in this country has fallen by 75 percent because, in the last 3 years, because we have had added to the treatment, so the mortality of AIDS has decreased.

But that is not the case in Africa. In just a 3-year period there are news articles indicating it is growing faster. In fact, children are being orphaned at an increased rate. Many of these orphan children will end up dying because they, too, are infected by AIDS, of which their parents have died. This is unacceptable to society in the 21st century. It is unacceptable morally. We cannot accept this as being a civil society.

There is a treatment called HAART which is highly effective. This therapy has indeed been found by a Congressional Research Service Report to save victims of AIDS. We should indeed make that available.

The President and Congress must keep this issue on the top of the agenda and find assistance, but, most importantly, the pharmaceutical companies

must be urged to provide needed drugs to Africa at a substantially reduced rate. We indeed celebrate and applaud those who have reduced rates. But that is not enough. Drug companies, particularly pharmaceutical companies with these treatments, are compelled to act morally now, not later. Indeed, it is not the moral thing to enter into a lawsuit to protect your property rights while individuals are dying. Indeed, we call on these companies indeed to drop that lawsuit.

The responsibility for treating and hopefully ending the AIDS epidemic is on the shoulders of us all. It is also on the shoulders of the people in Africa, and we ask that they recognize, all of the governments, that they indeed have a problem.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentlewoman has allowed us to speak on this issue.

Let me just say that Africa is indeed suffering from the scourge of this, but I would be remiss in not saying that where the rest of the Nation indeed is getting hold of this problem and indeed moving in the right direction, that five States, including my State, North Carolina, as well as South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi and Alabama, are indeed going in the wrong direction.

□ 2015

These are 5 States that are exceeding the States in other areas. Indeed, poor areas in North Carolina are increasing in the incidence of tuberculosis, as well as AIDS. So I want to work in my State on these emergencies, and I want to urge our citizens and our pharmaceutical companies to respond to the well-documented urgency of millions of people who are dying daily from the scourge of this disease in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to participate.

HIV AND AIDS STATISTICS, NOVEMBER 2000

GLOBAL [1]	
People newly infected with HIV/AIDS in 1999	5.4 million
Adults	4.7 million
Women	2.3 million
Children younger than 15	620,000
Number of people living with HIV/AIDS	34.3 million
Adults	33.0 million
Women	15.7 million
Children younger than 15	1.3 million
AIDS deaths in 1999:	2.8 million
Adults	2.3 million
Women	1.2 million
Children younger than 15	500,000
Total number of AIDS deaths since the beginning of the epidemic.	18.8 million
Adults	15.0 million
Women	7.7 million
Children younger than 15	3.8 million
USA [2]	
Reported total AIDS cases in the U.S. through 1999	733,374
By gender:	
Male	(82%)
Female	(18%)
By race/ethnicity:	
Children younger than 13	(1%)
Whites	(43%)
Blacks	(37%)
Latino/a	(18%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	(<1%)
By method of exposure:	
Men who have sex with men	(47%)

HIV AND AIDS STATISTICS, NOVEMBER 2000—Continued

Injection drug users	(25%)
Heterosexual exposure	(10%)
Blood or blood product infection	(2%)
Reported total AIDS deaths in the U.S. through 1999	430,441

[1] Sources: UNAIDS HIV/AIDS Report on the Global HIV/AIDS Epidemic—June 2000.

[2] Sources: CDC "HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report" Vol. 11, No. 2; National Vital Statistics Reports, Vol. 48 No. 11, July 24, 2000.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her very comprehensive statement and for reminding us that this is a global pandemic. We did declare in Alameda County a state of emergency as it relates to the HIV/AIDS pandemic in our own area in Northern California. I also thank the gentlewoman for reminding the administration of their commitment to address this as a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who serves on the Committee on the Judiciary. I have had the privilege to benefit from her insights in our travels to Africa, looking at the devastation caused by this pandemic as it relates to orphans and children, also as it relates to women and economic development in Nigeria.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and the opportunity to join her on this important Special Order that is seeking to put, again, on the national horizon the question of HIV/AIDS and its international impact. Let me thank the gentlewoman very much for her leadership on the Marshall Plan of the 106th Congress; and of course, we want to see it funded again this year.

I do not know if we realize the deep sphere, the piercing of the heart of what HIV/AIDS has done internationally. In our travels in visiting South Africa, we came upon an area in Soweto where, as we entered the area, we were told of a woman who had just been stoned to death because of her willingness to stand up and admit that she was HIV infected. These are the kinds of cultural differences that bar information from getting to large segments of the population in Africa.

Although I would say that I am gratified by the progress that has been made, it is clearly a necessity that we speak about this issue today and that we encourage and work with and make a strong request to the Congress and to the White House to put this as one of its number one priorities.

Let me also emphasize that this weekend I was able to participate in a community partners conference on HIV/AIDS in the 18th Congressional District in Houston. Over 500 people were present there who obviously were concerned about domestic AIDS, a variety of minority groups from all over the country who have helped sponsor this particular conference; and they too were as concerned about the international impact as they were concerned about the national impact.

As my colleague well knows, we were together at the United Nations when Vice President Gore spoke to this issue, with the support of Kofi Annan and the former United States ambassador to the U.N. It was clear that the members of the Security Council were recognizing that this is a devastating plague. So I believe that it is of necessity that we acknowledge it, we acknowledge the fact that HIV/AIDS has been declared the world's deadliest disease by the World Health Organization. It is expected to grow in intensity in India, Southeast Asia, and in China.

Mr. Speaker, HIV/AIDS has become a plague on the continent of Africa of biblical proportions by claiming over 18 million lives in recent decades. This crisis is having a direct impact on the future viability of many sub-Saharan countries. For this reason, I am delighted this evening to again emphasize the importance of how we can bring about a cure or bring about a diminishing of this terrible impact.

We need additional funding for medication to be made available to the millions of poor around the world, to fight the growing death toll attributable to HIV/AIDS. The impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on sub-Saharan Africa has been especially severe. Since the beginning of the epidemic, over 80 percent of all AIDS deaths have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa, and by the end of 1999 there were an estimated 23.3 million people in sub-Saharan Africa living with HIV/AIDS. That is 70 percent of the total HIV-infected people worldwide.

In sub-Saharan Africa there are over 5,000 AIDS-related funerals per day. That is why when we passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a trade bill and, of course, many went to the floor of the House and said, what relevance does a trade bill have to do with Africa now, when, in fact, they are dying of HIV/AIDS. But it was important, and I offered amendments, to focus the corporate community on providing resources. I am sorry to say that we are not yet there with enough resources to help in the devastating pandemic that is going on and the resources needed to provide the medication.

The world knew the size of the coming catastrophe in Africa and had the means available to slow its progression. Estimates from the World Health Organization in 1990 and 1991 projected a caseload and eventual death toll in the tens of millions by 2000. Yet, we did not act. And now is the time that we must establish the fact of a crisis not only of mind and action, but of heart.

Less than 20 years after doctors first described the symptoms, HIV has infected 53 million people. So far, 19 million have died, roughly the population along the Amtrak route from New York to Washington, D.C. We have pharmaceutical companies who have

offered to provide charitable dollars to help; but I believe we need important action, and that is why I am a cosponsor of the Affordable HIV/AIDS Medicines for Poor Countries Act of 2001. It is important that pharmaceuticals begin in a massive way to allow generic drugs to go into sub-Saharan Africa to be able to confront this problem. It is only a matter of funding, and we need the administration and its White House Office on AIDS policy to begin to develop this kind of strategy and work with the pharmaceuticals to now go to the next step and be able to develop these generic drugs.

The administration and Congress can work together, along with the Congressional Black Caucus and many other caucuses that are concerned about this issue. This effort should be led by drug manufacturers and the Congress. It should be a top priority. We could see an end to unnecessary deaths and suffering by the close of this year if we make the commitment to do so today.

The cost of HIV/AIDS treatment for those living in the Third World is estimated to be about $10,000. It is estimated even if treatment costs were reduced to only $1,000 a year, it would still be far too expensive for Third World countries. Drug therapies that have extended the lives of people living with HIV/AIDS in the United States and other developed countries could cost between $4,000 and $20,000 per person per year in sub-Saharan Africa. We can do this. The treatment of HIV/AIDS involves three drugs that, taken in combination, can prolong the life of an AIDS patient significantly, the cocktail. In the United States we have seen a 75 percent decline in the amount of mortality in the last 3 years.

The therapies which use various combinations of anti-viral drugs emerged in Western countries 5 years ago, transforming the health and future of AIDS patients who took them. Since that time, the gap in medical care between rich and poor countries has grown tremendously. We have a crisis, Mr. Speaker, and we can do something about it. Of the estimated 36 million people living with HIV, more than 25 million are in sub-Saharan Africa.

Nearly 42 million of South Africa's 45 million people are infected with the virus, more than any other country. What I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that the UNAID update report released last week on HIV/AIDS infection rates reports that in many countries, up to 35 percent of all adults are infected with the disease. The report also estimates that half of today's teenage population in parts of Africa will perish from HIV/AIDS, and the most vulnerable group are women in Africa. Fifty-five percent of all adults living with HIV are women. I believe we can do something about this, and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and her visit to the South African conference in Durban, South Africa, in bringing back the information.

This is a time now for us to be concerned about our babies, the babies of the world, the babies in sub-Saharan Africa, the women of the world, the men of the world, families of the world. It is time now that we stand and join in with the World Health Organization, this administration, the Congress, many of our progressive caucuses, including the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. Speaker, and provide a resolution and a solution to the devastation and death.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my democratic colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE from California, in expressing our concerns regarding the ravages of HIV/AIDS on the continent of Africa. For this reason I am in favor of any effort by this body to increase access to HIV/AIDS treatment and education throughout the developing world, but especially on the continent of Africa.

HIV/AIDS has been declared the world's deadliest disease by the World Health Organization. HIV/AIDS has become a plague on the Continent of Africa of biblical proportions by claiming over 18 million lives in recent decades. Unlike the black death in 14th century Europe, which took half as many lives, the means of controlling AIDS were known.

This crisis is having a direct impact on the future viability of many sub-Saharan African communities. For this reason, I am joining Congresswoman LEE of California in support of additional funding for medication to be made available to the millions of poor around the world to fight the growing death toll attributed to HIV/AIDS.

The impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on sub-Saharan Africa has been especially severe. Since the beginning of the epidemic, over 80% of all AIDS deaths have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa. By the end of 1999, there were an estimated 23.3 million people in sub-Saharan Africa living with HIV/AIDS. That is 70% of the total number of HIV-infected people worldwide. In sub-Saharan Africa, there are over five thousand AIDS-related funerals per day.

The world knew the size of the coming catastrophe in Africa and had the means available to slow its progression. Estimates from the World Health Organization in 1990 and 1991 projected a caseload, and eventual death toll, in the tens of millions by 2000.

Less than 20 years after doctors first described its symptoms; HIV has infected 53 million people. So far, 19 million have died, roughly the population along the Amtrak route from New York to Washington, DC.

Recently a drug company announced an initiative to offer a limit of $100 million in charitable contributions of medicines to fight AIDS in Africa.

I would offer that the drug manufacturers and the Congressional Black Caucus should be on the same side in this effort. It is only a matter of funding, which this Administration could take the lead in gathering from the global community of wealthier nations. This effort should be lead by drug manufacturers and the Congress as a top priority. We could see an end to unnecessary deaths and sufferings by the close of this year if we make the commitment to do so today.

The cost of HIV/AIDS treatment for those living in the third world is estimated to be about $10,000 a year. It is estimated that even if treatment cost were reduced to only $1,000 a year it would still be far too expensive for Third World countries.

Drug therapies that have extended the lives of people living with HIV/AIDS in the United States and other developed countries could cost between $4,000 and $20,000 per person per year in sub-Saharan Africa.

The treatment of HIV/AIDS involves three drugs that taken in combination can prolong the life of an AIDS patient significantly.

In the United States, where the treatment has become standard, the AIDS-related mortality rate fell 75 percent in three years.

The therapies, which use various combinations of antiviral drugs emerged in Western countries five years ago, transforming the health and future of AIDS patients who took them.

Since that time the gap in medical care between rich and poor countries has grown tremendously—our nation along with other should be ashamed at this condition.

Now we are faced with a situation where the world's largest drug companies have begun a court challenge of South Africa's efforts to buy cheap, generic substitutes for patented AIDS medicines.

Of the estimated 36 million people living with HIV more than 25 million are in sub-Saharan Africa. Nearly 4.2 million of South Africa's 45 million people are infected with the virus, more than in any other country.

According to the UNAIDS Update report released last week on HIV/AIDS infection rates in many countries up to 35% of all adults are infected with the disease. The report also estimates that half of today's teenage population in parts of Africa will perish from HIV/AIDS. The most vulnerable group being affected by HIV/AIDS is the women of Africa; their infection rate is far greater than males. About fifty-five percent of all adults living with HIV are women, and this rate is expected to continue to rise in countries where poverty, poor health systems and limited resources for prevention and care are present. What fuels the spread of this disease or any disease is, misinformation, cultural practices, passivity on the part of leaders, neglect on the part of those nations with resources that if engaged would make a difference in the fight to win out over the disease.

I would like to commend Congresswoman LEE for her efforts to offer a clear perspective on the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. She recently returned from Durban, South Africa, after participating in AIDS 2000, which was the 13th International AIDS conference.

Now, more than ever, the leadership of the United States is needed in order to avert a tragedy on the Continent of Africa. Therefore, I implore my fellow colleagues of the House to seriously reconsider the level of funding that has been appropriated for this critical area.

Many people have asked why this is important to the United States. I reiterate that aside from the humanitarian perspective, the CIA has issued a report that declares HIV/AIDS a threat to our national security. HIV/AIDS undermines democracy and progress in many

African nations and the developing world. Left to its own course HIV/AIDS will lead to political instability and may result in civil wars, which may affect the global balance of powers as well as economic viability of many African nations. In many of these instances, our military service personnel may be pressed into service in order to defend American interest in any attempt to bring stability to those nation's that decline into civil strife because of the ravages of HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS like any plague cannot be contained in any specific geographical area it will roll across borders of the rich and poor nations alike. Unfortunately, when this dreaded disease came to our shores many felt that it was a calamity for gay people, drug users AIDS knows no boundaries. With globalization, we also must be conscious of the potential for AIDS and other infectious diseases to be carried across borders.

The World Health Organization estimates that 34.5 million children and adults in Africa are living with HIV and/or AIDS. We must work to bring this tragic situation under control using all means at our disposal as a nation, which includes acting in a leadership capacity to encourage other nations to join in an effort to address this mammoth health crisis.

I would ask my colleagues not to continue to bury their minds under useless words, but to apply our collective resources to find solutions to the problem of HIV/AIDS in Africa.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for taking time out of her very busy schedule and making a major contribution to this Special Order tonight.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, I think we have heard tonight from many of my colleagues who are indicating that they believe, as I do, that this lawsuit should be dropped and it should be dropped immediately. We have made some progress in the fight against this pandemic, but we certainly do not need any more obstacles to making sure that people begin to receive medication so that they can live.

I thank my colleagues, once again, for joining us this evening.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, HIV/AIDS continues to devastate women throughout the world and nowhere is it more overwhelming than on the African continent. As news reports tell us daily, AIDS in Africa has reached crisis proportions. Two-thirds of the world's 33 million AIDS infected victims live on the African continent. Tragically, the epicenter of this disease is among African women with profound effects on their children. More than nine-tenths of the eight million children orphaned by AIDS last year were in Africa. What can any of us do?

New and inexpensive drug treatments that help prevent mother-to-child transmission need to be employed in Africa. Governments, corporations and non-governmental organizations must coordinate strengths and cooperate in addressing major problem areas, including the critical absence of adequate infrastructure throughout the continent. Local capacity must be developed through education of the masses, and scientific knowledge needs to be improved.

I call upon the Administration to include $150 million in its FY2002 budget for the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund. This landmark public/private partnership, authorized under the Global AIDS and Tuberculosis Relief Act of 2000, is designed to leverage contributions with additional resources from the international donor community as well as from the private sector. These funds are necessary to implement HIV/AIDS best practices in countries hardest hit by HIV/AIDS.

While the HIV/AIDS disease continues to devastate humanity and finding a cure seems far into the future, we cannot afford to give up. I will continue to devote my time and energy to finding solutions to the myriad difficulties surrounding the treatment and fight against AIDS.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I commend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for organizing today's Special Order and for her leadership in the fight against the global AIDS pandemic. Rep. LEE's work was instrumental in the establishment and funding of the World Bank Trust Fund. With her unrelenting advocacy, over the course of the past year, the world has finally, albeit belatedly, started taking notice of the global AIDS pandemic and the havoc it is creating in the developing world. I join her today in calling for a stronger U.S., international, and multilateral commitment to combat global HIV/AIDS, which is the world's most deadly infectious disease ever.

The social, economic, security and human costs of this crisis are devastating entire nations. Increased funding for global AIDS programs must be provided as part of a renewed commitment to a comprehensive and adequately funded development assistance strategy addressing the new challenges facing the developing world as a result of HIV/AIDS.

The United States must take the lead. Our investment in the fight against the global AIDS pandemic not only has a direct impact, but it also leverages significant funds from other countries and multilateral institutions. Non-governmental organizations working to fight global AIDS believe that the U.S. funding for global AIDS programs should be doubled this year, to a total across all U.S. agencies and programs of $464.5 million. Just to put this number in perspective, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) estimates that $3 billion is needed annually for Africa alone to provide minimal care, anti-viral drugs, and HIV prevention. Estimates of costs for an effective response to the epidemic worldwide start at $7 billion annually.

In FY 2001, Congress and the Administration significantly expanded funding for global HIV/AIDS efforts with the LIFE (Leadership and Investment in Fighting an Epidemic) initiative. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I have served as the Ranking Democrat, succeeded in our effort to dramatically increase funding for global AIDS at the United States Agency for International Development. Programs which last year received $190 million for international prevention, care, and education efforts, including programs to prevent mother-to-child transmission and address the needs of the growing population of AIDS orphans, will receive $315 million in the current fiscal year.

So much more needs to be done.

Comprehensive prevention efforts have turned around HIV epidemics in Uganda and Thailand, and averted an epidemic in Senegal. We know that prevention and education programs work. The United States must now demonstrate leadership in providing needed funding so that effective programs can be expanded and replicated.

We must also invest in the efforts to develop a vaccine. Vaccines are our best hope to bring this epidemic under control, and we must do all we can to facilitate cooperation between the public and private sectors in order to bring together the necessary resources and expertise.

Unfortunately, these challenges are only the beginning. India already has more infected people than any other nation, over 3.5 million. Experts are predicting that without significant efforts to treat those with HIV and prevent new infections the number of people living with HIV/AIDS in India could surpass the combined number of cases in all African countries within two decades. Asia already accounts for one out of every four infections worldwide. The Newly Independent States in the former Soviet Union are also seeing significant increases in their HIV infection rates. There has been a six-fold increase in the number of HIV infections in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the last four years.

Developing nations will be unable to turn the tide on this epidemic if even the most basic health care is unavailable or out of reach for most of their citizens. Yet despite such scarcity, community-based organizations in villages are doing much with little. People must be educated about HIV and how to prevent its spread. Increased testing and counseling opportunities are desperately needed. Basic care and treatment that can be delivered in homes or makeshift clinics is essential. And the need for support for the growing number of children orphaned by AIDS looms large.

Access to affordable drugs is a critical piece of the fight against global AIDS in the developing world. In January, I joined with 28 Members of Congress in writing President Bush urging this Administration to continue the Clinton Administration's Executive Order promoting Access to HIV/AIDS Pharmaceuticals and Medical Technologies. We must take every possible action to ensure that people with HIV/AIDS around the world have access to life-saving drugs.

The fight ahead of us against the global AIDS pandemic is a long one. We have no choice but to engage in the fight and to prevail. I look forward to working with Congresswoman LEE and others here and in the NGO community to promote U.S. leadership in the fight against global AIDS.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and other distinguished members who are concerned about the scourge of HIV and AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa and around the globe. I am glad we have decided to work on this issue from the outset of the 107th Congress. There is a lot of discussion and even more action that needs to occur in the next two years if we are serious about combating the spread of HIV/AIDS and if we want to aggressively work to provide relief to those who are already suffering from this terrible disease.

Those of us here tonight are familiar with the staggering statistics. However, I believe

that at least some of them need to be repeated time and again until necessary results are achieved.

Since the HIV/AIDS pandemic began, it has claimed 21,800,000 lives.

Over 17,000,000 men, women, and children, have died due to AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa alone.

Over 36,000,000 people are infected with the HIV virus today. Over 25,000,000 live in sub-Saharan Africa.

By 2010, approximately 40,000,000 children worldwide will have lost one or both of their parents to HIV/AIDS.

One does not have to look far to come across scores of figures like those I just mentioned. And, as daunting a picture as the numbers paint for us, there are in fact many things that can be done right now to advance the struggle to prevent others from being infected and to help extend the lives of those who are already suffering.

The numerous drug companies that have filed suit against South Africa in order to prevent that country from implementing aggressive strategies to make life-saving drugs available and affordable immediately should be dropped. I am appalled by the drug industry's thirst for profit and willful neglect of the AIDS pandemic in Africa. These companies have to stop putting profits before people. And, as the world's leader, the United States must set the moral example for other nation's to follow.

I welcome news that the Bush Administration will honor the policies implemented by the Clinton Administration on this subject. However, I believe that there is more that can and must be done. President Bush should use existing authority to give the World Health Organization (WHO) the right to use HIV/AIDS patents where the United States government has rights to those inventions. Great progress has been made in developing products to treat HIV and AIDS, and many of those products were developed with taxpayer funding. These publicly-financed products should be accessible and affordable to consumers both in the United States and in other countries. Along with Representatives JACKSON, WATERS, and LEE, I wrote to President Clinton on this subject last year and intend to raise this issue again with President Bush.

A recent Washington Post editorial stated,

> The Administration should lead an international effort to clarify poor countries' right to fight emergencies with generic drugs, and it should declare its sympathy for the South African government in the pending case.

The editorial went on to say that Robert Zoellick, the U.S. Trade Representative should come out publicly and declare this Administration's support for the Clinton Administration's Executive Order on pharmaceuticals for sub-Saharan Africa.

The Congress and the Administration need to work together to form a budget that includes increased HIV/AIDS funding for numerous programs. We also have a number of legislative initiatives that deserve action.

We need full funding for the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund—legislation sponsored by Congresswoman LEE and Congressman LEACH. With this bill, which is a public private partnership dedicated to fighting HIV/AIDS and developing vaccines, we have the ability to leverage more than a $1 billion U.S. contribution. This bill was authorized for two years and funded for this year and we need to make sure it is included in our appropriations priorities this year.

I want to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her work and for reintroducing the HIV/AIDS Medicines for Poor Countries Act, which I am an original cosponsor of, and which would make it illegal for the U.S. government to use the TRIPS agreement to challenge another countries efforts to make HIV/AIDS drugs available at lower prices. The bill would also prohibit any agency of the U.S. government from using federal bills to seek to revoke any law or policy of a developing country that promotes access to HIV/AIDS medicines. Finally, the bill would require the U.S. to urge the World Trade Organization (WTO) to exempt developing countries from the application of provisions of the TRIPS agreement that restrict their ability to make HIV/AIDS medicines available to their populations at affordable prices.

The Congress, President Bush, and his Trade Representative have a responsibility to South Africa and to the rest of the world. It should be the policy of this Administration and this Congress to denounce efforts that limit access to life savings drugs and to attack the AIDS crisis to the fullest extent. Anything less would be unconscionable.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). 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, I rise to offer comment on a source of poor women's health that is one hundred percent preventable—injuries and deaths caused by domestic violence. The injuries, mental and emotional conditions of women and their children who are the witnesses or victims of domestic violence could be prevented, but there is a lack of resolve on the part of Congress to make this a top priority.

The dynamics of domestic violence are all encompassing and usually starts as emotional abuse that evolves into physical abuse that can result in serious injury or death on not only women, but also the children living in that home.

As a result, the federal government has moved to establish Violence Against Women and training programs that serve the young victims of domestic violence who either experience or witness violence.

It is alarming to note that according to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, between 50 and 70 percent of men who abuse their female partners also abuse their children. Moreover, at least 3.3 to 10 million American children annually witness assaults by one parent against another. Consequently, the children of domestic violence are at a high risk of anxiety and depression and often experience delayed learning skills.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence affects women of all cultures, races, occupations, and income levels. Ninety-two percent of reported domestic violence incidents involve violence against females.

Although domestic violence effects women across all racial and economic lines, a high percentage of these victims are women of color. African American women account for 16 percent of the women who have been physically abused by a husband or partner in the last five years. African American women were the victims in more than 53 percent of the violent deaths that occurred in 1997. This is why we must continue to fund programs like the Violence Against Women Grants that also fund projects to encourage arrests of the perpetrators of these most dreadful crimes.

I am joining my colleagues of the Women's Caucus to express concern about the plight of women's health in our nation, but to also include in that debate the negative health effects of domestic violence on our nation's women.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to bring awareness to the specific problems within my state of Texas. In Texas, there were 175,725 incidents of family violence in 1998. An estimated 824,790 women were physically abused in Texas in 1998. Of all of the women killed in 1997, 35 percent were murdered by their intimate male partners. In 1998, 110 women were murdered by their partners.

A new member of my staff is an advocate against and survivor of domestic violence and she offers this message to those who seek to remedy this situation. On March 18, 1990, she made the difficult decision to end her marriage of fourteen years, which was plagued by marital abuse. From her experience she has committed her life to advocating for and assisting women in crisis. "Women often do not want the relationship to end, they want the violence to stop!" Instead of seeing women as helpless victims they are in fact courageous survivors who work hard to preserve their families. The women of which I speak was the organizer of the City of Houston's first Candlelight Vigil in observance of Domestic Violence Awareness Month. She was asked by Vice President Al Gore at a White House ceremony, unveiling postage stamps with the National Domestic Violence Hotline number on the cover, to tell her story.

An example how important federal efforts in this area are demonstrated by the impact that VAWA grants have had on services in the local community. In Houston, we have the Houston Area Women's Center which operates a domestic violence hotline, a shelter for battered women and counseling for violence survivors. The center provides all of its services for free.

Furthermore, this center maintains an invaluable website that allows anyone to access information about domestic violence resources and support networks.

Over 34,000 women in Houston called for counseling services in 1997 for family violence. This counseling included services for women with children and teenagers who have also survived violence. The shelter housed 1,062 women and children and assisted close to 2,000 with other forms of services.

The Texas Council on Family Violence has used VAWA funds for several projects as well. These include the National Domestic Violence

Hotline, Technical Assistance and Model Policies and Procedures Project, the Texas Domestic Violence Needs Assessment Project and the Domestic Violence Rural Education Project.

Unfortunately, the STOP Grant funding for the Texas Council on Family Violence has decreased within the last 2 years from $8 million in 1999 to $8.5 million in 2000. Because the funding level for the Violence Against Women Grants has remained at the same level as fiscal year 2000, it is imperative that we increase funding so that these vital programs will be properly funded as we move into the new millennium.

As the public service announcement of the Texas Association Against Sexual Assault indicates, "Most people think rape happens in a dark alley. That beautiful women are the usual victims. But sexual violence isn't really about sex, it's about power. And it can happen to anyone, anywhere . . ."

Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Grants and the Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women's Act are the most important weapons that women and men have in this country to ensure that gender-motivated violence does not continue to increase in this society. I ask my colleagues to support these and other legislative initiatives in this Congress so that we may move forward, not backward in our fight to end domestic violence everywhere.

PUBLIC LANDS IN THE UNITED STATES AND RELATED TOPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for our little nightside chat this evening, there are a couple of topics that I would like to discuss with my colleagues, primarily involving public lands in the United States. As many of my colleagues know, and many may not be aware of, quite frankly, there is a distinct difference between the urban areas of the United States and the rural areas of the United States and even more of a distinct difference between the eastern United States and the western United States. Now, granted, the United States is one country, and we have a lot in common, but the reason that we have a lot in common is because we have the respect where we do not have things in common to understand that we work as a team. So this evening I want to go through some discussion on public lands.

I think the best way to begin this is to talk about a wonderful book that I have just almost finished reading. I would recommend it to my colleagues. As I should disclose, I do not know the author, I have never met the author, I do not have any interest in the book, other than it is fascinating. It is the book on the transcontinental railroad. The author is Stephen Ambrose, and it talks about the major accomplishment that was necessary in this country for the entire country to come together to build a transcontinental railroad, the armies that were necessary to put this thing together. I think really just reading a little of the first part, just a couple of paragraphs, because I do not like to read during my Special Order speeches, my nightside chat; but I thought here it would probably be appropriate, so that we can get a taste, a little idea of the flavor of what was necessary to build the transcontinental railroad in the United States.

In our own minds, we need to kind of put ourselves back 150 years and think of the United States, a new country, relatively speaking, out into the frontier, a frontier that most of the population of this country had never even set foot on, a frontier which had never been really surveyed in any kind of detail. In fact, the surveying techniques back then were still pretty rough as compared to today's GPS system.

So as I say that, keep this in mind. We need to put our mindsets for a moment back 150 years, back to about 140 years, 1858, put our minds there for a moment and listen to this: ''Next to winning the Civil War and abolishing slavery, building the first transcontinental railroad from Omaha, Nebraska to Sacramento, California was the greatest achievement of the American people in the 19th century.'' Next to winning the Civil War and abolishing slavery, that was the big accomplishment of the 19th century. ''Not until the completion of the Panama Canal in the early 20th century was it ever rivaled as an engineering feat. The railroad took brains, it took muscles and sweat in quantities and scope never before put into a single project. It could not have been done without a representative democratic system.''

Let me repeat that. It could not have been done without a representative, democratic political system. It could not have been done without skilled and ambitious engineers, most of whom had learned their craft in American colleges and honed it into war. It could not have been done without bosses and foremen who learned how to organize and lead men as officers in the Civil War; without free labor, without hard working laborers who had learned how to take orders in the war; without those who came over to America in the thousands and thousands and thousands from China seeking a fortune; without laborers, many speaking different languages and coming to America from every inhabited continent in the world.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, it could not have been done without the trees and without the iron available in America; without the capitalist willing to take high risks for great profit; without men willing to challenge all at every level in order to win all; without men to challenge all at every level to win all. Most of all, it could not have been done without teamwork. Nothing like it in the world. And that is the title of the book, Nothing Like It in the World by Stephen Ambrose.

Nothing Like It in the World is the story of the men who built the transcontinental railroad, the investors who risked their businesses and money, the enlightened politicians. By the way, the standout of the enlightened politicians, the political mover of the transcontinental railroad in the United States was Abraham Lincoln.

When my colleagues go out and talk to your constituents and say name the two major accomplishments of Abraham Lincoln, from a political viewpoint, obviously, most everybody I know could answer the first, the abolishment of slavery and the victory in the Civil War. But not very many people out there understand the role, the significant role, of which the transcontinental railroad could not have been built without Abraham Lincoln. In fact, even the measurement of how far the rails are apart was put in place by Abraham Lincoln.

The Union had won the Civil War, and slavery had been abolished, but it was Abraham Lincoln who was an early and constituent champion of railroads. Unfortunately, as we all know, Abraham Lincoln would not live to see this great achievement. Even the scheme of how to have it built, to have the government finance and to have the government put two private companies on two opposite ends of our great country in competition to build that railroad, and their destination was to the final mile of track to be laid which, of course, they met in Utah.

It was the last great building project to be done mostly by hand. Can you imagine the surveying back then to go out into the mountains of the Sierras or to go into the plains of Nebraska and trying to figure out a direct route which would support a railroad, the likes of which the world had never seen? The manpower took tens of thousands of men and women, but tens of thousands of people to be able to go out there and lay that track, just the organization of those thousands and thousands of working people.

If we had not had the Civil War, we probably would not have had the organization in place, because the amount and number of people that we took out there and the logistics that were necessary to put this thing together had been earlier put together through the Civil War. So there was a benefit coming out of the Civil War. In addition to that, people knew how to take orders. People knew how to be foremen.

The Chinese labor, which played a major role, they wanted to come over here. They returned to their homeland, China, as rich people.

It is amazing, as I said earlier, that this was the last building project to be done mostly by hand, excavating dirt, cutting through ridges, filling gorges, blasting tunnels to the mountains; and, as the book says, those tunnels, they would have to hand bore a hole into the rock, and they would use thousands and thousands of kegs of powder to blow the rock apart.

Many times the explosion would just come back out, and they would have to start again. On a good day, according to the book, on a good day these hard-working people would be able to dig into that granite and maybe move 6 inches a day.

At the height of the construction of this railroad, those companies were laying rail for the first transcontinental railroad at the pace a man could walk. Imagine laying rail at the pace a man could walk. Imagine the accomplishment of this country, of the political system that would allow this kind of massive project to be put together, of the engineer, of the support, of the young power, the young people that went out there because, as my colleagues know, this was back-breaking work.

It is a part of the history of this country. And as I move on to what I want to talk about, public lands, the transcontinental railroad really was one of the most significant events in the history of this country. It changed everything.

For example, my colleagues may not know this, but we had no time zones before this railroad was put into place. Every community in the United States kept its own time. It is the railroads that put time zones in place in the United States.

It is the railroads that allowed one person to have more than one store because they could ship their products from one place to the other. It was the railroads that allowed the cattle and so on to be shipped across the country. It was the railroads that allowed many, many different things.

It changed the entire nature of the United States of America. It allowed America to expand across the lands it had purchased through, for example, Louisiana Purchase and the other purchases of which we had put together out in the West. You know, it is very interesting.

Again, before I set the book down, it is Stephen Ambrose, and the title of the book is Nothing Like It In The World. I encourage my colleagues to take a look at this. It is a fascinating book.

By the way, every history class in America ought to have some time devoted to the transcontinental railroad and what it did for America and how it moved us into the settlement of the West and the production and the manufacturing. Every business class, every college in America ought to be aware; and this book, frankly, does a good job of it. They ought to be reading this book to understand what a massive project it was.

Again, our minds are still back, colleagues, around the 1858s, 1860s. The Civil War was just getting over, and out here in this country we knew that the law back then was not that you simply had a title to a piece of land. A piece of paper saying you owned a piece of land did not mean a whole lot back then, especially in the frontier of the West. It did not mean a lot.

What meant a lot was possession. If you did not possess the land, and all of us have heard that saying that possession is 9/10 of the law. That is what it meant. That is where it came from. If you did not possess it, the chances of you being able to retain legal title on it were not very good.

This country, the population of this country was primarily on the East over here to my left on the map. Our population centers were right along the East. That is where we saw it. We had all of this land out here. By the way, as we begin to build the transcontinental railroad, then we came from both ends.

On this end, over on the California end, we had no steel production. We did not have rails and the timber and so on. We had to harvest the timbers as they came across for the ties. All of that had to come down and back around.

But back in those days what they wanted to do, what our government wanted to do, what the people of this country wanted to do was to settle the new frontier, to claim that land for that new country, the United States of America. And it is from that intent that the dynamics of much of the difference between the East and the West and public lands and government lands, it is from there that these differences were borne.

Let me give my colleagues an example. In the East, they have private property ownership; and if you take a look, I have some very interesting statistics that I think will help us get the picture of concentrations of people. Today take a look. We know we just had the Census come out to give you a concentration of people. This is total, 78 percent of the people in America lives in the East Coast. The remaining 22 percent that we have in our country is West, this area. But of that 22 percent, half of them live in the State of California.

In comparison, this area of the country is pretty sparsely populated. When my colleagues take a look at the difference in ownership, and this is a critical factor, and I will explain how we got there, but this is a critical factor, when my colleagues from the East wonder why we in the West stand up and talk about public lands and we stand up and talk about the need to use these public lands, you have to understand that in the East your ownership is dominated.

The ownership of land in the eastern United States, as pointed out here, is dominated by private ownership. In the East, it is almost all private property. In the West, ownership is dominated by government ownership; and this map that I have to my left demonstrates that. The color on the map, whether it is the light green or the dark green or the red, the colors on that map indicate or show, demonstrate land that is owned by the government.

The white parts of the country is private ownership, private land ownership. Take a look at this in the West.

Now, the district that I represent is the 3rd Congressional District of Colorado. I would like to point it out here. That district goes right along the edge, and it goes from Wyoming to the State of New Mexico.

My district, most of my colleagues have been in my district. If my colleagues have ever skied in Colorado, if my colleagues have ever vacationed in the mountains, the odds are you were in my district here in the 3rd Congressional District. That district is larger than the entire State of Florida, but my colleagues can see it is on my eastern boundary.

On my eastern boundary, where the difference between public land ownership to the West and private ownership to the East meet, they meet right on my district line. They meet on the line as it goes out further to the north and further to the south.

How is it? How in the history of our country did we come up where primarily you have private ownership in the East and you have primarily government ownership in the West? It is the very factor that is talked about in this book. It is the very factor of talking about settling the West. Go West, young man. Go West. That was the theory, because our population was so populated in the East as it is today.

The government decided to give some kind of incentive for people to leave the safety of the cities in the East where commerce was healthy, where there was sophistication, so-called, we put that in quotes, where there was movement and populations and lots of thriving economy. You had to be able to give some kind of incentive to get people to leave the populations of the East and head West to possess the land.

The transcontinental railroad was just a part of that. But even before that, again we are in that 1858 to 1865 time period, in 1862, the Homestead Law was enacted by Congress. Most of my colleagues have heard about the Homestead Law.

An interesting note for my colleagues, the reason the Homestead Law was not enacted before 1862 was that the southern States knew that any settlement in the West or any new States in the West would be free States. They

would oppose slavery. So it took until 1862 when the southern States had left the Union. It took until 1862 to pass the Homestead Act because, prior to 1862, the southern States defeated the Homestead Act.

What is the Homestead Act? The Act enacted in 1862 provided that either head of a family, either head of family, which is interesting back then because there was recognition of the woman, but even the woman or the man as head of the family had to be 21 years old or a veteran of just 14 days in service in the Armed Forces. And if you were a citizen, you could acquire a tract of land under private ownership. You could acquire a tract of land of 168 acres.

And what happened, every American's dream, every American's dream is to own private property. Every American's dream back then was to own a farm. You see, our land, our economy back then was 98 percent agriculture, and it was your dream back then to go out and have your own piece of land. And 160 acres under the Homestead Act, even the poor people of our country could go out. You did not have to be rich to have the land. All you had to do was commit to that piece of land 5 years. You had to live on it and work on it for 5 years.

That was enough incentive to entice a lot of our population, not a lot, but enough of our population would be more proper terminology, enough of our population to go West, young man, go west, and that is what they did.

They begin to move into these areas. They begin to go into the Iowas and the Nebraskas and the Ohios and down here in the regions, the Oklahomas. As they got up here in the Dakotas and so on, a funny thing happened, what is that saying, a funny thing happened on the way to the play? A funny thing happened on the way to the West Coast.

What happened was this, when they started to move West, they found out in the State of Kansas or up there in Nebraska that 160 acres really was not quite enough in some spots to produce enough agriculture to support one family. In a lot of areas, it was enough land to do that.

They actually amended the Homestead Act to double the 160 acres in some places to make it 320 acres. That is why you have a homestead of 160 and some of 320. Some areas out in here took 320 acres to support a family. Remember the focus of the country back then was a family. What was necessary to provide for an average family?

□ 2045

They based on that on acres, 160 acres or 320 acres. But as I said, something happened on the way to the West. They hit the Rocky Mountains. What happened in the Rocky Mountains? This starts to begin to explain our differences, why we have so much government ownership in the West and very little public ownership in the East, why in the East we are dominated by private property ownership, and in the West we are dominated by government ownership.

What began to happen is when people, our frontiersman, the explorers, the brave people, the men and the women and the husbands and the people who went out, a typical life-span was probably 35 years old, the disease and so on that took so many of their lives, but they continued as frontiersmen to go into the West.

When they hit the Rocky Mountains, guess what they discovered? They got up in that kind of country, number one, they found out that, in the East, you try to get rid of your water. In the West, you try and conserve water. They discovered that the West was a very arid place, that it did not have water like the East did.

On top of that, they discovered 160 acres in many places would not even support a cow. There was no way possible for you to be able to support a family in the Rocky Mountains on 160 acres from an agricultural point of view.

So what was the result? We found that our populations were going around the mountains. They found here in California, see this patch in California where you have private property, the white spot there, a lot of private property ownership there. That was prosperous. People were skipping this area, and they were coming around into the private property ownership areas of California where you could become prosperous, where you could support a family in the valleys and so on of California.

Well, the government realized that this was a problem. We did not want people bypassing and going around and ending up in California. We wanted people to live all the way from California to New York.

So they had to come up with some kind of remedy to convince people to live in the Rocky Mountains, to convince people to live in this arid part of the country.

So they did the calculation. Somebody came up and said, you know, in order to support a family in the Rocky Mountains, a family may need 3,000 acres, not 160 acres, which was later amended to 320 acres, but like 3,000 acres to support a family.

The government, as one can understand, said, wait a minute. We cannot give 3,000 acres to everybody that comes in under the Homestead Act. We cannot amend the Homestead Act to provide 3,000 acres.

Thereupon was born the idea, hey, instead of selling the land, instead of allowing our citizens to go out and work the land and take title to the land, let us loan them the land. Let us keep ownership of the land but allow the people to go out and use the land.

They talked about it, and they debated it. It was never the intent of this government, ever, it was never the intent of this government to take this part of the Nation and tie up almost the entire Western United States and almost all of Alaska.

Take a look at when we brought Alaska in as a State. Take a look at when the Seward's Folly bought Alaska. It was never the intent of the government and it has never been the intent of the government to make that land off limits to people. It was never that intent.

Today you will hear people who urge, hey, let us get them off the Federal lands. Ironically, most of those claims and those urges come from the East because they feel no pain. They do not have a lot of government land in the East. But we are completely surrounded.

For example, in my district, outside of the city of Pueblo, my communities, whether it is Glenwood Springs, Colorado, whether it is Durango, whether it is Grand Junction, Meeker, Craig, Telluride, Aspen, Snowmass, Vail, it is completely surrounded by government lands.

The fact is that never ever, and I keep stressing this because it is so critically important, never in the history of this country was it the intent of the government, of the people, of the citizens, or of any organization to take that part of the country that is in color on this map and make it off limits to the citizens of this country. It was always the intent of the Federal Government and the government lands here to manage those lands in such a way that you could have a concept called multiple use.

Now, many of my colleagues grew up, as I did, going into the National Forests. Do my colleagues remember what the sign was that hung on the National Forests? For example, the White River National Forest, whose headquarters are in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, do my colleagues remember what that sign said? It says ''Welcome, you are now entering the White River National Forest''. Underneath that hung a sign that said ''A land of many uses''. That is exactly what our forefathers wanted, a land of many uses.

The government would keep title because of the politics. Because of the politics of giving that much land to one person, the government kept title, which explains exactly why the government owns these vast amounts of land. They kept title. But they always intended for it to be a land of many uses. That concept has worked very well over the years.

Now obviously the government maintained the management responsibility. Every one of us in these chambers have management responsibilities on government lands.

As science advances, as our own technology and management of lands advances, we have to change our management process. But never has our management required that, in bulk, we take people off the lands.

I come from a land where we are surrounded by the government. We live in a country where we all dream of private land ownership. We live in a country that was to be free of the government, that the government worked for the people. The people did not work for the government. That is the concept of our country.

Yet, in the West, we find ourselves besieged by people who do not face the same challenges we do, and some who face the same challenges but, in my opinion, do not appreciate the fact that we are almost totally dependent upon government lands for our subsistence, our recreational subsistence, our environmental protection, our highways, our power lines, our water.

I will give my colleagues an example. Water in the State of Colorado, almost every drop of water in Colorado in the western half is stored upon, originates, or runs across Federal lands. Can one imagine if our use of that water, if the many uses of lands, a land of many uses was prohibited as some people now urge?

Now, let me say that the public lands have with it, as I mentioned earlier, a very high responsibility. These lands do belong to the people of the country. But I am tired of hearing the argument that, hey, the people back here, the people that enjoy complete private ownership, look, some of these States we cannot even find a government spot in, but I am tired of some people who say, look, you know, we should not allow these people, for example, to have a ski area in Colorado, to expand a ski area, to have a highway, to have power lines. My colleagues cannot imagine what we go through.

To give my colleagues an idea, out here in the East, when one wants to build a ditch for water, when one wants to build a highway, when one wants to do some kind of alteration of the land, one goes to one's public zoning board. One may go to one's municipality or to one's county, the zoning board.

When we want to do it out here in the West, our zoning board is located here in Washington, D.C., the BLM or the Department of Interior or the Forest Service or the United States Congress. That is where our planning and zoning board is. So as one can expect, it gets somewhat frustrating for those of us.

I can tell my colleagues that, for some reason out there, there seems to be a connotation that, if one supports many uses of the public lands, why, one must be against the environment. That could not be further from the truth.

The reason many of us live out there is because of the environment. We do not live out there because we get rich living out there. We live out there because, and I happen to think my district is one of the most beautiful, and I think most of my colleagues on the floor would agree, my district is one of the most beautiful districts in the country.

My district has got 54 mountains over 14,000 feet. My district is the highest district in the Nation. We live at the highest elevation in the Nation. It is beauty everywhere one looks.

But do my colleagues know what we have discovered over the years, people can live amongst that beauty without scarring it.

Now, we have learned a lot. We learned that the mining techniques, for example, which pretty much are gone now in the mountains, and that argument could be held one way or the other, we learned that the old mining techniques tore up the land, and we are now recovering a lot of that land.

But we also know, for example, for our forests, we have learned a lot about forest and forest health. We know that in forest and forest health that management of that forest, taking timber out of the forest, not for the sake of commercial timber, but to manage the forest for our wildlife, for the health of the forest is necessary.

I think it is incumbent upon those of my colleagues who do not live near public lands, I think it is incumbent upon them to take a little time to understand why in the West we have different problems because of the fact that we live on government lands or we are surrounded by government lands, compared to the problems my colleagues have under private ownership.

Let us go just for a moment, I want to talk about another book here that is very fascinating about the forests in America. This is strictly now limited to forests, not just public lands. This book is by Douglas McCleary. It is called ''American Forests, a History of Resiliency and Recovery.'' Now, again, I have never met the author to the best of my knowledge. I am just telling my colleagues this is a good book, a good reference book for something I am talking about. I think it would be good to talk about a few interesting factors that are highlighted by this book.

Now, this book, by the way, is not put out by an environmental organization. It is not put out by a lumber company. It is put out by an individual who has gained a reputation for integrity in his investigations and his facts.

Let us read a few things. ''Following two centuries of decline, the area of forest land has stabilized. Today the United States has the same amount of forest area as it did from 1920.''

Now, if my colleagues listen to some of this propaganda, a lot which, by the way, has just come on recently to raise funds, attacking the Interior Secretary Gail Norton, who I know personally. I have dealt with Gail. I have worked side by side with her, she is from Colorado, for years and years. This is an individual in my opinion of high integrity, but who is being assaulted by certain organizations who want to use her as a fund-raising technique. If one listens to some of this advertising, one would think the forests out here have been devastated.

Again, look at it, the forests today are as large as the forests were in 1920. One could never gather that from those commercials that one hears.

''Nationally, the average volume of standing timber per acre in the United States forest is about one-third greater today than it was in 1952. In the East, the average volume per acre of standing timber'', this is not processed timber, this is not commercial timber, this is standing timber, ''in the east, the average volume of standing timber is almost doubled.'' In the West, it is a third greater than it was just 50 years ago, a third greater in standing timber.

Now, remember, a large part of this is because, in the early days, for example, when the transcontinental railroad went through, they took a lot of forest. They took a lot of timber down. The trains, the steamships, the food, everything depended on timber. They put their cows in there. They did not manage the harvest of it. They cut timber tree after tree after tree for the ties underneath the rail. Remember all those steam locomotives, before they put coal in there, they threw wood in there.

And the fence, back then, the fences were all built of wood. Today, this is before the invention of barbed wire or wire for fences. So a lot of the uses of wood have been reduced. So that is in fact a contributing factor that we have to consider when we talk about the increase here.

But nonetheless, listen to this: ''The populations of whitetail deer, wild turkey, elk, pronghorns, and many other wildlife species have increased dramatically. Tree planting on all forest land rose dramatically after World War II, reaching record levels in the 1980s. Many private forests are now actively managed for tree growing. 70,000 certified tree farms encompass 95 million acres of privately owned land.''

In other words, now the big thing is not farming, but actually growing trees.

''The tens of millions of acres of stump lands that existed in 1900 have long since been reforested. Many of those areas today are mature forests. Others have been harvested a second time, and a cycle of regeneration to young forests has started again.

''Eastern forests have staged a major come back. Forest growth nationally has exceeded the harvest since the 1940s with each subsequent decade generally showing increased margins. Recreational use of our national forests has increased many fold.''

I am going to talk about recreational management because it is very important.

''American society in the 20th Century changed from rural to urban and industrialized. And although this change has been accompanied by a corresponding physical and psychological separation of people from land and resources, today's urbanized nation is no less dependent on the products of its forests and fields than were the subsistence farmers of the Americas past.''

I think, and I will not read much further here, but I think the summation that I am trying to say here is, look, we have to retain, and we have to stand strong for the preservation of multiple use, of many uses on Federal lands. It is critical for the well-being of half of this Nation.

Now I realize that this takes some patience on people who do not deal with Federal lands. Oh, sure, out here in the East, you have the Appalachians. Down here in Florida, you have got the Everglades. You have some spots up here near the lakes, Great Lakes and so on.

But for the most part, I am asking the understanding of my colleagues, before they draw automatic conclusions about people's use, about people as being a resource on government and public lands, take into consideration the management of those lands.

There are lots of ways that we manage Federal lands. The most exclusive way and the way that is fixed forever, it is locked in, I guess theoretically Congress could change it, but short of a world war, I do not see it changing, the most aggressive, most nonflexible and most locked-in management of Federal lands is called a wilderness area.

I know a lot about wilderness areas. I sponsored wilderness areas. Last year I put in over 100,000 acres of land into wilderness on different projects. The year before, I think I put in another 18,000 acres. Wilderness is a very extreme tool and it is a very proper tool in its appropriate use.

□ 2100

But from wilderness clear over to this end of the spectrum would be no management of Federal lands. That is no good.

The days of being able to allow people to go onto the public lands and cut timber or recreate or take water or destroy the environment, those days are gone. Every one of us who lives in the West has an additional responsibility. Because we live on the land, we can monitor the land more carefully. We have to be the enforcers of making sure that those public lands are not abused.

But at the same time we need to understand there are different methods. There is a strong advertising campaign going on out there that would suggest to my colleagues that if these government lands, if large parts of these lands are not put into wilderness areas, then these lands will not be protected. The reason wilderness was used as the designation is that it is a very popular word. Stop 10 people in your district and see if you can get any negative view about the word ''wilderness.'' That is like motherhood and apple pie.

The reality is that you have to look at the fine print. What does the fine print do for water rights, and in the West I intend to speak extensively about water soon in one of my nightside chats, but wilderness areas have significant impacts on water rights. And Colorado is the only State in the Union, where all of our free-flowing water goes out of the State. We have no free-flowing water for our use that comes into the State. So water rights are a big deal; and when you have the Federal Government out of Washington, D.C. coming in and doing things with land designations that impact our water rights, we kind of get up in arms. We kind of become a little defensive, which is why you see such extensive debate when we have Congressmen from the eastern coast who decide let us put a wilderness out in Colorado or Utah or Nevada, it kind of burns us when one of you colleagues steps forward, and you have probably never spent a night in the West unless you were doing a political trip or on vacation, and you step forward and say it does not impact my constituents, we are not going to put a wilderness area in Central Park of New York City or Connecticut, but let us put a wilderness in Colorado.

The impact and the management of government lands, what does it do to the local people? What is the fine print? We have a lot of different management tools, and by the way, every other management tool allows more flexibility. We have national parks, national monuments, special management areas. We have areas where we allow mineral protection and grazing and hunting. We have areas that have special designations like Lake Powell for water storage; and by the way, California, for power production.

We have an array of management tools. Many of you may remember the tragic fire of Storm King Mountain that occurred in Glenwood Springs. We managed that land under one plan one day; and because of the fire, a few days later we switched the management plan because we had an entire different set of factors to deal with.

The wild fires that take place, we have discovered that many fires are healthy for the forest; but many of these fires do damage which needs to be managed in a different way. The wildlife that we try to preserve, the Endangered Species Act, we find out that there has to be certain management of the forest to preserve these.

We have to understand that recreation, many of the people, unless you are very wealthy in my district, for example, if you live in Glenwood Springs or Aspen or Steamboat, most of the mountain communities in Colorado, unless you are very wealthy, you do not own a lot of land because the land out there is very expensive, and most people are not wealthy, although it is a very wealthy district, and most of those people recreate on Federal lands. Some of our biggest family recreational sports are skiing or recreating at Lake Powell. Yet we have people out there, primarily again out of the East, we have special interest groups who want to drain Lake Powell. Lake Powell has more shoreline than the entire Pacific West Coast. It produces massive amounts of power. It gives us flood control. But again as I said, it is probably the primary family recreation spot in the State of Utah; and of course you have that family recreation area in Arizona, and these groups want to drain it. They want to take down the dam to go back, as they say, to days they never experienced, and with very little knowledge.

And here we have a State like California who suffered blackouts yesterday and suffered blackouts today, and they may suffer rolling blackouts tomorrow. Why? Because on a per-capita basis California produces less power than any other State in the Union. Recently in the last 10 to 20 years, they have kind of bought into this picture: not in my backyard. No power production in my State. Let somebody else do it.

That kind of philosophy is what creates problems. Let me come back. There are lots of ways to manage these lands which does a good job. For example, the Colorado Canyons Conservation Area, that was my bill last year. My wife and I hiked the conservation area this last weekend. There are very few weekends that my wife and I are not hiking public lands, recreating on the lands, talking to people that use the lands, talking to the environmentalists and the water experts on these lands.

The Colorado canyons, and if you are ever in Grand Junction, Colorado, go walk the canyon. Go down to the Great Sand Dunes or the Black Canyon National Park, take a look at the Rocky Mountain National Park. There we have used in a responsible fashion, and we have been able to manage these public lands. Do not take it away from us. It is our life-style. We subsidize. It is our subsistence, and we think that we have good teams out there.

My Colorado canyons legislation could not have happened if I had not had cooperation from environmental activists, if I had not had cooperation from the ranching community, if I had not had cooperation from the locally elected officials, from local groups like the local chamber of commerce or from the mountain bikers, the users, or from

the people, the water experts, because the Colorado River came there.

There are a lot of different people that can come together, but they ought to come together in a straightforward fashion. From the ads that I hear about wilderness, the perception, especially here in the East, because those in the East have not really lived it, it is very easy to kind of direct your perception of what is happening in the West. And the easiest way to kind of propagandize or direct your vision of what is going on in the West and on the government lands is to make you visualize that the only way to protect the lands is to put it in wilderness; that the people have overrun the lands and that we need to take people off the lands.

In some cases, that is accurate. In most cases, it is not. In most cases, the land is being properly managed. Can we improve? Of course we can improve. Who cannot? Education can improve, health care can be improved, highways can be improved, environmental organizations can improve. Of course we can improve that management. And it is a responsibility of ours to improve that management. But we should not take the most dramatic, the most radical step, and that is to join that movement to take people off these lands.

Now, I am going to have an opportunity here in the next week or week and a half and I will have another night-side chat where I will talk to my colleagues about water. Water really is an amazing subject to talk about, especially when we take a look at exactly the differences that we have in the East and the West. My colleagues are going to see that, as I mentioned, there are dramatic differences between ownership and so on.

And before I close out on water, I want to give some comparisons of some interests. My comments here are focused towards those here who represent eastern States, States like Kentucky, Rhode Island, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Delaware, or Maryland. Let me give some comparisons so my colleagues can understand where my focus, where my devotion is in the West. You will get a pretty broad picture.

Let us compare some States. I picked 11 eastern States tonight in preparation for these comments. I picked 11 eastern States, and I picked 11 western States to compare the amount of public ownership and the amount of government land in the West compared to government land in the East.

The State of Nevada. In the State of Nevada, roughly 83 percent of the land is owned by the government. Eighty-three percent of the State of Nevada is owned by the government versus the State of New Jersey, which is only 3 percent. Three percent in the State of New Jersey.

The State of Utah. Sixty-four percent of the State of Utah is owned by the government; in Maryland, just a little over 2 percent; Utah, 64 percent. Maryland, just over 2 percent. Idaho. Sixty-one percent of the State of Idaho is owned by the government. In Delaware, 2 percent. Pennsylvania, 2 percent. Indiana, 1.7 percent. Oregon, back to the West again, 52 percent. Wyoming, 50 percent. Half of the State of Wyoming is owned by the government. Arizona. Almost half of the State of Arizona is owned by the government. California. Forty-five percent of the State of California is owned by the government. Colorado. Thirty-seven percent of the State of Colorado is owned by the government. And, by the way, most of that ownership is in my district.

In Ohio, less than 1.3 percent is owned by the government. Massachusetts. Less than 1.3 percent of Massachusetts is owned by the government. Maine, less than a percent. New York, less than a percent. Rhode Island, less than half a percent. Connecticut, two-tenths of a percent. On the other hand, back to the West, New Mexico, 32 percent; Washington, 28 percent; Montana, 28 percent.

So when one of my colleagues from Massachusetts, where about 1 percent of the State is owned by the government, proposes legislation dealing with a State like Nevada, which has 83 percent of its land owned by the government; or Alaska, Alaska is in the high 90s, I think 94 or 96 percent of Alaska is owned by the government, it is nice to understand these comparisons.

My point is this: we work as a team back here, theoretically, in the United States Congress. Not theoretically, we really do. There are a lot of things we agree on. A lot of people say to me, gosh, back at the United States Capital it is always Republicans and Democrats, Republicans and Democrats. Always division. That is not necessarily true. There are a lot of differences back here between urban and rural, between East and West, and I am here tonight to try to explain the justification.

It is not evil that there are differences between the East and the West, but it is something that should be understood. For us to do our jobs efficiently, for us to be Representatives of the United States of America, we need to understand some fundamental differences brought about during the early days of our country and the settlement of our country. That is what I hope my comments tonight have accomplished.

Now, I want to come back in a week or so, and I want to spend an hour talking about the differences in water. Water and the West. It is uniquely different than water in the East. The water tastes the same, perhaps; but the water laws and the allocation of water and the amount of water and the implications of storage of water and the power production of water, all of those issues have factors that create a differentiation between the East and the West.

We clearly, in the West, are outnumbered by those in the East. We know this. It is like the same in my district in Colorado. In my district in Colorado, we have 80 percent of the water resources, and 80 percent of the population lives outside my district.

□ 2115

We have to try and educate and work with each other so that we truly can have a team effort towards a common goal. But many times in the West we feel left out. And so my purpose in speaking with Members this evening and my purpose in speaking with them next week about water is so that they have a little clearer understanding of why we get so energized here, why we are so concerned when we talk about something as fundamental to us, not necessarily fundamental to you but fundamental to our subsistence in the West, such as government and public lands, such as water.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to again next week having a similar discussion where we will focus on water. I think Members will be impressed, they will be surprised how much water is necessary, I think about 1,500 gallons of water to serve them a Big Mac, a French fry and a malt. That is about the water that is necessary to grow that kind of food for them. The amount of water that agriculture takes, we never even think about, because you do not think about how much water it takes to get a Big Mac hamburger at McDonald's. You do not think how much water it takes when you buy hamburger buns at the grocery store. You do not think how much water it takes when you have the oak tree outside. It is a lot of water. The management of that water is just as critical to us as the management of public lands.

In conclusion, I would recommend, it is fascinating, regardless of where you live in the United States, it is fascinating to read this book about the transcontinental railroad, 1863 to 1869. It is entitled ''Nothing Like It in the World,'' Stephen Ambrose. Members may remember, he wrote about the Lewis and Clark exploration and so on. It is fascinating. I would challenge each of my colleagues to go out and get this, and I would bet you that every one of them in a couple of weeks will say, wow, that is a great book. That really gave me a perception and a study of American history. I would also recommend that any time you come across a history teacher or a business teacher, ask those instructors to present this to their classes, to talk about the difference that the transcontinental railroad made in everything from timekeeping in the United States to the amount of federally and government owned lands in the West compared with government and privately owned lands in the East.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for the week of March 12 and for March 19 and the balance of the week on account of family health concerns.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of inclement weather and canceled flights.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HEFLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes today and March 21.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHROCK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1276. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyriproxyfen; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301103; FRL–6766–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1277. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pymetrozine; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301106; FRL–6766–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1278. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imazethapyr; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301108; FRL–6774–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1279. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Butene, Homopolymer; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–301104; FRL–6769–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1280. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of the Stratospheric Ozone: De Minimis Exemption for Laboratory Essential Uses for Calendar Year 2001 [FRL–6952–1] (RIN: 2060–AJ15) received March 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1281. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Washington [WA–72–7147a; FRL–6938–5] received March 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1282. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List—received March 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1283. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Availability of ''Allocation of Fiscal Year 2001 Operator Training Grants'' [FRL–6951–6] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1284. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Request For Grant Proposals Making Smart Growth Work: Community Innovations And Responses To Barriers—received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture.

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:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 92. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 107–23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 93. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 247) to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks (Rept. 107–24). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JOHN (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

H.R. 1096. A bill to provide for improved educational opportunities in low-income and rural schools and districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GANSKE (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 1097. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1098. A bill to improve the recording and discharging of maritime liens and expand the American Merchant Marine Memorial Wall of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1099. A bill to make changes in laws governing Coast Guard personnel, increase marine safety, renew certain groups that advise the Coast Guard on safety issues, make miscellaneous improvements to Coast Guard operations and policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. REHBERG):

H.R. 1100. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the ability of individuals and local, State, and Federal agencies to prevent natural flood disaster; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1101. A bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PICKERING:

H.R. 1102. A bill to provide for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically women's public colleges or universities; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COX, and Mr. SCHAFFER):

H.R. 1103. A bill to provide safer schools and a better educational environment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1104. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide, in the case of an employee welfare benefit plan providing benefits in the event of disability, an exemption from preemption under such title for State tort actions to recover damages arising from the failure of the plan to timely provide such benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1105. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to provide for homeowners to recover treble damages from mortgage escrow servicers for failures by such servicers to make timely payments from escrow accounts for homeowners insurance, taxes, or other charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1106. A bill to exclude certain veterans' compensation and pension amounts from consideration as adjusted income for purposes of determining the amount of rent paid by a family for a dwelling unit assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow married individuals who are legally separated and living apart to exclude from gross income the income from United States savings bonds used to pay higher education tuition and fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that remarriage of the surviving spouse of a veteran after age 55 shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. COX, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 1109. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRANK, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1110. A bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. OSE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1111. A bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and 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. HOEFFEL (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1112. A bill to make Federal law apply to antique firearms in the same way it applies to other firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1113. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an office within the Administration to conduct oversight of certain loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1114. A bill to combat international money laundering and protect the United States financial system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1115. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of nonprofit entities for the Department's international educational, cultural and arts programs; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WEINER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STARK, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1116. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. JOHNSON

of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1117. A bill to provide a United States voluntary contribution to the United Nations Population Fund; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1118. A bill to establish comprehensive early childhood education programs, early childhood education staff development programs, model Federal Government early childhood education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1119. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to State and local educational agencies to pay such agencies for one-half of the salary of a teacher who uses approved sabbatical leave to pursue a course of study that will improve his or her classroom teaching; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 1120. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to designate Fort Belvoir, Virginia, as the site for the planned National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1121. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to require retailers of beef, lamb, and pork to inform consumers, at the final point of sale to consumers, of the country of origin of the commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1122. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1123. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 153 East 110th Street in New York, New York, as the ''Tito Puente Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1124. A bill to authorize the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to enter into negotiations with representatives of the Government of Cuba to provide for increased cooperation between Cuba and the United States on drug interdiction efforts; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1125. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 1 Federal Plaza in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas:

H.R. 1126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow all taxpayers who maintain households with dependents a credit for dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for amounts paid for health insurance and prescription drug costs of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1128. A bill to reduce the amount of paperwork and improve payment policies for health care services, to prevent fraud and abuse through health care provider education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1129. A bill to establish the High Performance Schools Program in the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1130. A bill to establish a research program at the National Science Foundation to quantify the relationship between the physical characteristics of elementary and secondary schools and student academic achievement in those schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1131. A bill to provide permanent appropriations to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund to make payments under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1132. A bill to ensure the timely payment of benefits to eligible persons under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1133. A bill to amend the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 relating to the calculation of payments for small local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exemption from the self-employment tax for certain termination payments received by former life insurance salesmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. OSE):

H.R. 1135. A bill to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are married and have minor dependents are eligible for military family housing containing more than two bedrooms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PAUL, Ms. HART, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 1136. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require Department of Veterans Affairs pharmacies to dispense medications to veterans for prescriptions written by private practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a permanent tax incentive for research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SABO, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22nd amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. KIRK):

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the Taiwan Relations Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution condemning the Government of the People's Republic of China for its poor human rights record; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HORN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BENTSEN):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and urging all Contracting States to the Convention to recommend the production of practice guides; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. FROST):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should develop, promote, and implement policies to slow global population growth by voluntary means; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, 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. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. ROEMER):

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of families and children in the United States and expressing support for the goals and ideas of National Family Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WICKER:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the employers of the members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H. Res. 92. A resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; House Calendar No. 8. House Report No. 107–23.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H. Res. 93. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 247) to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize communities to use community development block grant funds for construction of tornado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks; House Calendar No. 9. House Report No. 107–24.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Res. 94. A resolution honoring the contributions of Venus and Serena Williams; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 95. A resolution expressing the support for a National Week of Reflection and Tolerance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 13: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 16: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 17: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 20: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 25: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 28: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 31: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 41: Mr. KELLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. HART, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 45: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 61: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 65: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 98: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 133: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 144: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 161: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 184: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 187: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 198: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 199: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 214: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 220: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 240: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 257: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 267: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 278: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 283: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 285: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 288: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 303: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HORN, Mr. FORD, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 322: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 326: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TAUSCHER, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 335: Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 336: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 337: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 338: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 339: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 361: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 362: Mr. PENCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 368: Ms. HART.

H.R. 369: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 374: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 436: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WU, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 437: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 457: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 503: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 507: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 544: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 549: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 557: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 572: Mr. GORDON and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 594: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 600: Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 601: Mr. OTTER and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 602: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 606: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 609: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 611: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 613: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 623: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 638: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 641: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 648: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 661: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 663: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. RIVERS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 668: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BACA, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 671: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 686: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 704: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 705: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 710: Ms. HART and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 717: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 721: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCOTT, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 737: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 744: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 745: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 762: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 765: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 770: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 787: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 792: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 801: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 808: Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 817: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 827: Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 835: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 839: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 844: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 853: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 862: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 864: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 868: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 871: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 875: Mr. FRANK, Ms. LEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TERRY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 876: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 886: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 887: Mr. GRUCCI and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 892: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 893: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 899: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 902: Mr. FILNER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms.

BALDWIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RILEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HART, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 908: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 912: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 914: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 917: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 933: Mr. FILNER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 936: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 937: Mr. SUNUNU and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 938: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 948: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. CLEMEMT.

H.R. 951: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 952: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 956: Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 959: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. LEE, Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 963: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 968: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. WILSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FROST, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HORN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 981: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 995: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 996: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1004: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1015: Mr. FRANK and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1018: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1019: Mr. GOSS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1066: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 1076: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. LEE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1086: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1089: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. OTTER, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. KING.

H. Con. Res. 29: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COYNE.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. DELAY and Mrs. KELLY.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. WEINER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 13: Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 56: Mr. KIRK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Res. 67: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 73: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 86: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 87: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. CASTLE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 526: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

7. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 56 of 2001 petitioning the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to immediately shut down Indian Point 2 nuclear power plant until the Commission inspects each and every safety component and piece of equipment and certifies to the public that the said nuclear power plant is safe; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING GAYE LeBARON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend and a true Sonoma County legend, Gaye LeBaron.

Ms. LeBaron is stepping down as a daily columnist with the Press Democrat newspaper in Santa Rosa after nearly 46 years with the paper.

She began her career in journalism in 1951 as a correspondent with the Sonoma Index Tribune. She joined the Press Democrat as a student intern in 1955 and graduated to cub reporter in 1957. Over the years she has performed almost every job in the newsroom. She began writing her Press Democrat column in 1959 and it has since become a daily staple in the lives of thousands of Sonoma County readers.

Gaye LeBaron embodies the county's collective memory. She has written on both events she has witnessed and experienced and on the county's colorful and more distant past.

She co-authored a two-volume history of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County and edited a third volume on Sonoma County in the 19th Century. Her class on the History of Sonoma County at Santa Rosa Junior College is one of the most popular offerings each semester.

To her colleagues at the paper, she was the newsroom's ''go-to-guy'' who could tell them when a highway opened, or how a local landmark got its name or whether an obituary should run on page one.

To her readers she was an artist who painted broad word pictures of how the county once was and made us all feel part of the continuum of history.

But there was another side to Gaye LeBaron. Many of her columns reflected her keen observations of the contemporary political and social landscape, often seen through the eyes of her acerbic informant, ''Sam the Shark.'' Whether a literary device or Sonoma County's own ''Deep Throat,'' Sam asked the questions that more dignified people perhaps would not and together Sam and Gaye stirred the debate and moved us forward.

Mr. Speaker, Gaye LeBaron has received a multitude of awards and acknowledgments. She is revered in her community and is a giant in her profession. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor her today for her long and distinguished career and for her many accomplishments.

HONORING CHAMPIONSHIP SEASON OF THE LADY BLUE DEVILS

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the championship season of the Jackson County Lady Blue Devils. The Lady Blue Devils recently won a second straight Class AA girls basketball state championship.

Residents of Jackson County, Tennessee, can be proud of their Lady Blue Devils. The team went 22–10 this season and showed remarkable perseverance and resilience. Just hours before the team beat their opponents by a 46–42 score, the mother of senior guard Sarah Gipson died after a two-year fight with cancer.

The team played with guts and determination despite Sarah's heart-wrenching loss. Sarah's mother, the former Dianne Spivey, was a member of the school's state championship team in 1973.

I commend the team and its coach, Jim Brown, for a fine season and gutsy win. The following are members of the 2000–2001 state champion Lady Blue Devils: Candace Stafford, Courtney Childress, Kayla Olson, Becca Focer, Sarah Gipson, Sheena Hager, Jennifer Harris, Ashley Hopkins, Amanda Naff, Deanna Apple, Andrea Davidson, Emily Lane, Marissa Hensley, Megan Pepper, Alyssa Bowman, managers Lucy Anderson, Stephenee Clayton, Faith Henshaw, Lacy Sircy, and trainer Shawn Moffitt. Kevin Bray and Barbara Brown also serve as the team's assistant coaches.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INVESTOR AND CAPITAL MARKETS FEE RELIEF ACT

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mrs. MALONEY for introducing legislation that is vitally important to every American investor indeed, to every American business seeking access to our capital markets. It's called the Investor and Capital Markets Fee Relief Act, and it will save investors and market participants $14 billion dollars over the next ten years.

Congress must take action. If nothing is done to stop the flow of investors' cash into government coffers, more than $24 billion overcharges will be collected over the next ten years.

This fee Relief legislation reduces fees to a level more consistent with Congress's original intent. Fees will recover the Commission's costs of supervising the markets, but they will no longer be a burdensome tax on investors and capital formation.

The bill reduces all excess SEC fees: transaction, registration, merger/tender, single stock futures, and the trust indenture fee. The fee relief bill provides a stable funding structure for the SEC by ensuring that appropriators have sufficient funds to meet the agency's funding needs.

The fee relief bill also includes a pay parity provision to help the Commission attract and retain first-rate attorneys, accountants, and economists. In the post-Gramm-Leach-Bliley financial services world, SEC professionals performing the same work as their colleagues in the banking agencies should receive similar compensation.

I would like to commend our colleagues in the other Body, specifically Senators PHIL GRAMM and CHUCK SCHUMER, for their excellent work in moving similar legislation, S. 143, through the Senate Banking Committee. I look forward to seeing the Senate act on that legislation soon.

Here in the House, I thank my numerous colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have joined Mr. FOSSELLA as original cosponsors of this legislation and given it such strong bipartisan support right from the start. I look forward to moving this bill through the financial Services Committee expeditiously.

HONORING THE HOPKINTON BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the community of Hopkinton, Massachusetts in celebrating the accomplishments and performance of the Hopkinton High School Girl's Varsity Basketball Team. Their banner season came to a remarkable conclusion on March 13, 2001 at the Fleet Center in Boston where they captured the 2000–2001 Massachusetts Division IV State Championship.

There are many stories of note surrounding this group of remarkable athletes. Of the 15 members of the team, 12 are underclassmen. Such an accomplishment for a team of relatively young women is certainly impressive. Another story is the inspirational play of sophomore forward Meg Davis, who overcame a painful back injury to play in the tournament. In the first half, while the Hillers were trailing the Manchester Hornets, Davis and junior guard Mari Levine, who finished with a team-high 20 points, sparked a critical run, ultimately leading their team to a convincing 61–39 victory.

Teamwork was the key to the Hillers' successful season. Led on the court by senior co-captains Connie Chace and Jen Sanborn, every player added to the Hillers' fairy tale season: senior Kelley Connelly, juniors Allison Azar and Shawna McCabe, sophomores Katie Baldiga, Taylor Chance, Julia Weaver, Lindsey Dragin, and freshmen Lauren Aulds, Erika Steele, Callie Nealon and Jackie Pappas. And of course, special recognition must be extended to Coach Dick Bliss for his inspirational leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I recognize the exceptional student-athletes of the Hopkinton High School Girl's Varsity Basketball team for an unforgettable season. I congratulate them on their accomplishment and wish them the best of luck in years to come.

HEATHER HAGAN—AMERICAN HERO

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, in a time of crisis, many of us choose not to get involved. Mr. Speaker, we've all read the newspaper headlines when someone has witnessed a crime or even saw someone get injured and they chose not to get involved because they didn't want to complicate their lives.

Today, I rise to pay tribute to someone who acted differently, bravely. Heather Hagan personifies a hero's life. She chose to get involved and in the end saved a woman's life. At 15 years old, Heather showed incredible intuition, caring, and determination for one so young.

On March 12, as she was doing her daily rounds delivering The Herald to her customers on her paper route, she noticed something different at the home of Josephine McCutcheon. The newspapers were piled up against the door, unclaimed for several days. Additionally, Heather realized she had not seen the 81-year-old woman in days.

Heather completed her route. She thought about how odd it was that Mrs. McCutcheon had not picked up her newspaper or even stopped delivery if she was going out of town. Worried, she called the elderly woman's house but the line was busy.

Heather chose not to let it end there. She knew something was not right so she returned to the home of the former Mercer councilwoman and county commissioner. There was no response when she knocked at the door. Sensing something was wrong, Heather contacted the local authorities, who found Mrs. McCutcheon lying on the floor of the house after a fall, unable to summon help.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when the news is full of stories of insensitive and selfish people, they have not been introduced to teens such as Heather Hagan. She broke the mold. She gives me hope for the coming generations.

The easy thing to do would've been for Heather to do her job and leave it at that. But she, in the immortal words of Robert Frost, took the road less traveled by, going out of her way, having a dramatic impact on someone's life. I would like to say thank you to Heather—she is truly a treasure to our community.

HONORING THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF VOLUNTEERS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the International Year of Volunteers. The United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 2001 to encourage and advance the concept of volunteer service.

In Humboldt County, California, the North Coast Regional Network for Service and Volunteerism was founded to facilitate and improve effective volunteer efforts. The North Coast Regional Network joins other volunteer groups throughout the nation in working to promote and strengthen volunteerism. Hundreds of California's North Coast residents enthusiastically volunteer their time to enhance the quality of life in our community. They work in a wide variety of non-profit organizations, educational institutions, senior and youth programs, the arts and health services.

Mr. Speaker, the International Year of Volunteers recognizes and honors the voluntary commitment of individuals and groups who contribute their time and resources and share their skills to build better communities. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor the efforts of the North Coast Regional Network, and all volunteers, for their dedication to community service.

GOODBYE MRS. CULLEN

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress and in the Executive Branch intensify our efforts better to support public education in this country, we should be sure to continue to focus on teachers as the central element in this effort. The dedicated men and women who have entered the teaching profession over the years deserve far better treatment than we have given them. Too often they are inadequately compensated, and given too little to work with in the way of resources. Despite that, large numbers of talented, intelligent, creative individuals have continued to go into the teaching profession because of their love of learning and their concern for young people.

In June, one individual who is an excellent example of this tradition will be retiring.

Patricia Cullen is a sixth grade teacher at the Wareham Middle School in Wareham, Massachusetts and she will be enjoying a well deserved retirement after 33 years of dedicated teaching at the end of this year. In the words of Judith Bruno of the Wareham Middle School staff, speaking on behalf of the faculty and staff of the school, "Mrs. Cullen is a dedicated, caring and loving teacher to all of her students. She focuses on her student's strengths and positive attributes instead of the negatives. Pat helps her students to strive, to achieve, and to be successful in their endeavors. All her students love and respect her. The faculty and staff have the same feelings for her and trust me when I say we have mixed emotions about her leaving. We are happy for the new chapter beginning in her life but saddened to see her leave us."

Ms. Bruno continues, "Mrs. Cullen is truly a remarkable woman and a credit to the teaching profession. Pat Cullen truly personifies what a teacher should be."

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply committed to providing more resources at the federal level so that Patricia Cullen, her colleagues, and those who will join this profession can do an even better job than they have been doing. But in addition to the material resources which we owe these dedicated public servants, we owe them better recognition as well for the job they do in often difficult circumstances. I am delighted to join Patricia Cullen's students and colleagues in recognizing her excellent work, and wishing her well.

HONORING THE 270TH BIRTHDAY OF PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Prince William County, Virginia, which will be celebrating its 270th birthday on March 20, 2001.

Prince William County was established by the Virginia General Assembly on July 9, 1730, when the population increased to a point that the formation of a new county was necessary. It took several months for the legislation to become law. In 1731, Prince William County was recognized as a county and included Fairfax, Arlington, Alexandria, Loudon and Fauquier. Named for William Augustus, the second son of King George II, the county was cut to its current size in 1759. Within the county there are also two independent cities, Manassas and Manassas Park.

The citizens of Prince William County are continually contributing to the country's history and cultural heritage. The county was home to some of the nation's first European settlements. Many of the first arrivals to the county were of Irish descent. They settled on vacant plots and began to farm, aided only by convicts who had been sent from England. It also played an important role in the American Revolution by aiding in the formation of the new country.

Prince William County was the site of many Civil War battles. One of the most notable of the Civil War conflicts was the Battle of First Manassas, which was the first major encounter between the North and South. The Manassas Battlefields are now National Parks visited by thousands every summer.

Prince William County continues, to this day, to have a close connection to our military. In fact, the town of Quantico is completely surrounded by a Marine Corps Base. The military history of this town goes back to the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, when the land was used for Virginia Naval Operations. The Marine Corps Base was established there in 1917.

Today, Prince William County is the second most populous county in the Commonwealth. The rich history in this county makes it one of the most historical counties in the nation. The citizens are proud to keep this history alive and are continually reminded of the past by the collective knowledge of those who live and work there. Moreover, Prince William County is a leader in a new Virginia revolution, a technology revolution. I am certain that her citizens will continue their role as leaders of Virginia's and America's futures.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish continued prosperity for the County of Prince William and I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in applauding this remarkable milestone. I am proud to represent a portion of Prince William County in the House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. McCARTHY

HON. DON SHERWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform my colleagues of the recent passing of Frank E. McCarthy, the President of the National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA). Frank died on February 25 as a result of complications from his battle with kidney cancer.

Before my election to Congress, I was a franchised new car dealer and a member of NADA, so I can personally attest to the role that Frank McCarthy played as an automotive industry leader for more than three decades. Dealers, automotive executives, and policymakers alike will miss his determination, reasoned voice, and knowledge of the industry. NADA is the Voice of the Dealers and for 33 years Frank McCarthy was the heart of NADA.

Frank had been the chief executive of NADA since 1968, making him one of the deans of the trade association community in the nation's capital. To put his service in perspective, Frank assumed the helm of NADA when Lyndon Johnson was President and the 1968 Ford Galaxie was the best selling car in America. During his entire tenure, Frank enjoyed the utmost respect among Members of Congress, professional staff, and his colleagues in the private sector.

On behalf of dealers, Frank built strong relationships with the automobile manufacturers. He had a unique abilty to convey the concerns of the franchised dealers directly and concisely without sacrificing civility or professionalism. Under his leadership, NADA has become one of the largest trade associations in the United States, providing a wide variety of services to dealers and their more than one million employees. In all of these efforts, Frank was the consumate team player, always seeking credit for others rather than himself.

Despite Frank's extraordinary professional accomplishments, he never lost sight of what is truly important in life. During the eulogies delivered at his funeral earlier this month, his family and colleagues spoke eloquently about the balance in Frank's life. His deep faith was a guiding force in his approach to life, and his professional responsibilities never overshadowed his commitment to his wife, Pat, and their five children and 12 grandchildren. In that regard, Frank McCarthy was a role model to working men and women in all walks of life.

At this time, we all feel a tremendous sense of loss, but also reflect with great affection and gratitude for his contributions to the industry and his community.

TEACHER SABBATICAL LEAVE GRANTS ACT

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Teacher Sabbatical Leave Grants Act.

Without a quality teacher in the classroom, it is impossible for us, as a nation, to provide the education our children deserve. It is essential that we ensure quality teachers are in every classroom in every school.

Professional development helps ensure our teachers' skills grow and change as our students grow more diverse and as our technology changes. However, our teachers will never get the in-depth development training they need to stay on top of their field from one-day workshops.

Recent findings have shown that 99 percent of our teachers have participated in at least one professional development activity in the past year. However only 12 percent of teachers who spent only 1 to 8 hours in professional development said it improved their teaching a lot. That is a dismal figure. We must work to provide teachers with intensive professional development, so 100 percent of teachers who receive the training feel that it improved their teaching. Without it, we will never be able to ensure our children are being taught by quality teachers.

My bill will give teachers the opportunity to receive intensive professional development training. This bill creates a program to provide grants for public school teachers who take one or two semesters of sabbatical leave to pursue a course of study for professional development. The grant covers one-half of the salary the teacher would have earned if the teacher had not been granted a leave of absence. Teachers are eligible if they have been approved for sabbatical leave and if they have enrolled in a course of study at an institution of higher education designed to improve classroom teaching.

By providing teachers with financial resources, they will be free to pursue an intensive course of study that can greatly improve their teaching skills.

And studies have shown that the more qualified a teacher is, the better the students' performance will be.

For instance, in Boston, students assigned to the most effective teachers for a year showed 18 times greater gains in reading and nearly 16 time greater gains in math than those students who were assigned to the least effective teachers.

In Tennessee, similar students with 3 very effective teachers in a row scored 50 percentile points better than students who were assigned 3 very ineffective teachers in a row.

All of our students deserve to achieve these same gains.

By providing teachers with the opportunity to receive intensive professional development, my bill will help put more effective, qualified teachers in the classroom.

I urge my colleagues to support the Teacher Sabbatical Leave Grants Act.

CONGRATULATING THE OUR LADY OF LOURDES WARRIORS

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of hard working women who have given their all in order to continue one of the Hudson Valley's greatest dynasties. On Sunday afternoon, the 14 members of the Our Lady of Lourdes women's basketball team cruised to their third consecutive Class B State title, the Warriors' eighth crown in the past 15 years.

Under the guidance of 18th year coach Brian Giorgis, Our Lady of Lourdes won their final 27 games en route to a 27–1 record and a 22nd place ranking in USA Today's national poll. After defeating Garden City, 57–37 to reach the championship games, the Warriors put the crown jewel on their season by setting down Iroquois, 57–28 in the final.

Throughout the year, the Warriors embodied the American ideal, working together as a team to accomplish a goal. From seniors who had played on two previous State championship teams to first year players getting their first taste of interscholastic competition, the team formed a cohesive unit under coach Giorgis and steamrolled the competition, outscoring its opponents by a whopping 1,905 to 978. At the same time they showed dedication to their sport and their teammates, they held the same high standard towards their education and the local community, making it easy to understand their near invincibility.

While Our Lady of Lourdes is not a large school, it looms large in the annals of women's basketball. My fellow colleagues, please join me in congratulating coach Brian Giorgis, the Most Valuable Player of the Tournament, Kristin Keller, all-tournament team members Jenna Viani and Kristen Vilardi, team members Kelly Barnum, Kim Boone, Sue Clanci, Kathy Duffy, Jocelyn Kelly, Vicki Koster, Lauren Martinez, Aimee Meyer, Kelly Roche, Natalie Serkowski and Julianne Viani and all who assisted the Our Lady of Lourdes Warriors in building the latest empire in the Empire State.

IN HONOR OF DENNIS WEBER FOR HIS SERVICE TO DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS AND OUR NATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dennis Weber, Commander of the California chapter of the Disabled American Veterans for his service to his community, his country and as a proud member of the Armed Services.

Mr. Weber, a true Californian, was born on February 21, 1948 in Los Angeles, California. Upon graduating from high school Mr. Weber enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. While serving with the 3rd Marine Engineer Battalion near An Hoa, Mr. Weber's platoon was ambushed by the Viet Cong. As platoon leader and while severely wounded, Mr. Weber encouraged his men to stand strong against the ambush and managed to lead his platoon to safety. Unfortunately two of his men were killed in the battle. After spending a year in the hospital recovering from his wounds Mr. Weber was medically discharged and returned to Los Angeles where he immediately began serving his country's needs in the Los Angeles city government.

During Mr. Weber's year as Commander he has lead the organization in assisting veterans in filing more than 16,000 claims for VA benefits, assisted in transporting more than 49,000 veterans to medical appointments covering over 1 million miles, and his given veterans countless amounts of emotional support.

The State of California and this nation is proud to have Mr. Weber as a native son. Mr. Weber is an example of the finest product of this nation and I want to thank him for his professionalism, initiative and unwavering devotion to veterans. As commander of the California chapter Mr. Weber's performance has truly been in keeping with the highest tradition of the Disabled American Veterans, the state of California, and the United States of America.

Colleagues, please join with me as we honor Mr. Dennis Weber with his wife Pam for his outstanding contributions to our nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RITCHIE VALENS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Ritchie Valens, who was inducted into the Rock of Roll Hall of Fame on March 19th. Although Valens died over forty years ago, his presence is still strongly felt in my congressional district, especially in the Northeast San Fernando Valley where he grew up. The recognition he is receiving brings honor to his entire community.

A pioneer in the history of rock and roll who helped shape American music, Valens is considered to be the first Chicano rock and roll star to cross over into mainstream America with his hits, ''Come On, Let's Go,'' the ballad ''Donna'' and the flipside, ''La Bamba'' which is still heard all over the world. At age seventeen, his career ended tragically when he died in a plane crash along with rock and roll legend Buddy Holly and fellow rocker the Big Bopper (J.P. Richardson) on February 3, 1959.

Valens achieved success and stardom at a younger age than many of rock's superstars, including John Lennon, Paul McCartney and Bob Dylan. The music Valens made is as vibrant today as it was when his hits were released in the late 1950's.

Born Richard Steve Valenzuela, Valens began his music career by imitating the earliest rock and roll artists, especially Elvis, Chuck Berry, Jerry Lee Lewis, Fats Domino, The Penguins and The Drifters. Like so many of that era, Valens was caught up in the excitement of rock and roll. The performer with the greatest influence on his music, however, was Little Richard. Ritchie would entertain visitors in his household with his versions of Little Richard's ''Ooh My Soul.'' He joined The Silhouettes, a typical high school garage band that played the popular tunes of the day at high school sock hops, church dances and local parties. Playing for the Silhouettes helped Valens realize that making music was what he wanted to do more than anything else.

In 1987, Columbia Pictures released the film La Bamba, written and directed by admired Chicano playwright Luis Valdez, which immortalized Valens' brief life. The movie rejuvenated his music nearly thirty years after his death. A whole new generation of fans grew to love Valens' as his hits were re-recorded and performed by the East Los Angeles Chicano group, ''Los Lobos,'' for the La Bamba soundtrack. This contemporary band went on to become a musical phenomenon, in large part because of Valens' achievements in the early days of rock and roll.

Since the release of the movie La Bamba, Valens' contributions to rock and roll have been honored many times: he received a star on the Hollywood walk of Fame, The United States Postal Service recognized his life and career with a commemorative postage stamp, the Ritchie Valens Recreation Center was formally dedicated at a park in his hometown of Pacoima, and he was inducted into Hollywood's Rock Walk for his contributions to pop music. Additionally, an annual music festival, ''The Legend Lives On,'' is held in his honor.

It was an honor to work with Valens' family, friends and fans to urge the recording industry to name this outstanding artist to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Although long overdue, Valens' inclusion is richly deserved and is cause for great celebration in Pacoima today.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Ritchie Valens, rock and rolls' first Chicano star!

TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA MARITIME PRESIDENT JERRY ASPLAND

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues another milestone in the seventy-two year history of the California Maritime Academy, located in the City of Vallejo in my district of California. In furthering its mission of supporting the maritime interests of the United States, Cal Maritime receives federal assistance, primarily in the form of its training ship, the T.S. Golden Bear. Many of its graduates become licensed officers on merchant marine vessels, or in the U.S. Navy or Coast Guard. As a federally designated regional maritime academy for the Western states, Cal Maritime is the maritime college of choice for students from California, Washington, Alaska, Hawaii, Arizona, and other western states.

On June 30, 2001, California Maritime Academy President Jerry A. Aspland will retire, completing five years at the helm of this fine institution. President Aspland, a Cal Maritime graduate, had previously retired from his position as President of Arco Marine, Inc., when the California State University system called him to begin a second career as one of the nation's leading maritime educators. He assumed the position of President of Cal Maritime on July 1, 1996.

President Aspland's tenure has been marked by numerous advances for the institution. Cal Maritime has become fully involved with the CSU system, as its twenty-second campus. Enrollment has nearly doubled. Numerous improvements to their facilities have been completed on his watch, including the recent opening of a new, state-of-the art laboratory building, infrastructure and technology replacement and upgrading, seismic retrofits, and the acquisition of additional training vessels. Ground will be broken soon for a new technology center on the campus. A second annual summer training cruise has been introduced, thereby doubling the number of training billets. Academic programs have been expanded, and further options are in the planning stages. Under his leadership, Cal Maritime was the first U.S. maritime academy to receive preliminary approval for having its educational program meet the requirements of the international Standards for Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping. A new strategic plan has just been published, and the institution is in readiness for its next academic accreditation visit scheduled this fall.

By any measure the Aspland years at the California Maritime Academy have been years of accomplishment in every aspect of this distinguished academic institution. I invite my colleagues to share my great pride in all that Cal Maritime has contributed and continues to contribute to its students, graduates, and to the maritime interests of the United States.

Finally, on behalf of the constituents of my district and my colleagues here in this chamber, I wish to extend to President Jerry Aspland our deeply felt appreciation for all that

has been accomplished on his watch, along with our very best wishes for the happy, healthy retirement that he and his wife, Carol, have earned and so richly deserve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. SHADEGG

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 2001, I missed rollcall votes 31 and 32. I was chairing a hearing with Vice President Cheney. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" for H.R. 624, the Organ Donation Improvement Act of 2001, and "yea" for H. Con. Res. 47, which honored the 21 members of the National Guard who were killed in the tragic crash of a National Guard Aircraft on March 3, 2001.

SCHOOLS INVITED TO APPLY FOR FREE 3M LIBRARY SECURITY PRODUCTS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

3M ANNOUNCES PROGRAM TO DONATE $1.5 MILLION TO SCHOOLS

3M, in partnership with the American Association of School Librarians, will select 100 schools to receive 3M security products that protect their valuable resources.

ST. PAUL, MINN.—March 6, 2001—3M today announced the company will donate $1.5 million to middle and high schools through its "3M Salute to Schools" program in 2001, which provides much-needed security products that help reduce the loss of valuable library resources.

One hundred schools will be selected to receive, free of charge, up to two 3M™ Detection Systems for the entrance/exit of their library media centers, a supply of 3M™ Tattle-Tape™ Security Strips for making materials and materials processing accessories—a package with an average value of about $15,000.

Now in its second year, "3M Salute to Schools" is sponsored by 3M, in partnership with the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), a division of the American Library Association. 3M and AASL both share a strong commitment to education and value investing in the nation's schools.

"Protecting a school's most valuable learning tools is an ongoing challenge for a library media center with limited resources and no proven security," says Don Leslie, 3M Library Systems. "One of the fundamental goals of '3M Salute to Schools' is to enhance education by making detection systems more available to schools that might not otherwise have the resources to purchase them."

In 2000, 3M donated $1 million to schools through "3M Salute to Schools." AASL selected 70 schools to receive a 3M detection system from among more than 500 applicants.

"Research shows the highest-achieving students attend schools with good library media centers, and protecting library resources contributes to the overall improvement of library media services for young people." says Harriet Selverstone, president of AASL. "AASL is pleased to again partner with 3M to help school libraries preserve these resources for students throughout the country."

"3M Salute to Schools" is open to middle and high schools in the United States. Schools selected to receive the donation will be awarded up to two 3M detection systems for the entrance/exit of their library media centers, a supply of 3M™ Tattle-Tape™ Security Strips for marking items in their collection and necessary materials processing accessories. Individual donations will vary depending upon specific needs of the library, such as the size of a collection and the physical layout of the media center. To be considered for the donation, a school must meet eligibility requirements and be able to demonstrate a need for a detection system.

Applications are available online at www.3M.com/library of by calling the American Library Association Fax-On-Demand system at 1–800–545–2433, then press 4 and request document no. 802. Recipients will be announced at the American Library Association Annual Conference, June 14 through 20 in San Francisco. Applications must be postmarked by May 1, 2001.

For more information about the 2001 "3M Salute to Schools" program, contact the AASL Awards Program at 1–800–545–2433, ext. 4383, or aasl@ala.org.

The global leader in library security for more than 30 years, 3M protects literally billions of individual items in thousands of libraries throughout the world. 3M is a Founding Partner to the American Library Association's Campaign for America's Libraries, also known as the @ your library™ campaign. This five-year public education campaign is designed to help promote the value of all types of libraries and librarians in the 21st century. The sponsorship further demonstrates 3M's commitment to helping libraries better meet the changing needs of library professionals and their customers—now and in the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I represent the 5th Congressional District of Maryland which is home to NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center. I would like to take this opportunity to celebrate the achievements of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard who, 75 years ago this month, launched the world's first liquid propellant rocket. Indeed, the flight of Goddard's rocket on March 16, 1926, at Auburn, MA, was a feat as epochal in history as that of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk. During his lifetime Dr. Goddard designed, built, and launched 35 rockets of increasing sophistication. Dr. Goddard was the first scientist who not only realized the potential of missiles and space flight but also contributed directly in bringing them to practical realization.

Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1959, the 86th Congress of the United States authorized the issuance of a gold medal in honor of Dr. Goddard. When measuring the importance of Dr. Goddard's innovative contributions, there is no greater proof of his originality than his United States patents. In addition to the two patents issued in July 1914, 56 more would be issued to him in his lifetime. Thirty-five patents pending were issued after his death in 1945. An additional 131 patents, based upon his notes, sketches, and photographs, were applied for by his widow, Esther C. Goddard. In 1960, the U.S. Government acquired the rights to use these 214 patents.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Goddard created the building blocks which others would later invent independently. Dr. Goddard considered both manned and unmanned vehicles to explore the moon and planets, solar power, electric propulsion, and even flight to the stars. Today, the Armed Forces, NASA, and many others in the science community are able to construct rockets, missiles, weather instruments due to Dr. Goddard's vision. On this day, I would like to honor and recognize one of the greatest scientists and the father of modern rocket propulsion, Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COUNTER-MONEY LAUNDERING AND ANTI-CORRUPTION ACT OF 2001

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be introducing today, in cooperation with Senator JOHN KERRY, anti-money laundering legislation that passed, on a bipartisan vote of 31–1, the House Banking and Financial Services Committee in the 106th Congress. Unfortunately, the full House did not consider this legislation in the previous Congress. But I am hopeful that we will make a serious effort in the 107th Congress to enact this important bill into law.

The purpose of the International Counter-Money Laundering and Anti-corruption Act of 2001 is to provide the United States with new tools to combat foreign money laundering threats, and to prevent the use of the domestic financial system by money launderers and corrupt foreign officials. The bill specifically addresses the abuse of offshore secrecy havens by criminals who seek to launder their illicit monetary gains.

Let me stress an important point: offshore secrecy havens are used by financial institutions and businesses around the world for perfectly legal and legitimate transactions. However, the officially recognized secrecy, and almost non-existent supervision, of the financial sectors in many of these jurisdictions, make it remarkably easy for criminals to abuse them. And with the global growth of electronic commerce and banking, and the unprecedented expansion of global commerce in general, the financial system is more vulnerable to abuse.

In a speech to international bankers in the Spring of 2000, former Treasury Secretary Larry Summers highlighted three important reasons to embark on an aggressive fight against money laundering:

First, it help us pursue criminals who commit the underlying organized crimes that generate tainted money, such as drug trafficking, tax evasion, and fraud;

Second, it helps us fight the foreign corruption that undermines U.S. and multilateral assistance programs to promote democracy and economical development abroad; and lastly,

It helps us protect the stability of the international financial system.

The bill we are introducing today enshrines these principles. The bill provides the Treasury Secretary with the authority and discretion to address a specific money laundering problem with precision—which cannot be done with current law.

Current law provides limited options for law enforcement; the Treasury Secretary can either issue informational advisories to U.S. financial institutions about specific offshore jurisdictions, or take the more extreme approach of invoking sweeping and often disruptive economic sanctions. In an effort to strengthen our ability to fight money laundering, the bill I am introducing today provides new discretionary authority to the Treasury Secretary, which can be invoked under certain select circumstances. For instance, the Secretary can use these discretionary tools if he or she were to identify an area of ''primary money laundering concern'' offshore. If invoked by the Treasury Secretary, these discretionary tools only apply to the activities of U.S. financial institutions outside the U.S., but not domestically.

Our bill grants the Treasury Secretary the authority, and policy discretion, to use several new tools that fall between informational advisories, on the one hand, and economic sanctions on the other. For example, the Secretary could identify a particular institution in a foreign jurisdiction as a primary money laundering concern without making a determination regarding the entire foreign jurisdiction, and then, impose restrictions on activities concerning such an institution. The approach taken in the bill offers the kind of regulatory flexibility, which does not exist today, needed to tackle a fast-moving and remarkably adaptable class of criminals.

More specifically, the bill would do the following:

Authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to impose one or more of five new special measures upon finding a jurisdiction, financial institution operating outside the United States, or class of international transactions to be of ''primary money laundering concern'';

Require the Secretary, in selecting a measure, to consult with the Federal Reserve and consider several factors of concern to domestic financial institutions;

Outline the special measures, including enhanced recordkeeping and reporting; collection of information on beneficial ownership of certain accounts; conditions on opening so-called payable-through and correspondent accounts; and prohibition of payable-through or correspondent accounts;

Require the Secretary to consult with selected Federal officials and consider a number of factors in making a finding relative to a primary money laundering concern;

Require the Secretary to notify Congress within 10 days of taking a special measure;

Authorize banks to share suspicions of employee misconduct in employment references with other banks without fear of civil liability, and clarify prohibitions against disclosure of a suspicious activity report to the subject of the report;

Clarify penalties for violating Geographic Targeting Orders issued by the Secretary to combat money laundering in designated geographical areas;

Require the Bank Secrecy Act Advisory Group to include a privacy advocate among its membership and to operate under the ''sunshine'' provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

Require reports from the Treasury Department and banking agencies regarding penalties for Bank Secrecy Act and safety-and-soundness violations;

Express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. should press foreign governments to take action against money laundering and corruption, and make clear that the United States will work to return the proceeds of foreign corruption to the citizens of countries to whom such assets belong; and,

Express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. should support the efforts of the Financial Action Task Force, an international anti-money laundering organization, to identify jurisdictions that do not cooperate with international efforts to combat money laundering.

We are often told by the financial services industry that it self-regulates well in the area of international and correspondent banking, and that, therefore, no legislation is needed. However, a recent staff report by the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded that U.S. correspondent banking provides an important avenue for rogue foreign banks and their criminal clients to carry on money laundering and other criminal activity in the U.S. We are also too often reminded by egregious cases—such as the recent one involving the laundering of Russian organized crime funds through offshore centers and U.S. financial institutions—that our current regulatory and law enforcement system may not be as protected as we like to think. A well targeted, common sense approach—such as the one in this bill—that fills in gaps in current law makes sense. Moreover, keeping in mind the need to protect legitimate commerce, the bill is crafted in a way that evenly balances burden-sharing between regulators and the financial services industry.

In sum, I am pleased to propose comprehensive money laundering legislation to address one of the most insidious and challenging of financial crimes. Money laundering is now estimated to absorb somewhere between 2 and 5 percent of the world's domestic product, or nearly $600 billion, and represents a significant threat to the international financial system. The enhanced tools in this proposed legislation will lead to improved ways of preserving the integrity of the international financial system, working in partnership with our major trading partners and the world's market economies.

As we consider policy changes in this area, we must address the appropriate needs of law enforcement without impeding legitimate commerce. By empowering the Federal government with more flexible and effective tools than those offered under existing law, the bill moves us closer to meeting this goal. I look forward to working with the Bush Administration, law enforcement officials, and the financial services industry, to enact a common sense approach to fighting money laundering.

APRIL SCHOOL OF THE MONTH

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have named Meadowbrook Elementary School in East Meadow as School of the Month in the Fourth Congressional District for April 2001.

Thomas Mangano is Principal of Meadowbrook Elementary, and Dr. Robert R. Dillon is the Superintendent of Schools for the East Meadow Union Free School District.

The school motto says it all—''Four Walls with the Future Inside.'' For over 45 years, Meadowbrook has been educating Long Island's future generations on the importance of accepting everyone as is. These children have learned that being ''different'' doesn't matter.

Boasting a 100 percent teacher PTA membership, Meadowbrook fosters a culture of inclusion and emphasizes a strong school, family and community partnership. All teachers have been trained in the ''World of Difference'' program which fosters a respect for diversity at all levels. Meadowbrook is a multi-cultural school representing a variety of countries such as India, Pakistan, Columbia, South Korea, South Vietnam, China, El Salvador, Egypt, Israel and Russia.

Meadowbrook, recognized as a New York State Blue Ribbon School, is one of five elementary schools in the East Meadow Public School District and has 510 students. Meadowbrook is one of two sites which provides educational services to children who face special educational challenges. This, combined with the school's emphasis on cultural awareness, teaches children that being different is good.

I commend Meadowbrook for the focus on special education students. I have a learning disability that wasn't diagnosed until I was an adult, so I'm particularly gratified to know children are being helped at a young age. It's also comforting to me that these kids don't feel ''different.'' I know that feeling, and it's not a good one.

Congratulations, and keep up the good work.

TRIBUTE TO REV. VERSIE PULPHUS EASTER OF THE CHRISTIAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, TURNER CHAPEL CHURCH

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church is an organization

with a noble mission: to preach the Good News, teach divine truth and heal life by the power of God. Extending from the efforts of first generation pioneers to present day evangelists, CME's mission has always been to spread good faith to communities worldwide.

Each year the Turner Chapel Christian Methodist Episcopal Church has held a week-long spiritual revival, encompassing several area churches and welcoming members of all denominations of faith. During this revival, congregation members join together in spiritual song, spoken word, and biblical teachings, renewing and strengthening their religious beliefs. This evening, as the Turner Chapel Church culminates its revival week with its final service, they have chosen to honor visiting revival leader Rev. Versie Pulphus Easter, for her treasured contributions to the community.

A life long evangelist and missionary to the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, Rev. Easter has demonstrated her dedication and commitment through her outstanding service with her community and beyond. A certified United States Chaplain Association member, ordained Elder in Full of the CME Church, and veteran pastor of over 31 years, she has made history as the first Female Presiding Elder of the CME Church. Captivating audiences as a world evangelist as well, her message and ministry have been received in Australia, the Bahamas, Germany, and Brazil. Currently serving as pastor of the Womack Temple CME Church in Dyersburg, Tennessee and living by the motto: Where God Guides, He Provides, her distinguished service and remarkable dedication to improving the lives of people through faith continue to serve as an example to communities around the world.

I applaud the Turner Chapel Christian Church and Rev. Versie Pulphus Easter for their leadership, commitment, and service. I know that Rev. Easter is honored by this recognition and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting her for her exemplary years of faith and service.

27TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on July 20th 2001, we will mark the 27th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the Sovereign State of Cyprus. On this date in 1974, Turkish troops began a campaign to forcibly evict nearly 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes located in the northern part of the island of Cyprus. After twenty-seven years, Greek Cypriots are still prohibited from returning to their homes and remain refugees within their own country.

Nearly 1,000 women were raped, their ages vary from 12 to 78, while over 6,000 Greek Cypriots were massacred, many of them tortured to death. Over 1,600 men, women and children who vanished during the invasion have not been accounted for, and the Turkish government continues to refuse to provide information as to their whereabouts.

Despite these heinous crimes, Turkey continues to relocate some 80,000 Turkish citizens to Northern Cyprus, thus changing the demographic structure in the north. Many of these Turkish citizens occupy homes and estates once belonging to Greek Cypriots who were evicted during the invasion. Additionally, historical institutions of religious and cultural heritage have been willfully pillaged and destroyed.

Tragically, there are only 500 Greek Cypriots still living in the occupied area, and even those few families are subject to constant and systematic campaigns of harassment and intimidation. They are forbidden to attend school or work, denied medical assistance and cannot visit their families living in the Republic of Cyprus. This blatant violation of international law and basic human rights must not be tolerated.

In 1983, Turkey encouraged a ''unilateral declaration of independence'' by the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). The United Nations Security Council as well as our government condemned this declaration. To date the TRNC is not officially recognized as a sovereign State by any country except for Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, since that time, the international community has made some progress on this issue. In June of 1999, the European Commission of Human Rights found Turkey responsible for continuing to violate several provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights, including not accounting for missing persons, limiting the living conditions of the enslaved, and failing to protect the properties of the displaced persons.

The recent decision of the European Parliament (EP) to approve a report delivered by Jaques Poos, the former Foreign Minister of Luxembourg and the Cyprus Rapporteur of the EP Foreign Relations Commission, has rattled Turkey and the Denktash regime. The decision accused the illegal TRNC regime and Turkey of a lack of progress in efforts to find a solution on the island. In addition to insisting that the Turkish occupation forces withdraw from the island, the report defended the Greek Cypriot's position that would allow for its membership in the European Union, before a settlement of the Cyprus issue.

Mr. Denktash and his government at present are experiencing some difficulties of their own. Faced with collapsing banks, unemployment, inflation and devalued wages—the situation could be ready for change.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my argument from last year that the continued occupation of Northern Cyprus is clearly an affront to over 90 United Nations and Security Council resolutions calling on Turkey to withdraw its forces and return refugees to their homes and for Turkey to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus. This is an insult to the United States and the global community which has worked tirelessly to unify Greek and Turkish Cypriots in a peaceful manner.

I hope that the United States and the international community will continue to advocate for a peaceful solution to this conflict that has torn Cyprus apart and caused 27 years of suffering for thousands of innocent people.

H.R. 333 PROVIDES RELIEF TO FAMILIES, CONSUMERS, FARMERS, AND SMALL BUSINESSES

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my support for H.R. 333, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2001. H.R. 333 is the culmination of many years of compromise and discussion in Congress and among consumer advocates and business representatives. This bill is the culmination of efforts to protect families filing bankruptcy, family farmers, and small businesses without negatively harming responsible borrowers.

In recent years, the bankruptcy filing rate has increased rapidly, with a record high of 1.4 million in 1998. In 2000, over $40 billion was discharged through bankruptcies. Retailers pass on the costs of losing this money to all consumers by raising prices for goods and services. All consumers, regardless of their use of credit, pay for these discharged debts. In fact, bankruptcies cost each household in America $400 per year.

Furthermore, creditors are forced to restrict access to credit as bankruptcies cost creditors more and more money. This restricted access to credit disproportionately affects low-income Americans, who are most in need of affordable credit for mortgages and consumer purchases. It is more important than ever, given the recent economic downturn, that we fight to lower prices for consumers and provide equal access to credit to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 333, fairly addresses the concerns of bankruptcy filers, consumers, and creditors. This bill contains a needs-based formula that directs filers into chapter 7 or Chapter 13 based on their ability to pay. Filers earning less than the national median income are not affected by this legislation. Furthermore, if filers earn more than the national median income, but if after paying the allowable monthly deductions and secured debts payments the filers are unable to pay not less than the lesser of 25 percent of non-priority unsecured debt or $6,000 (or $100 a month), whichever is greater, or $10,000, they will have access to Chapter 7 without qualification. These precautions are taken to ensure that those who can afford to pay their debts are required to do so. And even if a filer is above the limits, this bill protects those who have special circumstances such as a decline in income or unexpected medical expenses that can be taken into account and preclude moving the filer into Chapter 13.

All of these provisions are included to ensure that bankruptcy relief is available to those who are truly in need, while ending the abuses in the system by irresponsible debtors who are capable of repaying their debts.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 333 includes provisions to protect women and children, those individuals who typically have the

most to lose in bankruptcy proceedings. There has been criticism that the bill would put women and children in competition with credit and finance companies for scarce resources of the debtor. This is not the case, however. Current bankruptcy law puts child support and alimony payments in seventh priority. H.R. 333 moves alimony and child support to the first priority of debts to be repaid. H.R. 333 also protects savings for a child's education and retirement savings. Additionally, it strengthens the ability of women to collect marital dissolution obligations.

Also of importance is the provisions that permanently extends Chapter 12, the agricultural bankruptcy chapter. It also adjusts the jurisdictional debt limit so it may be adjusted periodically pursuant to the Consumer Price Index and provides different treatment for certain tax claims arising from the disposition of a family farm. Protection of family farms is especially important given the low commodity prices of recent years. Farmers need this protection.

Finally, H.R. 333 contains a number of provisions that were devised to address serious problems in the small business bankruptcy context. Small businesses often work with small profit margins and an even smaller margin for error. Thus they cannot afford the losses they are faced with by bankruptcy abuses.

Currently, the bankruptcy system significantly harms small businesses with endless delays that last for months and even years. H.R. 333 includes provisions improving the management of bankruptcies by providing effective cost and delay reduction by incorporating several time-tested techniques.

Specifically, the bill directs bankruptcy judges to actively manage Chapter 11 cases, thereby encouraging debtors and creditors to work together to try to move businesses out of bankruptcy, and restore them to normal business practice and protecting employees.

The bill also encourages the development of standard-form plans and disclosure statements. Current law requires disclosure statements to be drafted from scratch, which greatly contributes to the costs of the Chapter 11 process. The use of standard-form plans and disclosure statements would free up vital assets that companies could otherwise use to help in the reorganization.

I believe in personal responsibility, and not spending more than you make. I also realize, however, that there are circumstances in life that prevent honest and hard-working individuals and families from getting ahead. A death in the family, divorce, job loss, unexpected medical expenses and other events can all contribute financial hardships. Our family farmers are facing low commodity prices and other unavoidable situations, and their farms should be protected. Small businesses should be provided with the ability to get out of bankruptcy quickly. We all want to enable these groups to find relief in filing for bankruptcy, while ensuring that all consumers are protected. Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 333 accomplishes these goals, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

MARCH CITIZEN OF THE MONTH

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have named Frederick Brewington, Attorney and community activist in Hempstead as Citizen of the Month in the Fourth Congressional District for March 2001.

When there is an issue the public is concerned about, you can bet Frederick is there, fighting against injustices, and seeking the truth. Our community is better because Frederick is with us.

A graduate of Northeastern University School of Law, Frederick opened his personal practice in Hempstead over 13 years ago. His law firm handles civil and voting rights, employment discrimination, constitutional law, and fair housing cases.

In addition to his practice, Frederick also finds time to teach Federal Pretrial Litigation and Trial Practice at Touro College in Huntington. A much-sought after public speaker, Frederick has addressed the Nassau Bar Association on numerous occasions, taught at the Practicing Law Institute, and conducted many media interviews.

Frederick stands out from the crowd because of his commitment to all elements of community activism. Well-fought legal battles are only part of his contribution to Nassau. He is an active member of the Church of the Good Shepherd, where he serves as a Trustee, and he is a certified Lay Preacher.

He has proven that a community is what you make of it. He has lived on Long Island, in Albany, and in Massachusetts. Frederick has been honored by all three communities, and has a long list of titles, awards of recognition, and certificates of appreciation from each.

Every so often you come across someone who is so actively, so immersed in his or her community, that you have to stop and wonder how he or she does it. Frederick is one of those people.

Frederick and is wife, Adrienne, who is pastor of United Methodist Church of Westbury, reside in Freeport.

AIDS CRISIS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the AIDS death toll now stands at a staggering 21,800,000. Sheer numbers tell us that AIDS is one of the most pressing humanitarian issues that faces the international community. From Africa, to Bangladesh, to back home in Michigan, AIDS is crippling the human condition. It is our responsibility to do all that we can to thwart this deadly pandemic.

Internationally, we should take a leadership role in combating AIDS. Of the 36 million people infected by the HIV virus today, 25 million live in sub-Saharan Africa. That is why the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund needs the full $150 million to fund its efforts to assist those countries hardest hit by HIV/AIDS, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa. I urge President Bush to continue to support President Clinton's initiative that made the patent laws over HIV/AIDS drugs in sub-Saharan Africa less stringent. This will allow African AIDS patients to more easily get their hands on the medicine which they so desperately need. In promoting education and prevention abroad, we are taking fundamental steps to battling this crisis at home which knows no borders, age, or race.

AIDS is also hitting us hard at home. More than 700,000 cases of AIDS have been reported in the United States since 1981, and as many as 900,000 Americans may be infected with HIV. In Michigan, Detroit hospitals are having a hard time providing quality HIV/AIDS care because of the costs involved. Nationwide, we need to ensure that hospitals have the proper resources to provide AIDS patients with the quality care they deserve. Half of all new HIV infections are estimated to occur between the ages of 13–24. We need to ensure that our young people have the knowledge and counseling necessary to prevent and battle this disease.

Concrete steps need to be taken to battle this overwhelming problem. The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program needs at least $300 million this year to continue to do its job. It is the only Federal program that helps our cities and States address the housing crisis facing people living with AIDS. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is in need of $10 million dollars to develop and implement a grassroots HIV/AIDS prevention media campaign for minorities. Every dollar we spend on prevention saves many lives and dollars in the long run.

It is crucial that we are not only reactive in this situation, but strongly proactive as well. I hope that all of my colleagues will do the right things, and support funding for AIDS prevention and increasing access to medication for our worldwide community. We need adequate resources to deal with this terrible crisis at home and abroad. Millions of lives are at stake.

DRESS FOR SUCCESS: EMPOWERING WOMEN THROUGH CHARITABLE GIVING

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the celebration of Women's History month, I rise to inform my colleagues and their constituents about a unique program, Dress for Success, designed to provide low-income women with appropriate dress clothing for job interviews.

Dress for Success is a non-profit organization that helps low-income women to make the transition into the workforce. To assist in this transition, Dress for Success provides each of its clients with one business suit when they receive an interview and a second suit when they secure job placement. Most of these

women are referred by organizations such as domestic violence shelters, job training programs, and programs for incarcerated women. To date, Dress for Success has provided suits to over 50,000 women.

''Clean Your Closet Week'' is its annual major business suit drive, and it is being observed during the period of March 17th—March 24th. This year ''Clean Your Closet Week'' will be celebrated in over 50 cities in the United States. One of the drop off points may be in or near your district. I encourage you to inform your constituents about this worthy and important event so that more women can be aided with re-entry into the work force. To find the Dress for Success site nearest you, please visit their web site at *www.dressforsuccess.org.*

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to explore how this program works to provide appropriate business attire to women, and how it acts to improve their self-esteem. This program promotes charitable giving to individuals in needs of assistance. We all aspire to dress for success, therefore, we should endeavor to help those who are less fortunate to realize their goals to look and feel their best.

HONORING ELDRED CLIFFORD SCHROEDER

HON. GARY MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the heroic deeds of Eldred Clifford Schroeder, a distinguished World War II veteran.

In February of 1943, at the height of World War II, 24-year-old Eldred Clifford Schroeder was drafted into the United States Army, where he was assigned to the 786th Bombardment Squadron in the European theater of operations. He climbed the ranks to become a Technical Sergeant and served as a tail gunner on a B–24 Liberator.

After flying 22 successful combat missions, Schroeder and his crew were shot down over France. Fortunately, the French underground rescued him and returned him to England where his leg was treated for shrapnel wounds. He resumed flying, but on his 26th combat mission, he was again shot down over France. This time, German troops found Schroeder, and he was taken as a prisoner of war. He was imprisoned at Stalag Luft One, in Barth, Germany, until the camp was liberated nine months later by the Russian Army in May of 1945.

Mr. Schroeder, a distinguished veteran, died in 1968 without receiving the numerous medals and honors he earned. His World War II experience reads like a Hollywood movie, but the bravery he demonstrated in the face of danger was real. Today, I am honored to celebrate the contributions he made to help win the war in Europe, and privileged to present these tokens of a grateful nation to the family of a true American hero.

On behalf of the United States Army, I proudly present the Schroeder family an Air Medal with three oak-leaf clusters, a Purple Heart, a POW Medal, an American Campaign Medal, a European, African, Middle-Eastern Campaign Medal, and Honorable Service Lapel Pin, WWII.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this 107th Congress join me in posthumously recognizing a member of our Greatest Generation, Eldred Clifford Schroeder.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL PUHCA

HON. CHARLES W. ''CHIP'' PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill today to help America's energy consumers by repealing an outdated law that serves as a barrier to competition for increased supply and transmission in today's troubled energy marketplace. This bill, which is identical to legislation introduced by Chairman TAUZIN in the last Congress and very similar to legislation approved by the Senate Banking Committee in the last Congress, would repeal a New Deal Law, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (PUHCA).

I am pleased to be joined by Representative TOWNS, Representative STEARNS and Chairman TAUZIN in introducing this important bipartisan legislation. I will be working closely with these members as we seek to bring an end to this outdated policy which has outlived its usefulness and purpose. Chairman TAUZIN has been the author of this legislation in the past and I am proud to take his mantle forward. In addition, Representative STEARNS and TOWNS have long been involved in the fight to repeal PUHCA and I look forward to working with them and having their leadership on this effort.

This legislation is a bipartisan initiative. The current Republican and previous Democratic Administrations have called for the repeal of PUHCA. Further, the bill would implement the recommendations of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) made in 1995 following an extensive study by the SEC of the effects of this outdated law on the energy markets.

Mr. Speaker, one of the factors that has contributed to the current California energy crisis and will stand in the way of any permanent solution is the structural and financial restraints imposed under PUHCA. PUHCA unnecessarily restricts the flow of capital into the troubled California market, which is inhibiting the development of new generation and transmission capacity. Repeal of PUHCA would eliminate these artificial structural and financial barriers and could contribute to the alleviation of California's energy problem and the Western regional energy problem.

PUHCA is a law that has long outlived its usefulness. It imposes unnecessary costs on consumers and directly undermines the intent of recently enacted federal and state policies designed to bring more completion and capital to America's energy market.

PUHCA was enacted in 1935 to address abuses arising out of pyramid corporate structures at a time when electric utility regulation was just starting at both the federal and state level. PUHCA's primary purpose was to simplify complex holding company structures and to limit inappropriate business practices. This purpose was accomplished in the 1950's and the SEC has recommended to Congress that PUHCA be repealed since 1981.

Today, a significant number of electric and gas utility holding companies are required by PUHCA to operate under arbitrary rules that preclude them from investing in areas of need, developing new technologies and services, and competing in open markets. Other utility companies are exempt from PUHCA's restrictions, but must operate primarily within one state in order to maintain their exemptions. Our nation's gas and electric utility companies, therefore, must operate principally within certain geographic ''boxes.'' This stifles innovation, hinders competition, and creates market power problems in the regional electricity markets which conflicts directly with FERC's efforts to open the country's wholesale markets and transmission lines.

PUHCA also delays or, in some cases, prevents registered companies from offering new products and services to their consumers. As a barrier to entry for gas and electric utilities in all states, PUHCA limits investment and growth opportunities on a nationwide basis in the gas and electric industries. PUHCA also unnecessarily restricts the flow of capital into all states thereby inhibiting the development of new transmission and generation capacity. PUHCA stands in the way of the efforts by our nation's utility industry to serve consumers in a more competitive manner.

The counterproductive restricts that PUHCA places on the natural gas and electric power industries are based on historical assumptions that are no longer valid. The factors that existed when PUHCA was enacted in 1935 no longer exist today. Federal and state laws at that time were inadequate to protect consumers and investors 66 years ago. Today, federal and state regulations have become much more comprehensive and sensitive to market conditions. PUHCA, however, remains an economic drag on America's energy industry.

Mr. Speaker, I first became aware of PUHCA's outdated restrictions when I served as an aide to Senator Lott on the Telecommunications Act of 1996. At the time, we were trying to modernize the Communications Act of 1934, another command and control New Deal legislation like PUHCA. PUHCA had to be amended to allow competition in our telecommunications industry. Today, we need to repeal the 1935 Act and replace it with one that makes sense in today's energy and capital markets.

There exists no reason to retain this outdated regulation. The ability of State commissions to regulate holding company systems and, together with the development of regulation under the Federal Power Act of 1935 and the Natural Gas Act of 1938, have eliminated the regulatory ''gaps'' that existed in 1935 with respect to wholesale transactions in interstate commerce. The expanded ability of State commissions and the FERC to regulate inter-affiliate transactions have further rendered the 1935 Act unnecessary. In addition, important market power issues will continue to be reviewed by FERC, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission.

This legislation would reform the regulation of utility holding companies by repealing the duplicative SEC-related provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, while assuring that the SEC retains all of its non-PUHCA jurisdiction of securities and securities markets in order to protect investors. The bill would put gas and electric power companies on an equal competitive footing, allowing them to take advantage of market opportunities that benefit consumers, investors and utility companies.

Registered companies will continue to be subject to the same government regulation intended to protect consumers and investors as that to which other industry participants are subject. SEC authority under the Securities Act, Exchange Act, Investment Advisers Act, and Trust Indenture Act will all remain in place. The State securities commissions will also have available to them the various State Blue-Sky laws. The bill will assure FERC access to those books, records, accounts, and other documents of holding companies, their affiliates and subsidiaries, which are relevant to costs incurred by a public utility company and which are necessary for the protection of consumers with respect to rates.

In the new environment confronting the utility industry, PUHCA has become nothing more than a bottleneck that constrains the ability of our nation's natural gas and electric power industries to serve consumers. PUHCA is an anachronism that burdens utility systems with costs and restrictions that impair their competitiveness and prevent them from adapting to the new and more competitive environment. PUHCA is no longer a solution because the problems of the 1930's have been replaced by effective state and federal legislation and by the realities of today's marketplace. Simply put, America no longer can afford the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. It is time for Congress to act on the recommendations of the SEC and to enact this legislation.

IN HONOR OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FEDERATION OF THE DODECANESIAN SOCIETY OF AMERICA AND CANADA

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the members of the Federation of the Dodecanesian Society of America and Canada. The Dodecanesian Islands include the twelve Aegean islands of ancient Greece ringing Asia Minor. The goal of the Federation is to salute the islands' struggle to remain Greek through years of occupation and their ultimate triumph 50 years ago when the twelve islands united with modern Greece. The Federation will celebrate their 50-year independence on Saturday, March 11, 2001.

The Dodecanesian Islands most certainly have a remarkable history that dates back to ancient times. The epic and legendary story of the Dodecanesian Islands is truly one of captivating heroics. The chain of islands, which include the island of Rhodes whose great colossus was one of the seven wonders of the world, are where Hippocrates, the father of Medicine, called home and began his first scientific investigation of disease and the organs of the body.

Certain individual Dodecanesian Islands have fascinating histories that accurately illustrate Greek history. The Dodecanesian island of Patmos sheltered Saint John the Evangelist and it was there he wrote the Book of Revelation. The island of Kassos contributed a large fleet to the independence struggle and as well a large part of the Greek merchant fleet which aided the allied cause in the Second World War. Homer writes that the Dodecanesian Islands aided Agamemnon in the siege of Troy, where Rhodes bought from ''that most pleasant land'' nine ''tall ships.''

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Federation of the Dodecanesian Society of America and Canada do valuable work ensuring that the American and Canadian Dodecanese decedents develop strong and unbinding ties to their homeland of Greece. This organization does an admirable job promoting and instilling ''enosis,'' the Greek word for ties to one's homeland, for thousands of my constituents and I am proud to recognize them today.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH O. WALTON, JR., A SKI INDUSTRY LEADER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a ski industry leader. Ralph O. Walton Jr. announced on March 14th that he is retiring as Chairman of the Board of Crested Butte Mountain Resort, Inc. where he has been the driving force behind shaping Crested Butte as one of Colorado's premier destination mountain resorts. His leadership in this important industry deserves the recognition and praise of this body.

In 1970, Ralph and his brother-in-law, Howard H. (Bo) Callaway bought the Crested Butte Ski area. In the 30 years since, he has been the senior officer. ''I have had a great 30 years at Crested Butte, but now is the right time for Martha and me to spend a little more time together and let the younger generation take the ski area forward,'' Ralph said.

Under his leadership, the resort invested over $100 million in improvements, including 13 lifts, two warming houses, and 700,000 square feet of construction at the base area. He pioneered the first non stop, scheduled jet service to regional mountain airports, and developed both the Crested Butte Marriott Hotel and the Crested Butte Sheraton Hotel.

''Ralph Walton has been the guiding force behind the ski area at Crested Butte for the past 30 years and the ski area owes him a great debt of gratitude for helping it get to its position today. Everyone in Crested Butte will sorely miss his active leadership but we understand his desire to retire at this time,'' said Bo Callaway, the Resort's co-owner.

The 70 year old Georgia native graduated from Auburn University in 1951 with a BS in Electrical Engineering and spent two years in the United States Army as a First Lieutenant.

Ralph has also been associated with the National Ski Areas Association as a board member. He spent time as the Vice Chairman of the Board of Colorado Ski Country, USA and as a board member. He also worked for Westinghouse Electric Corporation for sixteen years.

Ralph has also found time to be active in Rotary International, the Optimist Club, IEEE, the Hamilton Baptist Church, and the United Congressional Church of Crested Butte.

Mr. Speaker, Colorado's ski industry is losing one of its great leaders. He has done so much for the ski industry, and for Crested Butte. I would like to take a moment to thank Ralph for all his work and wish him good luck in his future endeavors.

BERENSTEIN BEAR BOOK DONATION FOR THE CHILDREN OF SAN ANTONIO

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with you the devotion to public service displayed by a group known as the Southwestern Bell Communications (SBC) Telephone Pioneers. The San Antonio Council #40 of this organization worked diligently to have 991 popular Berenstein Bear books donated to their community's schools. With this donation they are taking concrete steps to promote reading of these fun books and others by elementary school children.

The SBC Telephone Pioneers have the goal of impacting over 86,000 families by donating a set of eleven books to ninety-one elementary schools in three different San Antonio school districts. The hope is that the teachers will read these stories about the popular Berenstein Bear family to help children better understand life's little and big issues while gaining an appreciation of reading books. Brother and sister bear share their stories of starting school, making friends, and dealing with their feelings while Mama and Papa give advice. They learn about honesty, sharing, and responsibility. These wonderful stories will not only help the children relate to different situations, but hopefully will also inspire the children to continue learning through reading.

This tremendous donation by the SBC Telephone Pioneers is commendable. The over 40,000 students that will have access to these books are fortunate. The SBC Telephone Pioneers have set an example of how to improve our communities one child at a time. The donation of these books is a special tribute to the children of San Antonio and volunteers who cared enough to make a difference.

HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS RESEARCH ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the High Performance

Schools Research Act, a bill that would establish a research program at the National Science Foundation to quantify the relationship between the physical characteristics of elementary and secondary schools and student academic achievement in those schools.

I am pleased that my colleagues Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. HONDA are joining me as original cosponsors of this bill.

This legislation is part of a package of bills I plan to introduce or cosponsor that together will promote ''federal smart growth.'' As we have seen in my state of Colorado, sprawl around our fast-growing towns and cities destroys valuable open space, farmland, wildlife, and natural, cultural and recreational resources. I believe that the federal government can do a better job to support state and community efforts to control growth and prevent sprawl.

I am introducing the High Performance Schools Research Act in conjunction with a bill I am reintroducing today, the High Performance Schools Act of 2001 (H.R. 3143 in the 106th Congress). The High Performance Schools Act takes the concept of ''whole buildings'' and puts it into the context of our schools, establishing a program in the Department of Energy to help school districts produce ''high performance'' school buildings. With energy costs and school enrollment on the rise and school buildings across the country in need of construction or major repairs, school districts need to have the appropriate tools and assistance to make good building decisions. The High Performance Schools Act is intended to help school districts make these good decisions, as well as to conserve energy and protect the environment.

In addition to the economic and environmental benefits of smart building choices, evidence is growing that high performance buildings are beneficial for student performance. A growing number of studies link student achievement and behavior to the physical building conditions. A study from Mississippi State University, for example, showed that in schools in North Carolina, Texas and Nevada, variables such as natural light and climate control played a role in improved test scores, higher morale and fewer discipline problems. And in one of the most rigorous studies of its kind, a 1999 report commissioned by Pacific Gas & Electric found that students who took their lessons in classrooms with more natural light scored as much as 25 percent higher on standardized tests than other students in the same school district.

But while these studies have begun to reveal important information correlating a school building's environment with student performance, no large-scale, comprehensive study has been conducted to date. Understandably, school districts are reluctant to base infrastructure investment decisions on the results of a few narrowly conceived studies. So to give them the information they need to make better decisions, I am introducing the High Performance Schools Research Act, which will establish a National Science Foundation research program to thoroughly investigate the linkages between specific characteristics of the physical environment of a school and student learning. My hope is that further research will confirm initial findings correlating a school's environment to academic achievement, thus bolstering the case for high performance schools, which are themselves important components in any smart growth plan.

I look forward to working with my colleagues Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. HONDA and other Members of the House to move forward with this initiative.

THE HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS RESEARCH ACT

The High Performance Schools Research Act would establish a research program at the National Science Foundation to quantify the relationship between the physical characteristics of elementary and secondary schools and student academic achievement in those schools.

This bill is intended as a companion to the High Performance Schools Act of 2001, which takes the concept of ''whole buildings'' and puts it into the context of our schools, establishing a program in the Department of Energy to help school districts produce ''high performance'' school buildings.

CONTEXT

In addition to the economic and environmental benefits of smart building choices, evidence is growing that high performance buildings are beneficial for student performance. A growing number of studies link student achievement and behavior to the physical building conditions. Although these studies have begun to reveal important information correlating a school building's environment with student performance, no large-scale, comprehensive study has been conducted to date.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

The High Performance Schools Research Act is intended to help give school districts the information they need to make better decisions. The bill would establish a National Science Foundation research program to thoroughly investigate the linkages between specific characteristics of the physical environment of a school and student learning.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues in the Women's Caucus who have been organizing weekly special orders around topics of great concern to women during the time when we celebrate Women's History Month.

Today's topic is violence against women. Violence against women is a profound and extremely pervasive problem, striking across borders, across economic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and across all the age groups. It is an epidemic that affects not only women, but their children and families as well.

We, in Congress, should be proud that we were able to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act last session. Now, we must live up to our promise and appropriate full funding to the programs included in this bill.

Furthermore, pervasive discrimination continues to deny women full political and economic equality, and is often at the root of violations of their basic human rights. This is reflected in the various manifestations of violence women endure: domestic violence; female genital mutilation; sex trafficking; rape during times of armed conflict; sexual assault; ''honor'' killings; sex-selection or gender preference abortions; and other manifestations, including neglect in areas of education and nutrition women and girls endure, both here and abroad.

The statistics are appalling. Globally, 1 out of every 3 women has been beaten or sexually abused in her lifetime. In the United States, 1 out of every 6 women has been beaten or sexually abused. There are somewhere between 1 to 2 million women and girls who are illegally trafficked around the world, with at least 50,000 coming into the United States. Some 130 million girls and young women have undergone female genital mutilation and it is estimated that in the United States there are at least 10,000 girls at risk of this practice.

Women's lives are endangered by violence which is directed at them simply because they are women. We must stop what I believe has become too accepted and tolerated in our society. Violence against women is not acceptable and we must get that message out to both the perpetrators of the violence and the women who endure it.

We recently witnessed a landmark moment in international justice, when three Bosnian Serbs were convicted for the rape, torture, and sexual enslavement of Muslim women during the Bosnian war. For the first time in the international justice system, sex crimes against women are being specifically identified and punished. In the past, UN war crimes tribunals ignored mass rape and sexual enslavement and considered these crimes to be a natural occurrence in war. Crimes against women such as forced prostitution and rapes that took place during WWI were never even prosecuted in the international tribunals that followed the war. Today, perhaps most significantly, the judges ruled that mass rape is a crime against humanity, the most serious category of international crimes after genocide.

However, while there is still even one woman out there who endures violence, our work will not be complete. We need more money for services such as transitional housing and job placement and training to support women while they seek to escape abusive situations. We also need to provide trainings to educate boys and girls against violence so the problem stops.

We must change our attitudes to come up with remedies to cure this epidemic, not just treat its symptoms. We as women must be empowered to challenge the culture of violence. Our work can not be complete until the women of the world live free from an ever present fear of violence.

TRIBUTE TO THE FOUNDERS OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the founders of San Antonio, Texas,

the city I represent here in the United States Congress. Friday, March 9, 2001 marked the 270th anniversary of the founding of La Villa de San Fernando, the settlement which would later become known as the City of San Antonio.

On March 9, 1731, the Spanish Government founded the first permanent civic settlement in what is now the State of Texas. On this day, under the stewardship of Spanish King, Philip V, sixteen Canary Island families arrived in the territory then known as Tejas to establish La Villa de San Fernando. It would become the first civic government in Texas.

In honor of the sacrifices and contributions of the founding families of the City of San Antonio, and on behalf of the Canary Islands Descendants Association of San Antonio, Texas, I hereby recognize the role of the Canary Islanders in the founding of the Villa De San Fernando in 1731—later named San Antonio, Texas.

The founding of the city of San Antonio was achieved formally under the law of the Council of the Indies which was the Spanish law governing Nueva Espana in 1731;

With the arrival of the Canary Islanders, having the required number of ten families, the number required by the Laws of the Indies, to establish a town, the settlers were thus entitled to organize their own civil government, to receive lands for the construction of their homes and the sowing and raising of crops, to have a church and town hall, and to build a town with a public square and regularly planned streets;

After reaching their destination, following untold hardships, the exhausted travelers were received by Captain Juan Antonio de Almazan of the Presidio of Bejar; on the following day they were lodged in the best houses of the soldiers;

Following the detailed instructions of Viceroy Juan de Acuna, Marquez de Casafuerte the survey and distribution of the lands for the establishment of a new settlement was made;

On March 12, 1731 Captain Almazan took the heads of families to the Arroyo (now called San Pedro Creek) and divided the lands among them for a later time when they might divide the lands with more care. He urged them to plant crops before June 30;

By July 2, 1731 the settlers gave their efforts to the establishment of the proposed town, the church, and the public square;

On the following day July 3, 1731 lots were distributed to the families to build their homes adjoining the church and Casa Real. Then a large cross was formed at the main entrance of the Church as the center. By completing each of the four squares of the four sides of the cross a perfect larger square two thousand one hundred eighty-six varas on each side was delineated. The corners were identified by four long rocks as markers. A deep furrow was plowed from corner to corner to indicate the boundary in accordance with the instructions of the Viceroy;

On July 20, 1731 the first civil government was established when Captain Almazan appointed the members of the city council and other officers.

The Canary Islanders who were sent by King Philip V to establish the Villa de San Fernando did accomplish and played an important role in the beginning of the development of the magnificent City of San Antonio, in the region first known as Tejas, which developed into the great State of Texas.

TUNISIA 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARK KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize a great ally of the United States, Tunisia, as she celebrates 45 years of independence. In 1797, the United States signed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with the North African country of Tunisia. Over 150 years later, Tunisia peacefully gained independence from France. Today, we congratulate Tunisia for 45 years as an independent nation.

The Republic of Tunisia has remained a steadfast friend to the United States, joining Allied forces during World War II and continuing support throughout the Cold War. Today, Tunisia enjoys a burgeoning economy, as the nation's per capita income continues to grow substantially. One of Tunisia's most valuable assets has been its continued willingness to further the Middle East peace process. Despite being surrounded by nations engulfed in political turmoil, Tunisia continues to take an active role in fighting terrorism and international unrest.

I congratulate Tunisia on 45 years of independence and look forward to the United States' continuing strong relations with Tunisia for years to come. Please join me in celebrating the 45th Anniversary of Tunisia's independence.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK ACT OF 2001

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GOODLATTE Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the National Right to Work Act of 2001.

This Act will reduce federal power over the American workplace by removing those provisions of federal law authorizing the collection of forced-union dues as part of a collective bargaining contract.

Since the Wagner Act of 1935 made forced-union dues a keystone of federal labor law, millions of American workers have been forced to pay for union ''representation'' that they neither choose nor desire.

The primary beneficiaries of Right to Work are America's workers—even those who voluntarily choose to pay union dues, because when union officials are deprived of the forced-dues power granted them under current federal law, they will be more responsive to the workers'needs and concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this act is pro-worker, pro-economic growth, and pro-freedom.

The twenty-one states with Right to Work laws, including my own state of Virginia, have a nearly three-to-one advantage over non-Right to Work states in terms of job creation.

Workers who have the freedom to choose whether or not to join a union have a higher standard of living than their counterparts in non-Right to Work states. The National Right to Work Act would make the economic benefits of voluntary unionism a reality for all Americans.

While this bill is about economics, it is more about freedom.

Compelling a man or woman to pay fees to a union in order to work violates the very principle of individual liberty upon which this nation was founded. Oftentimes, forced union dues are used to support causes that worker does not wish to support with his or her hard-earned wages.

Thomas Jefferson said it best, ''. . . to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.''

By passing the National Right to Work Act, this Congress will take a major step toward restoring the freedom of America's workers to choose the form of workplace representation that best suits their needs.

In a free-society, the decision of whether or not to join or support a union should be made by a worker, not a union official, not an employer, and certainly not the U.S. Congress.

The National Right to Work Act reduces federal power over America's labor markets, promotes economic growth and a higher standard of living, and enhances freedom.

I urge my colleagues to quickly pass the National Right to Work Act and free millions of Americans from the tyranny of forced-union dues.

TRIBUTE TO ALEX BRISEÑO FOR TWENTY–FOUR YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to recognize Alex Briseño for his 24 years of service to the City of San Antonio. As Mr. Briseño retires from his current position as the City Manager to one of the largest cities in Texas we know that his hard work and dedication will be greatly missed by the people of our community.

Nobody understands San Antonio's government better than Alex Briseño. He began his career with the City of San Antonio in 1977 as assistant to the city manager. Within three years he advanced to become an assistant city manager. During his next ten years of service he learned the intricacies of different departments within the city, knowledge that would empower him to manage the city staff with the wise hand of experience. He supervised numerous different departments ranging from the Budget Department to the Information Services and Health Department. He was well prepared for the challenges he would face as

city manager, the city's top non-elected executive position.

In 1990, Mr. Briseño became city manager for a city that currently has more than 1.1 million people and covers an area of 417 square miles. He oversaw a budget of more than $1 billion and managed 11,000 employees. Through his leadership in the past ten years San Antonio has continued to grow and develop.

Mr. Briseño not only shared his leadership skills with the city while acting as city manager; he also served the community through his service in various organizations. He has been on the board of directors of the Boy Scouts of America, helping to develop the youth of our nation. He has served on the United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County Board of Trustees to better the lives of those in need, served on the board of directors of his alma mater, Trinity University, to improve education in the city, and worked with the Alamo Area Council and Free Trade Alliance San Antonio to create new opportunities for growth and advancement.

One aspect of this Mr. Briseño's life that helped to prepare him for leadership in the city of San Antonio was his education. At Trinity University he earned his undergraduate degree in economics where he graduated magna cum laude. He then continued his education to earn his Master's in Urban Studies. His service as a captain in the United States Army was another invaluable source of education that prepared him for his future years in city government.

We should all commend the dedication of this man to his job and his community. He was born and raised in San Antonio, received his education in life there, and stayed to help build its future. San Antonio is a better place because of Mr. Briseño's service. We wish him well in all future endeavors.

HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2001

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the High Performance Schools Act of 2001, a bill intended to help school districts build schools that provide better learning environments for children, while also saving on energy costs and protecting the environment.

I am pleased that my colleagues Representatives SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, GEORGE MILLER, DAVID BONIOR, BOB ETHERIDGE, and MIKE HONDA are joining me as original cosponsors of this bill.

This legislation is part of a package of bills I plan to introduce or cosponsor that promotes sustainable development and preserves quality of life in communities that are undergoing intense growth. As we have seen in my State of Colorado and in many parts of the West, unprecedented population growth has led to urban sprawl and congestion, which has eroded much of the quality of life we value, including valuable open space, farmland, wildlife, and natural, cultural and recreational resources.

I believe that the Federal Government can do a better job to support State and community efforts to control growth and prevent sprawl. And this bill is one step toward that goal.

Many of you know about my interest in clean energy. As lead co-chair of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus in the House, I am committed to promoting these technologies that further our national goals of broad-based economic growth, environmental protection, national security, and economic competitiveness.

In recent years, we've seen a wide array of successes in developing these technologies. In particular, much research has focused on improving energy efficiency and increasing the use of renewable energy in buildings in a "whole building" approach to design and construction. By incorporating advanced energy efficiency technologies, daylighting, and renewable energy, "whole buildings" provide benefits in the way of energy savings, environmental protection, and economic efficiency. As buildings account for roughly a third of our annual energy consumption and a commensurate share of greenhouse gas emissions, this research focus seems well justified. They are also important components in any smart growth plan.

The bill I am introducing today—the "High Performance Schools Act of 2001"—takes the concept of "whole buildings" and puts it into the context of our schools. My bill would establish a program in the Department of Energy to help school districts produce "high performance" school buildings. It would provide block grants to State offices of energy that would then be allocated as grants to school districts for building design and technical assistance. These grants would be available to school districts that are faced with rising elementary and secondary school enrollments, that can't afford to make major investments in construction or renovation, and that commit to work with the state agencies to produce school facilities that incorporate a "high performance" building approach.

Now is the time for improving the way we build our schools. One reason why—the current energy crisis is taking its toll on school districts across the country. Many of them are being forced to pay higher heating bills with funds that had been budgeted for textbooks or new teacher salaries. We must do all we can to ensure that scarce education resources are used primarily for education purposes, not to keep our children warm.

Another reason why the timing for this initiative is critical—this country is currently experiencing a dramatic increase in student enrollment due to the "baby boom echo," the children of the baby boom generation. During the 20 years from 1989 to 2009, this Nation is being asked to educate an additional 8.3 million children. At the same time, over 70 percent of our Nation's schools were built before 1960 and are now in need of major repairs.

Visiting schools in the 2nd Congressional district in Colorado, I have seen firsthand the spaces in which our children are learning and growing. Many districts can't afford sorely needed remodeling or construction of new schools, while others are scrambling to address severe overcrowding issues. And we aren't alone: School enrollment in Colorado increased by 70,000 students in the last five years. While new schools open at or above capacity, enrollment is projected to grow in Colorado by 120,000 in the next decade.

Clearly, there's an urgent need for school construction—in Colorado and in every State across the country. Thousands of communities nationwide are even now in the process of building new schools and renovating existing ones. But in drawing up construction plans, schools often focus on short-term construction costs instead of longterm, life-cycle savings. My bill would help ensure that school districts have the tools and assistance they need to make good building decisions.

High performance schools are a win for energy savings and a win for the environment, but best of all, they are also a win for student performance. A growing number of studies link student achievement and behavior to the physical building conditions. A study from Mississippi State University, for example, showed that in schools in North Carolina, Texas and Nevada, variables such as natural light and climate control played a role in improved test scores, higher morale and fewer discipline problems. And in one of the most rigorous studies of its kind, a 1999 report commissioned by Pacific Gas & Electric found that students who took their lessons in classrooms with more natural light scored as much as 25 percent higher on standardized tests than other students in the same school district.

We wouldn't dream of putting only manual typewriters in new school buildings—we would install today's computer technology. Nor should we build yesterday's "energy inefficient," non-sustainable, and less effective schools. Our kids are our country's future, and they should have the best school facilities, especially if they will cost less and benefit us all in other ways.

In short, we have an enormous opportunity to build a new generation of sustainable schools, schools that incorporate the best of today's designs and technologies and as a result provide better learning environments for our children, cost less to operate, and help protect our local and global environment. The High Performance Schools Act would start us on the road to achieving these goals. I look forward to working with Reps. BOEHLERT, MILLER, BONIOR, ETHERIDGE, and HONDA and other Members of the House to move forward with this important initiative.

THE HIGH PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2001

The High Performance Schools Act would enable our school districts to build today's schools with today's designs and technologies, producing school buildings that take advantage of advanced energy conservation technologies, daylighting, and renewable energy. Not only has this "whole building" approach been demonstrated to improve student performance, but such buildings also cost less to operate and help protect our local and global environment.

CONTEXT

Fully 25 percent of the energy used in today's schools is wasted, costing schools some $1.5 billion every year. Ending this waste could pay for the entire careers of 70 additional teachers in each of our congressional

districts. These savings could be especially significant at a time when there is a clear need for more teachers.

There is also a clear need for school construction. Students of the ''echo boom'' generation—the children of the baby boomers—are reaching school age even while class sizes are being reduced. At the same time, studies show that over 70 percent of our nation's schools were built before 1960 and are now in need of major repairs. School construction and modernization earned an ''F'' from the American Society of Civil Engineers in its 1998 Report Card for America's Infrastructure. Many districts can't afford sorely needed remodeling or construction of new schools, while others are scrambling to address severe overcrowding issues.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

The High Performance Schools Act of 2001 would help give school districts the tools and assistance they need to make good building choices. The bill would establish a program in the Department of Energy to help school districts produce ''high performance'' school buildings. Funds would be directed to school districts through state offices of energy for building design and technical assistance. These grants would be available to school districts that are faced with rising elementary and secondary school enrollments, that lack the resources to make major infrastructural investments, and that commit to work with the state agencies to produce school facilities that incorporate a ''high performance'' building approach. Some grants would also be available to facilitate private and public financing, promote the use of energy service companies, work with school administrations, students, and communities, and coordinate public benefit programs.

TRIBUTE TO JERALD T. MAHSHIE

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is truly my distinct honor to pay tribute to one of Northwest Indiana's hidden treasures, Jerald T. Mahshie, of Schererville, Indiana. Jerry is one of the most dedicated, distinguished and creative citizens of Indiana's First Congressional District.

For the past 3½ years, Jerry has been the Director of Food and Beverage at the Radisson Hotel at Star Plaza in Merrillville, Indiana. While Jerry has been a resident of the First Congressional District for only a short time, Northwest Indiana has certainly been rewarded by the true service and uncompromising dedication he has displayed to both its citizens and communities, as well as his employer.

During his tenure at the Radisson Hotel, Jerry's consummate professionalism and attention to detail enabled the facility to become one of the premier meeting and dining locations in the First Congressional District.

When I think of Jerry, the first image that comes to my mind is not his successful professional career, but his extraordinary leadership and care for others. Whenever a project has needed a leader or an issue has needed to be addressed, Jerry has stepped forward to accept the challenge. Unfortunately, Northwest Indiana will be losing this hidden treasure, as Jerry has accepted a position in the Indiana's capitol, Indianapolis.

Jerry is truly a remarkable man. His hard work has earned him a number of accomplishments and awards. Such achievements include: Member of the American Academy of Chefs, President of the American Culinary Federation Chefs of Northwest Indiana, Certified Executive Chef, 1999 Lake County Convention and Visitors Bureau Hospitality and Professional of the Year. In addition to his devotion to his job, Jerry finds time to serve his community. He is a past member of the Hammond Area Career Center Advisory Board and the Ivy Tech Gary Campus Advisory Board, as well as the Chairman for the 2001 Taste of Northwest Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Jerry Mahshie for his remarkable accomplishments, enduring service, and the unforgettable effect he has had on the people of Northwest Indiana. We will surely miss him. May the future continue to hold great things for this outstanding professional.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE PATSY MINK OF HAWAII

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, a time to reflect upon and honor the contributions of women that have made this country a better place. Today, we are going to recognize one of our own.

Few dispute the positive impact of Title IX, the landmark civil rights legislation that prohibits sex discrimination in federally-funded education programs. But I wonder how many of my colleagues realize that we have the privilege to serve with one of the driving forces behind that law—the Gentlelady from Hawaii, Patsy Mink.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Patsy was one of the architects of Title IX. And since its enactment 30 years ago, she has been a leading voice in the call for full enforcement of the law.

The importance of her work cannot be understated. This is demonstrated by my own family's experience.

Only the youngest of my three daughters, Adrienne, had the opportunity to play soccer from kindergarten on through college.

As the assistant soccer coach for her team in the mid and late 1980s, I can well remember the excitement of the girls—and their parents—when girls' soccer first became a recognized team sport in our high school. That meant that Adrienne, just like my son Rody before her, would have the opportunity to play a sport she loved throughout her years in school.

But the impact of Title IX is widespread.

Thanks to its passage in 1972, my daughter Adrienne and so many other young women and girls throughout America have come to benefit from the opportunities enjoyed for so long by young men and boys in America.

A recent GAO study reported that, since the enactment of Title IX, the number of women enrolled in college has more than doubled from about 3.7 million to 8.2 million. The number of women participating in intercollegiate sports also has grown from about 30,000 to 157,000—this is an increase from 1.7 percent to 5.5 percent of all full-time, undergraduate women. The unparalleled opportunities that women and girls currently have in the classroom and on the playing field are due in large part to Title IX.

Title IX has enabled young women to participate in school sports—to learn the value of teamwork and competition, and to gain the self-confidence and skills that are so valuable in business and in other future careers.

I cannot say enough about how instrumental Patsy was in bringing out these opportunities for young women. As with any issue on which Patsy Mink takes a stand, she has consistently shown her passion for enforcing gender equity, particularly as it relates to education. And as the legislative record shows, she has been steadfast in her commitment to preserving the advances and effectiveness of Title IX.

Congresswoman Mink is to be commended for her leadership on Title IX. She will long be remembered for her tireless efforts toward achieving true equality for women. And her efforts truly represent the spirit and ideals of Women's History Month.

SBA LEGISLATION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a bill which will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Small Business Administration (SBA). As you know, the Small Business Administration (SBA) is responsible for aiding, counseling, assisting, and protecting the interests of the nation's small businesses. According to the U.S. General Accounting Office, as of September 30, 2000, SBA's total loan portfolio was about $52 billion, including $45 billion in direct and guaranteed small business loans and other guarantees and $7 billion in disaster loans. The SBA plays a critical role in the development of small businesses all around the nation.

However, in a recent report, GAO found that SBA's lack of a coordinated lender oversight program increases the potential for program abuse and unnecessary financial risk. Therefore, GAO recommended that SBA ensure that the required 7(a) lender oversight reviews are conducted. Additionally, GAO recommended that SBA establish organizational responsibilities and a mechanism for ensuring that information on the lender review process is collected, reported and analyzed.

I am introducing this legislation to ensure that GAO's recommendations are carried out. My bill, if enacted, would not only address GAO's concerns by establishing an office which has responsibility for lender oversight reviews but would also bring forth a mechanism for ensuring that information on the lender review process and lender compliance is

collected, analyzed and reported to relevant Congressional Committees.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a partisan issue, but it is a good government issue because it not only assures that the people's money is spent wisely but empowers the SBA to ensure that the laws are followed. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I look forward to being able to vote on this bill on the house floor.

RURAL EDUCATION

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to reintroduce the Rural Education Development Initiative (REDI) Act which calls for an increased focus on rural education and provides assistance to the many small, poor, rural schools in our country. As the House begins the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, REDI will ensure that the educational opportunities for rural areas are not forgotten.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that 46 percent of our Nation's public schools serve rural areas, yet they only receive 22 percent of the Nation's education funds annually. In addition data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) consistently shows large gaps between the achievement of students in high-poverty schools and those in other schools.

Another critical problem for rural school districts involves the hiring and retention of qualified administrators and certified teachers, especially in special education, science, and mathematics. Consequently, teachers in rural schools are almost twice as likely to provide instruction in two or more subjects than teachers in urban schools.

More importantly, many small school districts often can't qualify for federal programs based on their small enrollments, and some money-distribution formulas do not fit many states' county-wide system of school districting.

All these problems add up to one thing: our rural schools need more funding opportunities. REDI provides this opportunity and gives our rural students a chance to succeed. This legislation creates a grant program to assist rural areas with technology efforts, professional development activities designed to prepare teachers who are teaching out of their primary subject area, academic enrichment programs, and activities to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in special education, mathematics, or science.

REDI is bi-partisan and is supported by the National Education Association (NEA). I look forward to working with my Colleagues to enact REDI and realize our goal of parity for rural students.

POLITICIZING THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, "Bipartisanship." "The rule of law." A judiciary that "looks and feels like the diverse country" we are. All ideas that then-Governor Bush's campaign promised to deliver on during the fall campaign.

Many believe that these slogans were just that: Bromides intended as camouflage, as feel-good dressing for a right wing agenda far outside the political mainstream.

President Bush's actions with the federal judiciary in just the past week—when the White House may believe that everyone is distracted with the tax cutting plan for the rich—may in fact prove just how far out of touch with the mainstream, and its own campaign rhetoric, this administration really is.

First, the White House has floated a balloon that it's considering abandoning the long-standing practice of soliciting comments from the ABA for judicial nominees. This could be the clearest signal that ideology and a crass desire to politicize the judiciary—rather than judicial competence—will be touchstone for Bush nominations to the federal judiciary.

And then today, the Bush administration has announced that it would rescind nominations for the federal bench made by the Clinton Administration. Among the casualties, African American judges who bore the stamp of enthusiastic approval from the ABA and from Republicans. Judges such as Roger Gregory, who had support of two Republican senators in Virginia, and who would represent the first African American appointment on the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals. Judge Gregory was appointed to the court in a recess appointment after the Republican Senate would not schedule a confirmation vote.

Both actions speak loudly to African Americans. They portend a plan by this Bush White House to politicize the judiciary. They both turn the clock backwards.

Today's Detroit News has the following article which is on point.

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 20, 2001]

BUSH WITHDRAWS MICH. JUDICIAL NOMINEES

(By Jesse J. Holland)

WASHINGTON.—President Bush on Monday dumped former President Clinton's last judicial nominees, including two Michigan women nominated for the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals who never got a hearing.

Michigan Court of Appeals Judge Helene White waited for a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing for four years—longer than any other judicial nominee in history.

And Detroit attorney Kathleen McCree Lewis, a partner in the Dykema Gossett law firm who often argues cases before the 6th Circuit, was nominated in September 1999 but never had a hearing.

"I'm very disappointed," she said. "I knew it could happen, but because there had been statements about bipartisanship, it was my hope that it wouldn't."

Bush officially withdrew 62 executive and judicial nominations.

Besides Michigan, the 6th Circuit includes Ohio, Tennessee and Kentucky.

"Both of these nominees were not only very qualified and widely respected, but would have been excellent members of the federal bench," said Rep. Debbie Stabenow, D–Lansing. "While the President has continued to talk about the need to reach out to Democrats and foster greater bipartisanship in Washington, it's time he needs to follow-up his words with bipartisan deeds."

Stabenow and Sen. Carl Levin, D–Detroit, had been pushing for a hearing for the two Michigan nominees.

"Some of these individuals will be considered for positions in the Bush administration," White House spokesman Scott McClellan said. "No one should be considered ruled in or out at this point."

The decision to withdraw the Clinton judicial nominees comes as Bush starts to look at filling the remaining vacancies with his own nominees.

White House counsel Albert Gonzales and Atty. Gen. John Ashcroft met with top officials from the American Bar Association on Monday to discuss the nomination process. A committee of senior administration officials led by Gonzales has interviewed more than 50 candidates in a drive to fill nearly 100 vacancies with judges who share Bush's conservative philosophy.

LASTING PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND IN U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week was Saint Patrick's Day and Irish events all around our country and the globe, commemorated the patron Saint of Ireland. The Irish in America proudly celebrated their heritage and prayed for lasting peace and justice in the long divided and troubled north of Ireland. Along with Ireland's many friends around the globe, we joined in that prayer for lasting peace.

Former President Bill Clinton played an important role, along with former Senator George Mitchell, in bringing about the historic Good Friday Accord of April 1998 that has the best chance for making that peace a reality, if the accord is carried out and honored by all sides.

Now, I am pleased to note that our new President, George W. Bush, has willingly and aggressively picked up the mantle of our continued U.S. support for finding and sustaining a lasting peace and justice in the north. Unlike any President of the United States in my memory, President Bush last week at the White House ceremony for Saint Patrick's Day stated, "It is in our national interest that there be lasting peace, a real lasting peace, in Northern Ireland.

I join with all of the Irish American community in thanking President Bush for that strong and unambiguous statement of our continued U.S. interest and support in the long and difficult struggle for lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the full text of President Bush's remarks at the White House ceremony for Irish American Leaders held on

March 16, 2001 be included at this point in the RECORD, and I invite my colleagues to review the President's significant supporting statement for peace in Ireland and I look forward to joining in a bi-partisan effort to support the President's initiative here in the Congress.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT DURING RECEPTION FOR IRISH-AMERICAN LEADERS

The President: Thank you very much. It sounds like we invited some rowdy Irish-Americans. (Laughter.) Thank you all for coming. Taoiseach, thank you very much, sir. Secretary of State of Northern Ireland, Dr. Reid; First Minister Trimble; Deputy First Minister Mallon. Thank you all for being here.

I want to thank the ambassadors who are here; I want to thank the other leaders from Northern Ireland who are here. It's most gracious of you to take your time to come and celebrate St. Patrick's Day with us. Mr. Speaker, it's good to see you again, sir, as well.

The Taoiseach and I just had an excellent meeting. We spent a good hour of frank dialogue. He gave me Dublin's perspective on the peace process in Northern Ireland, just as Prime Minister Blair gave me London's perspective when we met last month. An Irish proverb tell us that a friends's eye is a good mirror. and I can tell you that what is striking about my meetings with both Prime Ministers is how similar their persepectives are, how optimistic they are and how determined they are.

It is clear that all sides want the Good Friday Agreement to succeed. It is also clear that all sides are seeking to overcome very difficult internal obstacles and to keep up forward momentum. The agreement negotiated by both Prime Ministers in Belfast last week is a reflection of a common commitment. As always, we deeply appreciate the efforts.

And, again, I want to pledge what I said yesterday; the United States stands ready to help. (Applause.) It is in our national interest that there be a lasting peace, a real lasting peace, in Northern Ireland.

I also want to say how much I appreciate the contributions that Irish-Americans have made to the cause of peace. Many of you are right here in this room, and our nation thanks you. By supporting those committed to a peaceful approach, you're truly giving something back to your native land.

Today is also about celebrating what Irish-Americans have given to their adopted land. The White House itself was designed by an Irish-American. This fact about America's home is symbolic of the contributions made by millions of Irish of both Catholic and Protestant persuasion.

Your industry and talent and imagination have enriched our commerce and enriched our culture. The strong record of public service has fortified our democracy. And the strong ties to family and faith and community have strengthened our nation's character. In short, the Irish are a big reason why we'll always be proud to call ourselves a nation of immigrants.

Happy St. Patrick's Day. (Applause).

And now, would you join us, please, for some refreshments in the State Room. Welcome to the White House. (Applause.)